seem necessary to go over Rhodesia's defense to discuss disposition of the problem posed.

Question. Why not aim our attack on South Africa through military action over Southwest Africa, the area where South Africa is most vulnerable?

Chief Adebo stated that the U.N. has taken the position that South Africa has no right to continue to administer Southwest Africa. The friends of South Africa should press her to avoid a confrontation. The U.N. should proceed according to the provisions of the Charter and impose economic sanctions, and if these do not succeed, military sanctions.

Question. What will the African countries do if the Western countries do nothing?

Chief Adebo answered that the African countries can do little by themselves without assistance from the U.N., the countries of the West and the East. But those who have the power now should use it wisely.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John E. Huss, Charleston Heights Baptist Church, Charleston Heights, S.C., offered the following prayer:

It is with sincerity, Father in Heaven, that we earnestly pray for peace to come to our troubled world.

We pray for our enemies, even as Jesus taught us to pray. Enable them to realize that we merely seek justice and that we shall never lack in resoluteness.

Endow our President with wisdom. Give our lawmakers the determination to seek the right. Help them to use their high position of responsibility in sacrificial and noble service to our country.

And, Father, help us to humble ourselves, and to seek Thy face, and to turn from the ways of wickedness. In turn fulfill Thy promise to "hear from heaven, forgive our sin and heal our land."

We ask in His dear name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 286) entitled "An act to permit duty-free treatment of dicyandiamide pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962."

## LET US BRING CONGRESS UP TO DATE

Mr. SCHADEBERG. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, legislative reorganization has been the topic of frequent discussion and debate over the years in this Chamber and, I hope, at long last is approaching the stage of legislative action. The streamlining of Congress is a major issue of concern today throughout the Nation. We are living in the space age yet operating with horse-and-buggy machinery. The sixties demand that we take vital and constructive action in this area.

I have prepared testimony for the House Rules Committee on the proposal for legislative reorganization. I am including in the RECORD today my suggestions covering what I consider a unique change in present practice which I urge the Members to read and study carefully as a basis for serious thought on how we can make representative government in this changing modern world not only more efficient but effective.

My suggestions, I admit, are weighted on the side of the constituent, yet I firmly believe that they would also prove to be ultimately to the best interests of the health and well-being of the Members.

## THE LATE HONORABLE KONRAD ADENAUER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I turned on my TV set and found myself unexpectedly at the funeral of Konrad Adenauer.

It has been a great many years since I have been so deeply moved.

I have had the privilege of meeting him. Since I speak a little German, we had a happy little conference. His handshake was wonderful. His eyes were beyond anything one could imagine.

Yesterday during the mass and during the long procession evidencing such heartfelt respect and such deep feeling by those soldiers of the new Germany I was carried away. I missed my committee, but I did not care. The committee was not so important just then, though I did get there late.

But what that man in his 91 years has given to this world is almost unbelievable, raising Germany, as he did, from the depths to a place of respect among the nations. I said a little word in this Chamber about his death, but I could not restrain myself from speaking as I have this morning. I hope some of the rest of you heard and saw that satellite presentation. I hope you are reading the papers, but most of all I hope that as long as you live you will remember that Konrad Adenauer was a man of greatness of soul. We know that never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be never; birthless, deathless, and changeless remaineth the spirit forever. It is my earnest hope, indeed my prayer, that some of his humble magnificence may have been left among us and that we, sometimes arrogant, Americans, may find it in our hearts.

## FAVOR KEEPING OUR SPACE TECHNOLOGY

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much opposed to NASA Administrator James Webb's call for cooperative efforts between the United States and Russia in manned exploration of space. Mr. Webb is overlooking the fact that the law allows only Congress the right to make such a decision, not the administration, and not an emotional Space Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the loss of the life of the Russian cosmonaut—as I joined Americans in sorrow over the loss of our three astronauts. But I do not believe we can allow emotion to overlook the fact that Russia is our real enemy in Vietnam where far more American lives are being lost than in either country's space efforts. It is Russia that says they should join with Communist China to "defeat the United States in Vietnam." It is Russia that provides the missiles that attack our fighters and bombers. And, it is Russia that supplies the arms and ammunition, in increasing quantities, that are used daily against our American servicemen.

In the space effort it has been the United States that has developed the technology for space exploration, and some of that information is for defensive military purposes. Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept any proposal for sharing that outer space information with a country that is so openly trying to defeat us on the ground.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

[Roll No. 72]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Hansen, Idaho | Pool |
| Baring | Hawkins | Pucinski |
| Bell | Hays | Riegle |
| Berry | Hébert | Ronan |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Henderson | Rostenkowski |
| Celler | Holland | Roybal |
| Conyers | Hull | St. Onge |
| Cowger | Jacobs | Sullivan |
| Cunningham | Lennon | Taylor |
| Dawson | Long, La. | Tenzer |
| de la Garza | McEwen | Tunney |
| Diggs | McMillan | Utt |
| Esch | Mathias, Md. | Van Deerlin |
| Evins, Tenn. | May | Waggonner |
| Farbstein | Multer | Watkins |
| Fino | Murphy, Ill. | Williams, Miss. |
| Foley | Murphy, N.Y. | Willis |
| Fulton, Tenn. | O'Hara, Mich. | Wilson, Bob |
| Galifianakis | O'Neal, Ga. | Wilson, |
| Giaimo | Ottinger | Charles H. |
| Hanna | Pepper | Younger |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

## AMENDING THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1954, AS AMENDED, PROVIDING FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 303) 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 208)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the Bill (S. 303) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with a further amendment as follows: Add a new section to read:

"SEC. 2. Any appointment hereafter made to the office of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
HUGH L. CAREY,
JAMES A. HALEY,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HENRY M. JACKSON,
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 303) 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House and Senate versions of S. 303 agreed on the major objective, to increase the authorized annual fiscal year appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from $17,500,000 to not to exceed $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 and $35,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

The only area of disagreement was with respect to Section 2 of the bill. The Senate version changed the titles of the High Commissioner and the Deputy High Commissioner to Governor and Lieutenant Governor, respectively, and provided that future appointments to these offices should be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The House version omitted these provisions.

The differences were resolved in the following manner. The Senate conferees agreed to continue the use of the designation, High Commissioner, while the House agreed that future appointments to the position would be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The designation and appointment of the Deputy High Commissioner remains as at present.

It was further agreed that Congress would consider the request if, at a future date, the citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, through the Congress of Micronesia, ask that a change be made in the title of the High Commissioner.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
HUGH L. CAREY,
JAMES A. HALEY,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the report is a unanimous report of the conferees. It provides for the nomenclature of the Administrative Officer of the Trust Territory to remain "High Commissioner," and that the Commissioner be appointed by the President, rather than by the Secretary of the Interior, and be confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us a reason for this new appointive procedure?

Mr. ASPINALL. From the beginning, the High Commissioner has been known as the High Commissioner.

First the High Commissioner was appointed by the President. Then there was a secretarial order, approved by the President, that the High Commissioner was to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

It is our understanding that the position is sufficiently important that there should be a Presidential appointee confirmed by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Was the Commissioner's appointment approved by the Senate in the past?

Mr. ASPINALL. Heretofore, the High Commissioner, whether appointed by the President or by the Secretary of Interior, has not been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I wish to say that the conferees on the part of the House insisted that a number of changes which the other body had put into this bill when it passed be not agreed to.

All we are doing is returning to the same situation that existed before the President turned over this job of appointment to the Secretary of the Interior. Now we will go back to having a Presidential appointee and will have the Members of the Senate confirm his appointment.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9029, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting for the consideration of the House, the 1968 appropriations bill for the In-

terior Department and related agencies which covers 30 diverse agencies and is familiarly known to this House as the all-American bill, for it is that legislation providing funding not only to build a stronger, richer America through protection of our natural resources, both land and people, but to enhance the magnificent cultural heritage of this Nation.

Funds provided in this bill go to every State in the Nation and our territories, and to a certain extent affect the international relations of the United States. I have reference to our administration of the trust territories, Samoa, and various international negotiations in connection with commercial fish activities.

This is a bill full of details. Because of this and because it covers so many facets of our national living, with so much to be said in a relatively short time, I cannot review each item. This I regret.

However, I recommend that each of you read the committee report which describes these items rather completely and for a better understanding of the programs funded here, may I urge that you read the hearings. These are in great detail, covering the operations of each department.

At this time I would like to highlight some of the committee's major considerations.

The committee recommends a total appropriation for 1968 of roughly $1.4 billion. This includes appropriation of receipts in the amount of $126,400,000 but excludes borrowing authorization for the helium fund in the amount of $16,200,000.

This is $78,482,850 or 5.9 percent below 1968 budget estimates.

This recommended amount also represents an 11.1-percent reduction in borrowing authority and a 100-percent reduction in the annual contract authority.

Therefore, the overall amount recommended by the committee is a 6.3-percent reduction below budget estimates. Appropriations recommended in this bill are $32,151,350 over the 1967 appropriation.

This comparison excludes any pending pay supplementals for the 1967 fiscal year, which when considered, will leave this bill $18 million over the amount of funding available in 1967 for direct appropriations rather than the approximate $33 mil'ion listed in the report.

As you review this budget, it is well to remember that new authorizing legislation enacted by the second session of the 89th Congress for the Department of the Interior and related agencies funded here amounted to $229,297,000.

The 1968 budget estimate included requests of $24,064,700 for these activities.

INCOME AND REVENUE

One of the most important features of this bill is the income its activities generate.

We have a forecast of $1,041 million in fiscal year 1968 revenues as compared with $1,023 million in fiscal year 1967, an increase of more than $18 million.

Actual appropriations in this bill are $1.2 billion.

Receipt income is only $197 million short of funding the entire activity provided here.

Revenues could fund this bill entirely if there were not also certain nonreceipt items of major importance to the entire United States, one of which is the $334 million provided for the welfare and assistance of American Indians.

There is also a total for support of the government of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the administration of the Trust Territories in the amount of $33,113,000.

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES

On pages 3 and 4 of the report, the committee has listed some of the activities funded in this bill:

Few Members realize the extent of U.S. landownership under the management of our Federal departments.

For example, in the Bureau of Land Management there are 457,102,198 acres; U.S. Forest Service, 186,500,000 acres; Bureau of Indian Affairs, 55,294,080 acres; Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 28,930,769 acres; National Park Service, 26,551,432 acres; a total of 754,288,479 acres, or one-third of this Nation's land.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

The road mileage inventory in 1966 for the Forest Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, and the Park Service was 266,970 miles.

Mileage to be constructed in 1967, 8,349.

Mileage to be constructed in 1968, 8,763.

*Recreational visitations*

[In millions]

| | 1966 calendar year, actual | 1968 calendar year, estimated |
|---|---|---|
| National Park Service | 135 | 160 |
| Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife | 17 | 21 |
| Bureau of Land Management | 38 | 50 |
| U.S. Forest Service | 160 | 199 |
| Total | 350 | 430 |

Another area of U.S. revenues is in:

TIMBER PRODUCTION

Forest Service: An estimated harvest of 12.7 billion board feet of timber is anticipated in 1968 from Forest Service lands with a value of $171.5 million. This volume represents about 25 percent of the total timber cut for industrial purposes in the United States and is equivalent to the construction of 1.3 million homes of average size. It represents a million jobs based on timber use.

The Bureau of Land Management also administers the sale of over 1.5 billion board feet of timber annually.

GRAZING

Bureau of Land Management also administers grazing of over 10 million head of livestock and 2.7 million big game animals.

Forest Service provides grazing for 7 million head of livestock which provides a continued and necessary source of grazing required by about 20,000 family-size ranch units throughout the United States.

*Indian education and welfare*

| | |
|---|---|
| Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools total | 58,300 |
| Indian children in public schools total | 47,000 |
| Indians provided with welfare and guidance services total | 23,000 |
| Operation and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems total (number of systems) | 300 |

MINERAL RESOURCES

Bureau of Land Management administers mining and mineral leasing on some 780,000,000 acres in the continental United States and over 250 million acres of submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf, with estimated receipts of $560,000,000 in 1968.

Geological Survey supervises development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal Indian and Outer Continental Shelf lands, the annual value of such production being $1.9 billion with royalties of over $250 million.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

On pages 2 and 3 of the committee report, we have enumerated activities in the bill for which major increases and decreases are recommended. A quick glance at this table lists activities emphasized for 1968 and those for which funding is limited.

INCREASES

First. Additional education and welfare services and other assistance to the American Indian:

The committee is proud to make funding provisions for the integration of Indian youth into public schools. If this course is pursued with diligence, it will eventually result in lower construction costs in this category, at the same time providing a greater breadth to the total sum of American education.

We have also provided increases for sanitation, health, housing, and a wide scope of general education programs, as well as job training. These things are necessary in order that our Indian peoples may become part of the economic mainstream of America.

It is vital that we constantly improve the management of their reservation lands and resources, provide adult education to close the cultural lag between parent and child, and to add increasingly to total Indian knowledge.

Costs are major at this time in many Indian areas due to a multiplicity of reasons. It is impossible to place Indian children in public schools due to a lack of roads, and in many instances, availability of water. It is necessary to construct Indian hospitals because there is a lack of facilities in areas near reservations.

Until our Indians are provided with decent housing, sanitation, job training, economic status, we will never solve their problems or social needs.

However, I think the committee can point to certain accomplishments. In 1961 there were 125,450 Indians in school; in 1965, there were 149,462.

When we have the last child enrolled in school, we will have begun to see daylight. To this end the committee has worked diligently and hard.

Second. The second item of increase is

that of road construction, $18,481,000, providing additional funding for the U.S. Forest Service.

To indicate some of the receipts generated by spending in this category:

| | |
|---|---|
| Sale and use of Forest Service resources in fiscal 1966 amounted to | $173,900,000 |
| Increase over 1965 | 26,500,000 |
| 1968 receipts are estimated at | 180,700,000 |

*Third.* A third increase is for additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service, $11,426,000 for thinning, salvage, aerial logging, recreation, research, tree genetics, firefighting, and so forth.

THINNING AND SALVAGE

For the Bureau of Land Management, the budget proposed an appropriation of $560,000 for thinning and salvage activity in western Oregon. The committee has recommended that $760,000 be made available to the Bureau of Land Management for thinning and salvage work in 1968. However, instead of appropriating the additional funds it is the recommendation of the committee that the $760,000 be deducted from the 25 percent available in the Oregon and California grant lands fund and be earmarked for this purpose. This amount, with the $4,598,000 provided in the budget base for forest management, will provide a total of $5,358,000 for forest management work, including thinning and salvage, for the 1968 fiscal year.

The Forest Service budget for 1968 contains a request for $1,424,000 to sell and harvest thinning and salvage material as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Sell 280 million board feet at $2.67 per 1,000 board feet | $748,000 |
| Harvest 210 million board feet at $3.22 per 1,000 board feet | 676,000 |
| Total | 1,424,000 |

To the extent that funding for the regular sales and harvest timber program are not required, the Forest Service has indicated that additional funds could be used for thinning and salvage work. In its report, the Committee has stated it would be inclined to give favorable consideration to the reprograming of funds for this purpose.

Recreation. I think it is interesting to note here that U.S. Forest Service lands have shown the greatest increase in visitations of any lands in the United States. Someone said to me one day on the floor of this Congress, "Why do we need to spend money on forests and parks? We didn't have these things yesterday and it was a pretty good world."

My answer to that is very simply this—it was a good world that many of us enjoyed, but it has been gradually disappearing into a thicket of high-rises, clover leaves, on-ramps, water pollution, air pollution, and city pavements.

At this late date in our history, we are now trying to leave for those who will come after us some part of that "good way of life." This, I think, is in essence the concept of the multiple-use purpose of the Forest Service.

Fourth. The fourth increase is in the acquisition of land under the land and water conservation fund program, $9,500,000—an advance from the general fund.

This program I will discuss in more detail in just a moment.

Fifth. There is increased money for management protection and maintenance of national parks: $7,410,200 to provide for increased visitations and use with the necessary funding for maintenance and construction.

DECREASES

The next item which I would like to discuss briefly is that of decreases.

Each cut has been looked at, scrutinized, priorities discussed. Cuts represent personnel, travel, printing, other services, and in many instances they are small, housekeeping details for economy. There is no "credibility gap" here between the committee's frank decreases and the public's shouted desire for economy in spending, even though that economy be drastic and hurtful in many instances.

None of the committee enjoyed making any cuts. Each Member of Congress has been vitally concerned with his or her district and with appropriations for its betterment.

From the budget requests, from the hearings and from the careful review of items, the committee has tried to develop a program of orderly progress, not as fast as many of us would like.

The largest decreases are:

First. In the construction facilities: $35,729,600.

These items range from an Indian health hospital for which planning was not yet complete to Forest Service construction and low priority park construction.

Second. In saline water research: $20,000,000.

A hasty glance at the table in the back of the report might indicate the committee slashed saline water funding. This is not the case. For saline water research, only $7,500,000 remained of the authorization which had not been appropriated.

Action is currently being taken to extend this authorization but legislation has not yet been enacted. Therefore, the committee has approved funding for saline water to the extent of existing authorization and has passed over the balance of the budget without prejudice. If the necessary authorizing legislation is enacted in time, additional funding for this activity may be added in the other body, in which case it would become a conference item.

This bill is not as large in dollars as others. In fact, its total is little more than the cost of one aircraft carrier, but it has not lacked in various items of major importance to the entire United States.

I would like to discuss with you for a moment the arts and humanities budget request.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES BUDGET REQUEST

The committee approved $11,700,000. A reduction of $4,670,000 below the budget request of $16,370,000. Of this, the arts endowment share is $7,000,000. A reduction of $1,750,000. The humanities endowment share is $3,500,000. A reduction of $2,500,000.

Also provided is $1,200,000 for administration, a reduction of $420,000 below the budget estimate.

The question has been asked, "Why are we concerned with arts and humanities at this time?" I would like to read two quotations—one from a letter to me by the acting president of the University of California who said:

> A nation which neglects such basic areas of inquiry as history, archeology, philosophy, and jurisprudence will find itself adrift without perspective in a world it cannot understand. Worse still, it will lack a fundamental understanding of itself. A nation which neglects languages and literature will find itself inarticulate in a world where survival may depend on the communication of ideas. A nation which takes small interest in the record of its artistic endeavors and fails to give adequate attention to esthetic criticism of its contemporary life, may find its people dispirited by ugliness. All of these are the professional concerns of the humanist. He is not a marginal contributor to society. His work is vital.

Second, John Adams, after a trip to Paris, in 1787 wrote to his wife, Abigail:

> The mechanic arts are those which we have occasion for in a young country as yet simple and not far advanced in luxury. I must study politics and war, that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history and naval architecture, navigation, commerce and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain.

The United States is proud of its Constitution, it is proud of the thought which went into it. Sometimes few of us remember that its background is deep in the humanities.

In her magnificent book, "A Miracle at Philadelphia," Catherine Drinker Bowen reviewed the background of James Madison's documentation for the Federal Convention of 1787 when he wrote Thomas Jefferson, then in Paris, asking for "whatever may throw light on the general constitution of the several confederacies which have existed." Books from Jefferson arrived by sailing vessel, not by ones and twos, but by the hundreds—biographies, memoirs, histories. These documents on humanities enabled James Madison to be the best informed man and our leading constitutional architect at the Federal Convention.

May I further remind the House that the committee of this Congress has set aside funds for technology and scientific programs in forestry, fisheries, and wildlife, but equally important, our humanities provide social and philosophical guidelines enabling us to use these in ways beneficial to mankind.

It is well also to remember that a great many people never leave the sidewalks of a city to use a fishpole or hunt. They do, however, spend their Saturdays and Sundays in museums, galleries, at theaters, and with books.

The mind and additions to its sum of knowledge is their recreation.

The committee regrets that we could not fund both the arts and humanities to the full extent of the 1968 budgetary estimates, for the amount reported here is only one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the total U.S. budget. However, I am

sure that everyone realizes legislation is usually compromise.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

One of the major problems facing Congress and the departments is that of continuing land escalation costs and the rising price between authorization and funding. This has been of concern to the committee in prior years. It continues to be. This year as the first step, the President suggested a $32 million advance appropriation to the land and water conservation fund for land acquisition.

First. The States wanted 60 percent of this advance appropriation; the committee has approved only a total of $9,500,000, plus $110,000,000 of land and water conservation fund receipts.

States will receive $65,000,000.

Federal agencies will receive $51,725,000.

Percentagewise, this breaks down as 55.5 percent for the States and 44.5 percent for the Federal Government.

Because of the critical budget situation in the United States, the problems of war and the national debt, the committee was extremely careful and thoughtful about spending the full $32 million advance. Thus, we have only reported $9,500,000. We were selective on priorities for parks, forests, and the Bureau of Fish and Wildlife—perhaps too selective. You will note that tables on page 13 review the reductions. No one section of the country has received all the money or all the cuts.

The committee is deeply concerned that we felt we could not afford to spend not only the full $32 million but perhaps a great deal more, and I would be less than frank if I did not say that some of today's cuts may well be increased costs for the future. These conservation cuts can only be described as a casualty of war and debt. They also are the echo from those who have said "cut the budget, we refuse to pay additional taxes."

I would like to say as we discuss the wide differential between authorization and spending, that the American people should look at the willful speculator with appraising eyes and the speculator should take stock of himself. He, too, should remember that this is his United States and that speculation costs caused by his greed are unconscionable additional tax burdens which he, too, will bear and undoubtedly grumble about.

There are those in this body and in this country who may say, "Why spend money this year on recreation at all." It is well for them to remember that our country is urging people to stay at home because of the gold drain abroad. Therefore, it is obvious we must invest in the development of areas for our own recreation programs.

We have provided money in this bill for an experimental fish protein plant as part of a hopeful answer to the world's hungry people. For those who complain that this is "fish versus corn, or wheat or soybeans," may I say there are so many millions of hungry people in the world we must make use of every food resource at our command.

I would like to commend the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for their negotiations this year with Russia in developing policies relative to our off-shore fishing and particularly emphasizing the necessity of the preservation of fish spawning beds. The time continues to grow shorter for the entire world to plan a comprehensive oceanographic conservation program for resources.

Last year the committee did not authorize money for the expenditure of funds for ship construction in Poland. I am pleased to report to the House today that as a result, our own domestic shipbuilding concerns have entered into this program and have begun to develop trawlers for American use. This is most welcome.

COOPERATIVE FISH UNITS

The amount of funds involved here is not great, but the committee has received critical testimony with regard to the fact that cooperative fish units and cooperative wildlife research units are not funded uniformly. The committee directed the Bureau of Sport Fisheries to correct this situation in the 1968 budget estimate. No action was taken by the Bureau.

The committee therefore directs that the funding for the cooperative fish units in Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, New York, and Pennsylvania each be increased by $9,200 in fiscal year 1968, to bring these units up to par with the funding of other fish units and to absorb the additional cost.

The committee has further directed the Bureau to take action to equalize the funding for wildlife cooperative research units in its budget next year and indicated that if this were not done, the committee would take similar action on wildlife research units.

BLACKBIRDS

The committee had a great deal of testimony relative to farm crop damage by blackbirds. We have recommended an appropriation for:

| | |
|---|---|
| Research | $250,000 |
| Operation | 150,000 |
| Site selection for research center | 50,000 |

In addition there is $800,000 included in this bill for control of birds. The committee in its report directs the Bureau of Sport Fisheries to use a major portion of these funds for blackbirds. Total money available for these blackbird problems is therefore slightly in excess of $1,000,000.

Because the question is always asked, "Can we afford this bill?" I want to say we cannot afford not to spend this money.

The American Nation does not hesitate to spend money in far less fruitful ways. From the Department of Commerce I have the following figures: In the year 1965, for tobacco alone, Americans spent $8,420,000,000; on alcoholic beverages we spent $12,940,000,000. Therefore, does anyone suggest we cannot pay for the preservation of our American resources? For the land which holds our forests and about 2 trillion barrels of oil resources, safeguards purity of our water and provides access to areas of beauty of our Nation?

It is well to remember also that some of today's conservation costs are the result of yesterday's recklessness. In my own State there are streams where salmon no longer spawn because of old logs and snag debris, costly to remove.

I doubt that Americans ever again approach our natural resources with careless, greedy abandon. Instead, there will be caution, care, and conservation.

Finally, the money we appropriate today is another pledge from this Congress to those who walk here long after we are gone, that they may inherit in fullest measure the splendor which is America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. With pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that history is being made today. Another event in the great history of this body is taking place today, because the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington is the first lady to be chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the first gentlewoman of the House to handle on the floor of the House a bill coming out first from the Subcommittee on Appropriations of which she is chairman and which will later come from the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] is the first gentlewoman of this House of Representatives to handle on the floor of the House the first bill reported out of a Subcommittee on Appropriations of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely feel that all of us should pause to recognize and realize what this wonderful legislator has contributed today and shall continue to contribute to the history of this great body, the House of Representatives of the United States, as a result of being the first lady Member, as I have previously stated, to serve as chairman of a Subcommittee on Appropriations, in the entire history of our great and beloved country. The distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] is the first lady Member of the House to handle on the floor of the House an appropriation bill.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, for those remarks.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that it gives me great pride, under the magnificent leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House Representatives [Mr. McCORMACK], to express my personal gratitude for this opportunity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington yield to me at this point?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks

which have just been made by our beloved and distinguished Speaker. I, too, want to say that not alone is the chairman of this subcommittee most capable and most able and well liked, but I further wish to say that the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives has played no small part in seeing that the rights of women in this House of Representatives have had equal jurisdiction and recognition.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington for yielding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for her remarks, and to again reiterate that it has truly been a demonstration of equal opportunity for me to serve in this great deliberative body, the House of Representatives of the United States, under the distinguished leadership of our very beloved Speaker.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. I note that the committee withheld the budgeted amount of about $2.9 million for the completion of the visitors center in the city of St. Louis.

As the gentlewoman knows, this is not a new project and the work needs to be done on time. I wonder if, by delaying this project, it might result in a higher cost.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This is not the only project postponed by the committee that might cost more to complete in the future. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Missouri that the Federal Government has already appropriated $17,250,000 for construction of this project. Contribution of local funds amounted to $5,750,000.

We hope the time will come when budgetary problems are not of the concern they are this year, and that some of these very worthwhile projects, including the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial can be funded to the fullest extent.

Mr. KARSTEN. The gentlewoman knows that this is a joint project, under which the Federal Government, I believe, bears three-fourths of the cost and the city bears one-fourth.

In looking over the hearings, there appears to be some uncertainty as to the city's ability to match the Federal funds, due to a pending bond issue. Was there actually any uncertainty before the committee?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do not believe the committee was particularly concerned with that aspect in our considerations. We are concerned that adequate zoning protection be maintained against high buildings in this area so that the view of the memorial will not be obstructed.

Mr. KARSTEN. I believe we have to resolve that problem. I do want to thank the gentlewoman for her interest in this. I hope in the not too distant future funds will be forthcoming in order that we may use this wonderful memorial.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. May I assure not only the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, but also every other Member of the House that the gentlewoman is interested in every aspect of this wonderful Nation of ours, from the trust territory to Maine, and from Alaska to Florida.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. With pleasure.

Mr. ICHORD. I commend the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington for her very well organized and comprehensive statement and report, which was made in her usual competent manner.

I would direct your attention to page 33 of the report. I observe that under the appropriation for the Forest Service there are moneys appropriated for the acquisition of land under the Weeks Act. I would say to the gentlewoman from Washington last year I received many complaints from constituents in my district which caused me to look into the acquisition of lands by the Forest Service not only in my district but all over the United States. I feel today with our pressing budgetary problems it is contrary to sound public policy for the Forest Service to purchase any forest lands purely for the purpose of timber management, because today, 1967, the simple fact is that our private landowners can manage our timber resources just as well as the Federal Government and in many cases do a better job and still have the lands in taxation.

So I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Washington what lands, if any, the Forest Service will be permitted to purchase under the appropriations in this act.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is wide range of spending on Forest Service lands. There is the trade item, as you are well aware, in the field of timber management. It is often necessary to trade ownerships to work out land problems.

Mr. ICHORD. I am not objecting to the exchange.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is also a provision to acquire lands which are for sale. These things are constantly reviewed, because there may be, for example, a piece of land adjoining a Federal Forest Service area that can be used for timber or recreation. It might involve the destruction of a piece of forest land if it is not bought for forest management. This is one of the criteria that the Forest Service uses. I think wise and prudent management is used at all times. We have directed them to purchase these lands with the greatest care. You will find all of these items of land management are discussed in great detail in our hearings.

Mr. ICHORD. I have no objection to the squaring up of land ownership. I also have no objection to the purchase of recreational lands. But I do agree with the gentlewoman from Washington that we should be very careful in our land purchases, because I think it would be contrary to sound public policy in this day and age.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I assure you they do not have the funds to be anything but careful.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and would like to take this opportunity to join our distinguished Speaker in complimenting the gentlewoman, the chairman of the subcommittee, for the very splendid presentation which she has made and the mastery of a very difficult and widespread field which she has brought to the floor of the House with her presentation. I particularly want to express the appreciation of the people of Oklahoma to the gentlewoman for her recognition of the urgency of the need for improved educational opportunities for our Indian people.

Mr. Chairman, I have specific reference to the various things that the distinguished gentlewoman has done in this area and to her very able leadership of this very fine subcommittee of the full Committee on Appropriations.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that our very fine friend and colleague from the Dakotas, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] has given to her every assistance in the effort toward trying to improve the opportunities for the Indian people through focusing upon this problem a greater amount of attention to this important element of the society of our great country.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the distinguished gentlewoman is walking in the same pathway that our great colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], walked when he served with distinction as chairman of this most important subcommittee, and he said that this bill represented an investment in America, an investment in building a better America. It is my opinion that the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington shares that view, I am quite sure, based upon what the distinguished gentlewoman has said.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. Further, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma and to my other colleagues that I follow very humbly in the distinguished footsteps of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and my immediate predecessor, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Denton, in the consideration of items in this bill which contribute to an important segment of our society.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that all of my colleagues who serve on the subcommittee, as well as those who serve on the full Committee on Appropriations have been magnificent, able, capable. I would like to add that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] deserves a great deal of appreciation for his magnificent contribution to the resources of this great country. His leadership and foresight have made possible a better land for millions of Americans to enjoy. It has taken great

courage and wisdom and both of these attributes he has in full measure.

Mr. Chairman, any change which this committee has undertaken to bring about, has been designed for the best interests and on behalf of the resources of this great Nation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. It is with pleasure that I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], in his remarks insofar as the gentlewoman from Washington and her efforts in behalf of this legislation are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, may I make the further observation to the effect that the distinguished gentlewoman has had very fine training as a result of the gentlewoman's service on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of our great Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentlewoman one question, however.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will return to page 38 of the report—and calling the gentlewoman's attention to the "Indian Claims Commission," I see that the committee has increased the appropriation to the extent of $118,000.

However, in the language of the report it is stated that this is designed for the employment of five additional attorneys to assist in the processing of Indian claims and in order to meet the increased cost of processing of Indian claims and to meet the increased cost of additional expenses connected therewith, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], Was there any consideration given to the appropriation of additional funds for the employment of two additional Commissioners to serve on the Indian Claims Commission?

Now, I preface that interrogation with the fact that I realize the House of Representatives only passed this legislation a short time ago.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, as the distinguished gentlewoman realizes, $118,000 would not take care of the salaries of those two additional Commissioners and the necessary expenses incident to their addition to the Commission.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Florida is correct. There was a great deal of discussion which was held in the subcommittee upon this subject. However, at the time we were holding hearings on this bill, the authorization for this change in organization of the Indian Claims Commission had not passed, nor had it been passed at the time of the markup of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is the hope of our subcommittee, and the hope of the full Committee on Appropriations, that we can expedite the processing of the tremendous backlog which is involved in the settlement of various Indian claims now pending.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her response to my interrogation.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her presentation of this rather difficult piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington is following in the footsteps of the very able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and I am sure she is going to continue to do a very magnificent job.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], and it is my opinion that the leadership which has previously been demonstrated by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has laid the groundwork for making this an easier task.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield to me at this point?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, may I state to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that it has been a pleasure to work with the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington. It is my opinion that we also should say something about the Republican members who have served on this most important subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I, for one, sometimes have a tendency to be partisan. However, I feel it is important to point out the fact that this is a completely nonpartisan bill and every member of the subcommittee has undertaken to do an effective job for the country.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking Republican member, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], has been diligent and thoughtful and most considerate in the consideration of this bill.

And although I am an easterner without too much background on the subject directly I, have had the opportunity to see that what this subcommittee does is really important to every part of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to speak briefly in behalf of appropriations for museums and for endowments for the arts and humanities contained in this bill.

The money provided in this bill for the arts and humanities is necessarily modest in terms of the total budget because of our pressing needs in other areas of endeavor. However, by making this appropriation, we will hearten and encourage the arts and humanities. Let us not turn our backs on them. Let us not strangle the song in the throat of the singer. Let us not extinguish the hopeful light of learning.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. May I say it has been a pleasure to have him as a member of the subcommittee. I also join in expressing to the members of the Republican Party who served with diligence on the committee, my appreciation for their thoughtful, nonpartisan approach. I might say there was no partisan approach at all concerning our American land, and this is as it should be.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to add my word of commendation to those already spoken with regard to the work the gentlewoman has done on this constructive legislation. I would also add that my commendation goes to all members on the committee, and to the staff, on both sides of the House.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to commend the gentlewoman from Washington for doing a very fine job as the chairman of the subcommittee.

I also want to commend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] for his thoughtfulness in bringing about this bill today.

There are two specific items in the bill that our people in the State of California want to thank them for, that is, the consideration given for the forest roads and trails, and in increasing the amount of money that will be made available for the Forest Service for that purpose.

Also for the committee's consideration in the way of land acquisition, wherein moneys have been made available for the Whiskeytown Reservoir and national park area, which is going to be a great help to our State.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to associate myself with the remarks of our Speaker, and the remarks of our other colleagues who have commented on this historic day now taking place. I do this not only in consideration of the manner in which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has familiarized herself with the hearings, and in presenting this difficult bill of such broad public importance and appeal, but to the members of her staff and her committee in mastering the contents and in presenting the bill here in such a poignant and succinct manner.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman was even more gracious and charming in the handling of her subcommittee hearings, and this is indeed an historic occasion. I have had occasion to review the hearings and report in some detail, as the

gentlewoman knows, I believe it is well organized, and presented.

In connection with the problem that she spoke of so ably in her opening remarks in the well about "land acquisition," I simply want to parochially call attention to the fact that I have submitted and had referred three bills, one to the Committee on Public Works, one to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and one to the Committee on Ways and Means, implementing the hearings held 4 years ago by the Committee on Public Works on Land Acquisition, about which nought was done.

Second, insofar as the fees for the "land conservation and water use fund," for the people of our Nation, they make a new argument for bills to make this the land of free water instead of the land of the double fee.

And I would hope that, in spite of the need for the golden nugget and/or the "golden eagle" to aspire to additional land acquisition, it will not be pushed, as it is so unfair to the aged people, is impossible of implementation by the Corps of Engineers, but should be applied by them in the case of the U.S. reservoirs, not the Secretary of Interior. I also note the gentlewoman says we now have control of 34 percent of the land mass in the Federal Government, whereas a few years ago we were developing homestead laws in order to get rid of the land under Federal control. We must not become too central, too Federal, and exercise too much control.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I believe this has been a magnificent presentation and discussion, and I further compliment the other Members on both sides of the aisle for this fine subcommittee work on the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his very generous remarks.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I certainly want to join all of my colleagues in offering accolades to the gentlewoman from Washington. I appreciated her courteous attention when I appeared as a witness before the committee. In my opinion, she has done a commendable job in handling this bill from start to finish.

I would like, however, to refer to page 35 of the report and simply ask a question, which I think I know the answer to. This relates to forestry research. As you know, I appeared before the committee requesting an amount for Humboldt College. I understand that probably the reason for not including this was because of the overall fiscal problems associated with the Vietnam situation. Is that just about the answer to the question or is there any policy that the committee had?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The committee has tried to use guidelines of priority wherever possible. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from California, as he so well knows, I also come from a forest area and no one is more deeply interested in providing these forest research facilities than I. One example is the research facility for animal damage. In two States of the Northwest some $15 million of damage is done to young trees and seedlings each year, so, I completely share his concern and I assure him that I hope our budgetary difficulties are not resolved to the exclusion of this necessary research for our forests.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Certainly the amount you have provided for forest roads and trails and recognizing the value of the forest industry in the forestry States, and while all of us would like to have more of these projects in particular in our budget, I assure you of one thing, I will be back before your committee next year and I intend to support this bill against any amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODLING. I want to thank the committee for what it did and for the assurance of the attempt to eliminate some of the so-called nuisance birds. This problem is becoming more serious each year and I am happy to see that the committee recognizes its responsibility here in attempting to do something about it.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman. The committee was increasingly concerned with the problem of bird damage, and we hope that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife will give maximum attention to this problem.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. YATES. First, may I say I want to join all my other colleagues who have complimented the gentlewoman for the fine job she has done as chairman of this committee, which is shown by the excellence of the bill.

I suppose it is too much to expect that the entire House of Representatives would be in agreement with the report of the committee. I regret very much the action of the committee striking out the funds for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Reading the record and the report, I find it difficult to understand the committee's action. This new and beautiful park area suffered discriminatory treatment. It alone of all the new developments was denied funds.

On page 13 of the report it is shown that there were approximately 12 national parks, recreation areas, seashores and lakeshores for which funds were requested by the Department of the Interior. All of the installations received funds from the committee. Piscataway Park, like the Indiana Dunes area, had its entire funds stricken out.

I am advised that a significant amount of money will be available for Piscataway Park from reprogramed funds to begin the task of picking or purchasing property to carry out the intent of the Congress. There is nothing that is being made available for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

The committee has vetoed the action of the House in passing the bill establishing the lakeshore last year. I should like to ask the gentlewoman why such action was taken? Was it the purpose of the committee to veto the act establishing the Indiana dunes as a national lakeshore so that no funds would be available for this installation?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will permit me, may I say that the House Appropriations Committee has no intention of vetoing authorizing legislation. Very briefly, the vote of the committee members was to strike this item.

Mr. YATES. In effect, is that not what happened by the refusal to allocate funds?

Mr. HANSEN of Washington. This was action on an appropriation item.

Mr. YATES. Yes. May I ask the gentlewoman another question?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Within the time limits.

Mr. YATES. I promise to be brief. I understand there is a request made for an allocation of certain funds from reprograming accounts for reprograming from other installations, an amount of money which will permit a beginning of land acquisition through the establishment of an office by the Department. Is that correct?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The reprograming request came to our attention last week. As the gentleman well knows, we have been extremely busy with preparation for the consideration of the bill now before the House, and have not had time to properly consider reprograming requests.

On the question of the acquisition of new land not only for the Indiana Dunes Area but other areas, may I say that there should be adequate preparation for acquisitions so that they may be accomplished in good order and as promptly as possible, and that the necessary surveys and title work can be done efficiently.

Mr. YATES. So far as the gentlewoman is concerned, that is intended to be done here as well in the Indian Dunes.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The reprograming request is in abeyance at the present moment. As I have told the gentleman, I am working on this bill. One thing at a time. When I complete this action today, then I will consider the reprograming item. But never assume that the Appropriations Committee aspires to wield veto power over legislative authorizations. We sometimes find it necessary to scrutinize the flexibility of a budget in a given year and for various activities.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Washington yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. With pleasure I yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the authorizing Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Washington for the fine work which she has done since she came to Congress. She served on my committee for several years. Now she has stepped into a further responsibility of her own, and on this first piece of work in this committee that she now has under her control she has done a wonderful, a very efficient, and an effective job. It is a difficult committee. The gentlewoman stayed with the work hour after hour, day after day, and week after week, and I just want her to know how very proud I am of her and of the work she has done.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado for his very generous remarks.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If I have time, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to ask the gentlewoman a question with regard to the cut in the proposed appropriation for the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa. I notice there was a cut of $400,000. I am disturbed from reports that I get that in the end, by allowing this reduction, the project will cost a lot more. Also the action is causing a lot of confusion in that area among the people who are living there who thought that the Government had committed itself to an immediate program to move for the completion of that park.

It is causing difficulties to my own community. I was wondering if the gentlewoman had been aware of these problems and also the fact that it may cost more—undoubtedly it probably will cost more—if we postpone this?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield, I took great care to point out in my opening statement that the reductions recommended by the committee might be costly later on. May I say to the gentleman $600,000 was originally appropriated for the Hoover National Historic Site. There are funds still available from that appropriation, and there is $70,000 provided in this bill which can be applied. I can assure the gentleman this is exactly what cuts do in this budget. It means that some little part of America, some magnificent part of America, may not be developed as quickly. Maybe we will not take care of the things today that need to be taken care of.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of our full committee [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for yielding to me at this time. I shall take only a minute.

As the Speaker so well pointed out earlier this afternoon, this is a historic occasion in the House of Representatives. The Committee on Appropriations was established on March 2, 1865—102 years and 55 days ago. During its more than 102-year history, the Committee on Appropriations has had the honor of having three women as members. The Republican side of the aisle has somewhat outdone the Democrats with respect to the women on the Committee on Appropriations. The first woman ever to serve on the Committee on Appropriations was the charming Mrs. Florence Kahn, of San Francisco, Calif. She served a number of years. At this time, Mr. Speaker, the situation is well balanced with JULIA HANSEN on the Democratic side and CHARLOTTE REID on the Republican side.

So, Mr. Speaker, while the Republicans have outnumbered the Democrats 2 to 1 in this regard, in the long history of the Committee on Appropriations, the Democrats nevertheless take top billing, because, as someone noted earlier, Mrs. HANSEN is the first woman in the history of the Congress to present an appropriation bill to the House of Representatives. I know we all want to give her a special salute upon this occasion, not only because she has presented the bill, but also because she did a magnificent job in conducting the hearings, in drafting the bill, in piloting the bill through committee, and in bringing the bill to the House.

I again thank the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] for yielding to me.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, the proceedings when we consider the Interior bill in the Appropriations Committee cannot be right and cannot get started right until and unless we have some remarks from the former distinguished chairman of this committee and our good and revered friend, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN. I yield to him such time as he may consume.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address the Members of the House today. I served on the Interior Subcommittee, I believe, longer than any man in Congress. I was chairman of it for 14 years.

The woman who is chairman of the Interior Subcommittee today is well qualified to handle this bill. Her State legislative background and her experience while serving on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has provided good training for her present responsibilities. She is a hard worker with great capacity for intelligent decisions and gracious consideration. She has done an excellent job in the preliminary action to presenting this bill today.

The committee's recommendation for reductions is not to seriously cripple vital programs, but to economize where possible, and at the same time provide sufficient funding to protect our investment in our natural resources. I remember in 1961 there were many rollcalls on this bill when attempts were made to seriously cut many of the programs. An attempt was made to reduce construction funds for national parks for which we had not adequately maintained the facilities for 4 or 5 years.

In 1956 only 55 million visitors went to the parks. Last year 133 million people visited our national parks. Where would we be now if we had not had the foresight to fund needed park construction projects.

Every dollar provided in this bill is to be spent in and for America. No reductions should be made on an investment as sound as this.

I hope the committee will have your full support. The meticulous way they consider this bill and review its content is the only way to arrive at decisions on funding levels.

There probably is not a Member on this floor today who would not like something added for his or her district, but this it not the place to try to add projects to the bill. That should have been done before the bill reached the floor. Neither is this the place to attempt wholesale cuts in the bill.

There are two bills, this bill and the public works bill, in which every dime of the money provided is to be spent in and on America.

I hope today, as time marches on during the next hour or two, that the bill will pass. There has been very little controversy on this bill the last several years. I hope that will be the situation today.

Thank you.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I want to make a special appeal to this distinguished Committee to help put America's fishing industry back on its feet—or, I should say, back on its ships.

Once the leading fishing nation in the world, this country—as I am sure Members are aware—declined after 1940; by 1956, it had dropped to second place, behind Japan. But today, just 11 years later, we find this Nation's fishing industry has plummeted to fifth place. The frontrunners are Peru, Japan, China, and the U.S.S.R., respectively.

But, although our industry has been in a serious state of decline, there is hope that it can climb out of the doldrums and assume a more vigorous competitive role among the world's leading fishing fleets.

The first ray of hope came in 1960, when the Congress passed the first fishing vessel differential construction program. This legislation was designed to correct inequities in the cost of construction of fishing vessels, and to utilize American shipyards and labor in rebuilding and revitalizing our obsolete commercial fishing fleet. The program authorized an appropriation of $2.5 million annually and up to 33⅓ percent of construction subsidy. Although it only lasted 3 years before it was amended, it resulted in the addition of 10 modern vessels to our obsolete fishing fleet.

A second, and more important boost to the fishing industry came on August 30, 1964, when the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act went into effect. Under this important piece of legislation, a total of $10 million was authorized to be appropriated over a 5-year period to provide Federal subsidy for a new fishing vessel construction program.

Although the funding program has been disappointing since the inception of the act in 1964—because a meager total of only $10.1 million was appropriated by the Congress in that time span—the initiation of the act has had a beneficial and stimulating effort upon the industry.

Since the signing of the first contract under the new program, six new vessels have already been constructed and are now actively engaged in fishing activ-

ities. Eleven more are now under construction. I might mention here that two of these are stern ramp trawlers, which embody the most modern concepts known to the American fishing industry. These two craft, which will be built by the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. in Baltimore are prototype vessels, and are expected to make a valuable contribution to the industry by actively demonstrating how America's fishing fleet can once again become a first-class competitor in this vital industry.

Altogether, plans and specifications on a total of 41 vessels have been submitted under the new act. These vessels have ranged from a 50-foot lobster vessel to a 294-foot factory stern trawler, and have been designed for owners in the States of Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Virginia, Florida, Texas, California, and Washington.

But more is needed to continue this program. Although at present there is a carryover of approximately $2.3 million from previous appropriations, these funds will be obligated within the next few weeks. Also, when contracts are let on the 12 vessels already approved and awaiting bids—in addition to the remaining three vessels awaiting contract signing—$11 million of Federal funds will be needed for immediate funding.

This $11 million, however, would not include $5 million for applications for ship construction subsidy already approved by the Department of the Interior. Neither does it include an additional $8 million, which has been estimated as the subsidy cost on applications for which hearings are scheduled, and will be scheduled during fiscal year 1968.

In other words, this program is in dire need of funds if it is to be continued. As a matter of fact, my feelings about the importance of this program have been so strong that I have introduced legislation, H.R. 5919, which would increase the authorization from $10 million to $20 million per year and extend the entire program for an additional 5 years. If this legislation is enacted, the new program would begin next year, or fiscal year 1969.

I strongly urge the House to extend the hand of Federal cooperation and encouragement to this struggling but deserving industry by fully funding the authorization of $10 million.

On another subject of importance, it is also disturbing to note in the President's budget for fiscal year 1968, that a total of only $3 million has been requested for carrying out the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation Act.

The act authorizes $25 million—over a 5-year period—to be utilized in the conservation, development, and enhancement of our Nation's anadromous fish and the fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn.

Members will probably recall that $5 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1967; however, only $2 million was actually made available to the Bureaus for obligation.

This 5-year program has received excellent participation. A total of 67 projects have been reported to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife by 26 States; and 49 projects have been reported to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries by 23 States. All of these projects will require funding during fiscal year 1968 since no money is presently available. If an increase in applications for the remainder of fiscal year 1967 and during fiscal year 1968 occurs as anticipated, then the need for these funds will be even greater.

The current program will expire at the end of the next fiscal year and only $2 million of the $25 million authorization has been utilized. Therefore, I respectfully urge an increase in the amount to be appropriated under this program to at least $5 million for fiscal year 1968.

I suppose everyone who appears before the Appropriations Subcommittee invariably asks for more money, and I must admit I found myself in the same position on most of the matters I am addressing myself to today.

It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to state that I am perfectly happy with the President's budget proposal on the Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966.

I respectfully support the President's request for fiscal year 1968, which calls for $3 million for land acquisitions and $694,000 for research and research facilities. I might point out that 15 endangered species of birds and mammals are now cared for under this program at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Maryland.

This budget includes funds to acquire about 253 acres of land adjacent to the Patuxent Center. Additional plans call for a laboratory and additional rearing facilities for the support of this program.

This is a fine, worthwhile program. Once again, Mr. Chairman, I say I support these requests in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, this bill involves an issue which is of great importance to me and my State of Maryland. I refer to Public Law 89-720, to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other such pests.

Naturally I have a great personal interest in this legislation, because the Chesapeake Bay—a portion of which I represent—is severely afflicted by the yearly invasion of the jellyfish, which is sometimes known as the sea nettle. I introduced legislation in the 89th Congress because I felt very strongly that something had to be done to at least control these toxic water creatures, about which very little is yet known.

The presence of jellyfish has severely inhibited the growth and development of the vast recreational potential of the Chesapeake Bay, and I am convinced that controlling it would result in untold millions of additional revenue to that area. But other coastal areas, like New York, New Jersey, and Virginia, also have been afflicted by these stinging creatures, whose visits have caused beaches to be closed and hampered the operations of many small businesses.

The jellyfish legislation is limited to a 3-year research program which authorizes the appropriation of a total of $2.25 million; $500,000 for fiscal year 1968, $750,000 for fiscal year 1969, and $1 million for fiscal year 1970. The cost of the program is to be shared on a 50-50 basis by the States and the Federal Government.

At the hearings on this legislation, it was estimated by the director of the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory of Maryland that the program planned by the State of Maryland alone would in the first year far exceed the $100,000 which the budget proposes. Funds for an experimental laboratory alone will cost an estimated half million dollars; biological and chemical research will cost another $150,000 per year. Furthermore, no estimate is available on other essential activities, such as engineering studies of new and improved methods of beach protection, field testing and evaluation of control measures, and actual application of control, if it is proven feasible.

I would like to call attention to the fact that Maryland is only one of 22 coastal States which is involved and affected in some way by the jellyfish problem. And I would also like to note that, since this program will be based on a 50-50—or matching fund—basis, no State will become financially involved unless it volunteers to participate. But whether or not a State participates, all coastal States will benefit from whatever valuable information is developed through research.

Mr. Chairman, although the President's budget calls for only $100,000, I respectfully request that the full amount of $500,000 be appropriated for the first fiscal year of research into the jellyfish problem.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentlewoman who was the chairlady of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the kindnesses shown to me when we appeared before the subcommittee.

I approve the legislation and I will support the legislation. I hope it will pass unanimously.

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

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I should like to tell the committee that the subcommittee faced its responsibility and refused to be "jellyfished" by this problem.

Mr. GARMATZ. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, from all of the deserved commendatory remarks that have been made by the male Members of this body, I think there must be a little element of envy in the fact that the chairman of my committee happens to be the first lady to have served on such a committee of the Congress and that I am the ranking member to be associated with her in our deliberations on this particular bill and our consideration of the budget request that came before our committee. The distinguished gentlewoman from Washington has provided a thorough and accurate report of the committee's actions on the Department of the Interior and related agencies budget. Even if I attempt to improve on the presentation or give information that would add to what has been so brilliantly presented to you, it would not be possible for me to do so.

So what I am going to say will be an attempt to underscore what she has presented to you.

I concur in all that she has said. In her first year as the chairman of this subcommittee she has demonstrated convincingly her tremendous knowledge. Many of the members of this committee are probably not aware of the fact—but you should be—that she was an effective legislator in her own State of Washington before she came to the Congress and she is familiar with all of the aspects of the various agencies that this bill funds in the Department of the Interior—the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, the Park Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, and all of the other agencies covered in this bill.

It has been a real privilege to serve under the able direction of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN]. She has shown her appreciation for the job that each agency is doing and her concern at the same time for the taxpayer, as is evidenced by her most able report. Many will be disappointed, and understandably so, that we find it necessary to cut out many deserving projects, but, as our very able Member of this body and the former chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], pointed out earlier, we do have to consider priorities at such a time in our history. It is necessary to pare here and add there and do the best that one knows how in order to cut the cloth to fit the pattern.

A reading of the report will demonstrate hardly any unbudgeted programs are funded in this bill. Mindful of the billions of dollars that the Vietnam war is costing and mindful of the proposed 6-percent surtax on the taxpayers and mindful of the tremendous budgetary deficit which is officially estimated at over $8 billion for next year, we deemed it our duty to cut wherever we could and yet preserve the integrity of the programs of the Department of the Interior. So cut we did. As has been pointed out to you this afternoon, this is the tightest budget that the Department submitted since I have served on the committee. Yet by diligent search and setting priorities we were able to reduce it by 5.9 percent or almost 6 percent over the budget request, which is a decrease over the request of $78 million. We have done so without, in our opinion, sacrificing the goals of many worthwhile and ongoing programs.

Mr. Chairman, as was so ably pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman who spoke just previously, he has frequently referred to this as "an all-American bill."

Mr. Chairman, this bill is exactly that, and a little more. It is also a bit on the international side, because in this bill we find consideration of the Pribilof Islands—the Pribilof Indians who live up near the Russian border.

Mr. Chairman, we fund the people of the trust territories and also American Samoa.

Mr. Chairman, we are out there in the South Pacific as a display of what our democracy is able to accomplish and the kinds of programs that are being carried out in that area and in these other faraway places which represent our type of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, it is our hope that as time goes by we shall be able to do even more.

Mr. Chairman, many of the activities financed under this measure are revenue producing.

No appropriation bill that comes before the consideration of this body provides much return to the Treasury and to the taxpayers of these United States.

As has been previously pointed out, this bill forecasts that as a result of the various activities carried on in the various agencies which are funded hereunder, they will generate the sum of $1,041 million in Federal revenue.

Mr. Chairman, we must consider the timber revenue generated through the activities of the Forest Service and the land grazing fees which are collected by the Bureau of Land Management, as well as the grazing fees collected by the Bureau of Land Management in its other operations.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we must consider the valuable mineral resources which are developed by the Geological Survey and those revenues and resources which are developed through the fish harvest and through the operations of the commercial fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, all of these activities, and many more, are putting money back into the Treasury of the United States.

I find it regrettable, as does the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of this subcommittee, as well as the other members of our subcommittee that because of the pressing situations now confronting us, situations demanding more and more of our limited funds, that such an effective activity as that of the Geological Survey, struggling with its efforts to discover heavy metals, metals that are sorely needed in our manufacturing segment of our economy and other elements of our industry across the Nation, that we must cut back some on these activities, activities where it has been already demonstrated pay back $3 for every dollar we are expending upon them.

Mr. Chairman, every State of this great Union and every congressional district benefits from the work and the programs being funded by this bill, activities all the way from the Pribilof Islands which are located near the Russian border, to Florida, and to the Seminole Indians, as well as the trust territories—to Guam and to every State and almost every community.

Mr. Chairman, all of these entities are being either funded or cared for under this bill.

It is the opinion of the subcommittee that we have approached the financing of these programs in a prudent manner and in such a way that if any segment of this bill is reduced by any amount, either by an overall cut or by specific amounts having reference to specific programs, it is going to endanger the fruition of those programs that we are hoping will continue to keep our country and our economy strong.

Mr. Chairman, the principal out-of-pocket expense associated with this bill is for Indian education and Indian welfare, as the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington has so ably pointed out.

This year we propose to grant an additional $9.6 million to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for these services, bringing the year's total to $126,478,000. This is still $3 million below the budget estimate.

I am sure all of us agree that we still owe a large debt to the Indian people of this country. We have not fully met our obligation to the American Indian.

In this field we are taking another step in that direction, another look at this overriding problem. I wish budgetary conditions were such that they would enable us to do more.

Mr. Chairman, if I may—and pardon a personal reference—I was supplied with an Indian Bureau report, a quarterly report, on Indian schools, dated December 31, 1889, submitted by a teacher, the then Miss Marietta Cain, from Pennsylvania, a teacher out there on the Indian reservation where I was born.

In this list is my mother's name, who was then Lucy Burning Breast, 10 years of age. The first school that she had ever attended, the first opportunity to learn the English language. Twenty-five years later I was privileged to attend that same little country school, and today in comparison the things we are doing in education for the Indian people of this country is amazing. It is accomplishing great things, but more needs to be done.

We can take pride in the fact that when the Optimist magazine published an article by the Vice President of the United States, and when certain excerpts were taken from that by Russian publicists showing our country up in poor light, the Optimist magazine challenged the Russians to come to this country and they would be free to go wherever they wanted to find out the situation for themselves. So they went to the Navajo Reservation and they came back with the report that we are making great strides in the field of education among the Indian people.

Another area in which we are forced to inflict cuts was the land and water conservation fund, which is administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The authorizing legislation permitted up to $60 million a year to be appropriated for 8 years, as an advance to that fund. Visitors to our national parks, Federal reservoirs and wildlife reservations also contribute to the fund by a daily user's fee, or the purchase of a $7 Golden Eagle passbook. Instead of the $60 million this year, the administration requested $32 million. After taking into account the receipts that are coming into this fund we reduced this amount to $9.5 million.

This necessitated the deferral of some land acquisitions already authorized under the National Park Service.

Here was one of the most difficult areas, as our chairman has pointed out, that we had to consider, that of selecting which projects should be deferred. In general it can be said that we deferred funds for the acquisition of those projects which came along more recent-

ly than others. In some cases we felt insufficient justification was developed in the hearings. So we felt that at this particular point in time some of these acquisitions might well be delayed until next year.

We are concerned at the extremely high per-acre cost of land acquisition for some of the projects, and we did not wish to create more or less a windfall or to encourage speculation in land values at the taxpayers' expense.

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

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only for the purpose of inquiring whether a delay in 1 year in many of these projects will result in an increase of the prices to be paid for the purchase of the land?

Does not the record before the gentleman show that over the last few years land prices have risen an average of 10 percent per year? Certainly this trend will not be cut, but rather will be sharpened over the next year. Does the gentleman not agree with that?

Mr. REIFEL. I am sure the gentleman is correct, the price escalation on these projects is increasing by the year. However, they have done so on all of the projects we are faced with so it was a matter of setting up priorities in selecting those that we felt were of a higher priority than others in the hope that as the situation improved we can give them, as the chairman has pointed out, more favorable consideration later. So it was not with any sense of prejudice that some projects were deferred. We hope and trust that these authorized projects can be funded in the years ahead when budgetary restrictions are not so pressing.

In the meantime, we expect the States to meet their responsibilities under the land and water conservation fund. We also believe that it is reasonable the users of Federal recreation areas should be willing to pay a modest fee for the areas they occupy.

This, in turn, will generate a great deal more activity and enhance opportunities for all Americans and provide new areas for our people in which to swim, fish, and picnic.

Another area of concern is the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Last year an initial appropriation of $9 million was provided for this new Foundation.

We were requested to provide $16.3 million this year, but found it necessary to recommend only $11.7 million.

We have also insisted upon careful supervision and administration of grant programs.

We have insisted on the continued appointment of distinguished panelists to investigate research proposals. Some unfortunate publicity has surrounded this program and it is regrettable and it must be avoided in the future if we are to see this program enjoy the public esteem and fulfill its mission of preserving and enhancing our cultural heritage.

I regret we even have to cut back on this program one dime over the initial request.

I do not know too much about the arts and humanities. The fact is that every time somebody comes up from either one of these agencies, I ask for a definition of it and I have one here which I think is important to have in the RECORD.

I got this from the chairman of the endowment of the humanities, Dr. B. C. Keeney and this is what he says:

> If you want a really simple definition of the difference between arts and humanities, the one I use generally is this. If you do it, it is art. If you write about it and actually teach about it or think about it, it is the humanities.

In this connection, I also have put into the record of the hearings, at page 780, part II, of our subcommittee appropriations and related agencies, which you have available to you, a statement from Mr. Stevens. He is the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, which explains, in my judgment, what the arts and humanities and particularly the arts involve.

This was in the Washington International Arts Letter, volume VI, No. 3, dated March 1967, and I would just like to quote in part from that:

> In a society which has always been marked by that special disorder which comes of vast spaces, a highly diversified people, great natural and technical resources, and a rapid tempo of historical change, the arts are here of utmost importance—not only as a moral force, but as a celebration of the American experience which encourages, clarifies, and points to the next direction in our struggle to achieve the promise of our democracy.

As to the humanities, for that great area of effort, I have only the deepest and the warmest sense of concern.

I have here a copy of a book from the Library of Congress entitled "Giants of the Republic." The foreword to this book was written by Edward Everett Hale. The copyright is dated 1895. It gives us the giants who were the founders of the Republic, the builders of the Union, the giants of the great Civil War, the American Navy, of the reunited country, the giants of inventive achievement, the giants of men in business, the giants of religion and social reform, the giants of American literature.

A neighbor of mine had this book when I was about 10 or 12 years of age and I used to go to his ranch on horseback about 3 miles. I carried a flour sack in which to put the book and I borrowed it from him so many times that he finally gave it to me.

You can read in this book of the lives of the founders of our country—about Andrew Jackson, for instance. I quote:

> When he was only thirteen, the British ravaged South Carolina, killed his oldest brother, Hugh, and captured Andrew and his brother Robert, carrying them off with others to Camden, forty miles distant from their home. The captives were not allowed food or even water on the way; they were thrown into a wretched prison-pen, without beds, medical attendance, or any means of dressing their wounds. They were kept on miserable food, and, to crown all, smallpox broke out among them. Dying and dead lay in the ground together.
>
> Their mother came to the rescue of her boys; she obtained their exchange, took them home, and nursed them; but Robert died in two days, and Mrs. Jackson herself fell a victim to the disease. Thus at fourteen years of age Jackson was left alone in the world, without father, mother, or brother, and without a dollar to call his own.

As a kid on the Indian reservation, thinking that I had difficulties, that story was a source of encouragement. As I read about these great men, as I read about Abraham Lincoln, Longfellow, General Lee, Calhoun, I did not know that this was humanities. This was what we are talking about and what we would like to preserve in this budget. I am hopeful that, whatever is said and done today, in this particular area we will be able to retain even the minimal amounts that were felt so necessary and to which a cutback was made in the budget request.

All in all, I can recommend this bill to you as one that meets the test of financial responsibility, one that sets priorities in numerous areas of domestic concern, one that will preserve the work that has already been done and strengthen the programs of the future.

The total cost of the bill of more than $1.3 billion for fiscal year 1968 is less than the total cost of waging the Vietnam war 1 month—and to that tremendous effort of our men and women in southeast Asia, of course, we are pledged to give whatever is necessary.

The people in our national parks, forests, and wildlife preserves have demonstrated time and again tremendous dedication to their tasks and appreciation for the stewardship entrusted to them.

Last fall I spent 26 days visiting the Department of the Interior installations across our country, and I wish that every Member of this body could see the dedication of these men and women and the high use to which they are putting every dime that we appropriate for their efforts to improve our country. We know they are going to be disappointed in many instances in the level of funding provided in this bill. Nevertheless, the cuts that we made were deemed necessary at a time that calls for national sacrifice. This bill is going to make America a little better place to live in.

I believe it merits your support. I recommend it to you for passage without reservation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 23 minutes.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] as he may require.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill. However, before I make any comments about this bill or any section of it, I wish to express my appreciation to our new chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington, for the expeditious and impartial manner in which she handled

the hearings. My appreciation goes as well to the distinguished ranking Republican, the able gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], whose leadership has been of great assistance to me, and whose deep concern has had a great impact upon this important piece of legislation.

Just a short while ago, this bill was discussed in great detail, and I shall not reenter that technical area. Instead, I will focus on some of the many aspects under which this bill might be considered, and will make brief remarks on the significance of these aspects.

When I addressed this House on a similar bill last year, I noted the nationwide sweep of this appropriations bill, touching virtually upon all sectors within the borders of America, and even extending beyond those borders.

The scope of this bill is truly enormous. Some picture of this enormity may be gotten when one notes that in managing the public lands, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wild Life, and the National Park Service, administer more than 750,000,000 acres. This represents an area more than seven times greater than the combined areas of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. It is a truly staggering figure. The visitations to the recreation areas covered in this bill under the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wild Life, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service, totaled over 350,000,000 in 1966. It is estimated that this figure will rise to approximately 430,000,000 visitations in 1968. These visitations will represent more than twice the total population of America.

Other activities are included in this bill. Take for example, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wild Life. This is a Bureau that is concerned with the activities of 50,000,000 hunters and fishermen in America, and if one more proof were needed of the scope of this bill, I would point out to my colleagues that all of the activities included in this bill generate more than a billion dollars worth of revenue returning to the Federal Treasury. But though the whole scope of this bill is so vast, it is also fitting to look at some of the individual sections of the bill and the bureaus in the Department of the Interior, or the related agencies.

There is the Office of Saline Water, for example. This is an office which is not only concerned with the vital problem of cleaning our water resources but it is also concerned with developing new water resources, by the conversion of salt water.

There is the Office of Commercial Fisheries. This is an office that is constantly studying the tremendous resources of food which lie beyond the continental limits in all of our oceans. Many of our scientists have said that if the world is to be fed in the future, it must be fed from the sea. This Office of Commercial Fisheries is doing the pioneering work in exploring the food resources of the seven seas.

There is the Coal Mine Safety Board of Review. Because of this office there has been a significant decrease in accidents and fatalities in the operation of small mines all across the country, and there has been no decrease in the production of these mines.

There are funds to run the Smithsonian Museum, which is a great treasure chest of our American heritage, and funds to run the National Art Gallery which is a great treasure chest of world art.

Through the arts and humanities section of this bill, there are funds to raise the very quality of American life, so that we may offer all Americans a better life.

There is also the Bureau of Mines which has great significance in my own district. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the splendid work which has been done by the Bureau of Mines in the area of surface restoration in the anthracite coal region. I want to commend the Bureau also for the remarkably competent and efficient job which they have done in the past in combating mine fires, and, in particular, for the job they are doing at this very moment in fighting a serious mine fire in my district.

I thank all of the members of the subcommittee for the support which they have given me in my efforts to make the Bureau of Mines more and more conscious of the air pollution and the water pollution problems created by burning culm banks, and of the overall problem of coal refuse deposits. Thanks to the support of the subcommittee, and for which I am grateful, there is about $450,000 included in this bill to combat this problem, and it is a serious problem. In the relatively small area of 484 square miles of the anthracite area of Pennsylvania there are 863 refuse banks containing 910 million cubic yards of material. Many of these banks are burning today or have burned in the past. I applaud the attention which the Bureau of Mines is now giving to this serious problem, particularly its decision to have a meeting of the top experts in America to study this problem and to submit proposals to solve it. I will continue to watch closely the future developments in this matter.

I have touched only slightly on the scope of this bill, but I am sure my colleagues will know from the reading of the committee report how important it is.

This is a bill which encompasses a vast section of America and the best portion of American life.

There is written above this Chamber, a quotation from the writings of Daniel Webster:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

This bill is concerned with just that, developing the resources of our rich land. I urge its passage.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentlewoman, the chairman of this House subcommittee, for her outstanding presentation. I also compliment my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], for the hard work he has done in making this a successful bill on the floor today.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the funds in this bill for the setting up of a pilot plant for the production of fish flour to be used as a protein concentrate in our food-for-peace program around the world. I have serious reservations about this product from several standpoints.

Certainly one is from the standpoint of its purity. The Food and Drug Administration, in a recent shotgun decision, decided that it was indeed fit for human consumption. Fishmeal, or fish flour, or whatever you want to call it, is indeed a protein supplement, but it has been used mainly as an additive for hog feed and cat and dog food. It was never previously OK'd for human consumption and here is why: Fish flour is the leftovers from fish filet factories after they have taken the filet off. What is left—the eyeballs, the scales, the fins, the bodywaste, entrails, and all that kind of stuff, is cooked at a high enough temperature to kill off the bacteria and it ends up as a high protein byproduct of commercial fisheries. Its production can, of course, be expanded by processing normally inedible fish which exist in the sea in great numbers.

The strange ruling of the Food and Drug Administration that this type of junk can be sold for human consumption would indicate that wholesomeness is no longer a requirement for food in the United States. If they can do this, there is no reason why they cannot rule that a rendering plant could sell meat from animals that die of disease and old age for human food, rather than limiting its use to dog and cat food.

As a matter of fact, last month I got a letter from a packer who had heard of the recent decision of the Food and Drug Administration and he asked me this question:

> If this fishmeal is accepted by the FDA, why shouldn't the products produced by our rendering operations, operating in conjunction with our beef slaughtering plants, be just as acceptable for human consumption, assuming, of course, that the "paunch manure" would be removed before rendering as it now is. This is not done in fish meal processing as I understand it. The finished products from our rendering operation have 51 to 55% protein content and range in price between $85 and $115 a ton. Our product certainly seems to be the more feasible, cost wise, of the two. In all honesty I am not sure whether the consumers of the U.S. or the world would accept this product any better than they would fishmeal, but I certainly believe one should be as acceptable as the other.

So you see how ridiculous things are getting today. Fishmeal is indeed high in protein, but as my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, NEAL SMITH, has pointed out—so are cow manure, chicken feathers, and dead rats. As long as they are brought to a high enough tempera-

ture, they could meet the same sanitary tests as fish meal.

I have, also of course, grave reservations about fish flour products because of the potential it affords the Communist agitators and propagandists in the underdeveloped countries where we send our food-for-peace commodities. They generally do not need much of an excuse to go into action and the tale they could tell about the unwholesome food we would be passing off on the people of these nations could, in large measure negate the great good we have done in winning friends to our side through our most worthwhile food-for-peace program. While the Food and Drug Administration was undoubtedly obtained to combat this potential Communist argument, I doubt it would deter it too much.

I have grave concern, also of course, as a Representative of a farm State, because, at the present time the protein supplement that is being used in our food-for-peace program is a combination of soybean flour, corn, and dried milk solids. These are products that are selling below parity and they are all products that make a most wholesome protein mix. But if you do not share my concern with the unwholesomeness of the fish flour product, or the potential for Communist agitation if we begin to use it on a large scale, or if you are not interested in the farmer, who is now selling his product at a ruinously low price, you should be concerned with the fact that this fish flour will cost an estimated 2½ times as much per pound of protein as a protein supplement made from soybean flour.

These cost comparisons were furnished at my request by the Library of Congress when I asked for information on a comparison of soybean flour and fishmeal flour with respect to protein content and cost of each. They told me that a comparable soybean product is a low fat soy flour, which has already been developed and is in use for both animal and human food. This product may be called SPC—soybean protein concentrate—and with the oils removed, it contains a large percentage of protein. The two are compared in the table I wish to insert in the RECORD:

| | |
|---|---|
| Fish protein concentrate: | |
| Protein | 85 percent. |
| Biological value | 75 percent. |
| Cost per ton | $400 to $500. |
| Soybean protein concentrate: | |
| Protein | 50 percent. |
| Biological value | 65 percent. |
| Cost per ton | $120. |

The SPC is of high quality and is complete except for a slight deficiency in the essential amino acid, methionine. The soybean protein may be improved and perfected by supplementing it with 1.27 percent DL-methionine. In fact, by doing this, the improvement in protein efficiency ratio over the unsupplemented food is 74 percent. Methionine costs only about $1 per pound and 1½ pounds of methionine added to 100 pounds of SPC would not only remedy the deficiency, but increase the utilization of all of the other amino acids. The vitamin content of fish protein concentrate and soybean protein concentrate is a near draw.

The report from the Library of Congress, as I said, points out that the fish protein concentrate cost will remain at its present level of about $400 to $500 per ton mentioning that:

The factors which will ultimately determine the cost are, first, the acceptance and demand for FPC; second, the fixing of new requirements of the Food and Drug Administration; third, whether or not new technological problems develop in connection with mass production; and fourth, the appearance of problems of a bacteriological nature as FPS goes into more extensive use.

The latter may consist of extensive variations in the bacteria population of raw fish materials and production batches, including variations in coliform count and pathogens of enteric origin.

The report further points out that a soybean protein concentrate of the isolated type should be further developed and marketed for the following reasons:

1. It is less likely to be subject to variables mentioned in connection with FPC.

2. A protein concentrate of "vegetable" origin should be available in America and abroad for those populations whose dietary prejudices and preferences could not be met by FPC.

3. The processing technology for a plant protein isolate would appear to be inherently simpler than that of FPC. It has been under study for several years and much progress has been made. A pilot project now may be in order.

4. In the near future it may be possible to establish the production cost of isolated soybean protein. At the moment it appears that the cost would be approximately $250 to $300 per ton.

Mr. Chairman, in view of all this information and the fact that serious questions seem to exist as to whether or not fish flour will indeed be acceptable and certainly whether it will be anywhere near feasible on a cost-per-unit basis, I would like to have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that this is indeed just a pilot plant to determine price and production techniques and that within the next 2 years, full reports be given back to Congress as to the cost per unit and technical difficulties that might arise.

Adding methionine to soybean flour would bring the total cost to about $150 per ton, far below the cost of fish flour. It is also possible to produce an isolated soybean protein concentrate which contains about twice as much protein as the soybean meals and flours now on the market. This could be produced for about $250 to $300 per ton and, according to noted researchers in the field, the potential for isolated protein from 95 to 100 percent in human food is practically untapped.

Food scientists and industrialists, the report goes on to point out, believe that fish protein concentrate will remain at an anticipated production cost of $400 to $500 per ton. Even the isolated protein concentrate made from soybeans is much cheaper on a per pound basis of protein equivalent.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman, this is exactly what is proposed. No one knows for certain at this point the total overall costs of any of these protein products. They vary, and they will vary. It is also felt we may make fuller use of many of the food elements we throw away today. But I assure the gentleman our committee constantly will review the costs included and all the other pertinent information in this connection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. One of our departments of Government has made a concentrated effort to get the FDA to legalize fish filth for human consumption.

I do not believe there is anything wrong whatever—and there is nothing illegal about it—in using fish flesh for human food, but they want to include and mix in with it the filth from the fish in order to bring the price down, and still label it for human consumption, and not even require the label to show that there is filth involved in the product. This is going too far and is not consistent with other laws we have, administered by the Department of Agriculture.

I believe they ought to be consistent. I do not believe either animal, poultry, or fishmeal should be considered wholesome food, when it includes intestinal waste and filth.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Even with the filth included, the cost is still 2½ times as much as soybean flour.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks, and to express my concern over the action of the committee in authorizing this protein demonstration pilot plant.

I am, however, heartened that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee indicates that we will have an opportunity to closely follow this.

I am sure, as the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota indicated, many of us are concerned about the development of fish flour.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the great challenge that faces us in helping to fend off starvation for our fellow humans in the underdeveloped nations of this world is far too important to be treated lightly.

It is my hope that the Congress will not allow itself to go blindly into the search for adequate protein supplements to use in our important food-for-peace program. I should like to have firmly

established the intent of Congress that, first, this is indeed a pilot plant; second, that we recognize the problems involved in it; third, that a report be made back to the same subcommittee within the next 2 years for its evaluation; and fourth, that studies and pilot plant operations should be going on at the same time to see whether or not plant food protein sources could not be lowered in cost also.

The cost relationship now is 2½ to 1. If this pilot plant study succeeds in lowering the cost of proteins from fish, certainly it could be reasonably expected that a similar pilot plant study would succeed in lowering by the same percentage the cost of a protein supplement from soybeans, milk solids, and other agricultural products. Many of us feel that an investment in the food-for-peace program is perhaps the best investment that we can make in this world today. Certainly, food wins far more friends than bullets and bayonets and we know we must find the most efficient, least expensive, and most acceptable type of wholesome protein supplement that we can use in this program. This goal, I think, deserves the careful consideration of us all.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH].

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriation bill today and urge its adoption by other Members of the House.

Perhaps there is no other bill that covers such a diversified number of efforts and activities of the Federal Government, and certainly there is no other bill that is more a custodian of the natural resources of our great land.

The testimony again this year spotlighted the increasing demands of our public lands, our national parks, and our national forests as areas for greater recreational use by an expanding population. The testimony also bears out the inability to develop these recreational resources to keep pace with the demands for their use. This bill today recognizes this increased need and seeks the orderly development of our public lands for these purposes.

It should not be overlooked that a great deal of this development is multipurpose development. The opening of roads and trails and the improvement of existing roads for such purposes as the harvesting of timber also mean that these roads can be used as access to these lands for recreational development.

Neither can it be overlooked that simply investing in a given area to develop campsites, picnic grounds, and the accompanying sanitary facilities is only part of the total job. Frequently, it is the case that it is necessary, after the development of recreation areas, that substantial investments must be made in succeeding years for the construction of access roads to these areas.

It is significant to note that the direct appropriation requested in this bill is $1,381,510,150. However, this Department realizes from total receipts to the Federal Treasury from a wide range of activities the sum of $1,041,875,000. As the able chairlady of the subcommittee has pointed out, the bill as submitted to the subcommittee was a tight bill; nevertheless, the subcommittee has been able to find areas of reduction, and these reductions have been made, amounting to 6.3 percent. I might say there are many areas in the bill where substantial additional funds could be spent. There are many worthwhile programs and projects that are not funded in this bill. Some very hard choices had to be made in reduction of some requests and denial of others; however, in light of huge demands of our Federal budget and the critical situation in which we find ourselves, whereby there must be belt tightening, it has been necessary to select priorities. This has been done in this bill, and your committee feels it brings to the House a well-balanced bill. To further reduce this bill would not only adversely affect the operation of the various departments and agencies, but would jeopardize our natural resources.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to the outstanding leadership by the chairman of the subcommittee. The gentlewoman from Washington has displayed a real mastery of this complex bill. Together with the able assistance of Mr. REIFEL and other members of the subcommittee and its capable staff, she has brought to the floor a carefully structured bill.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, in recent months I have had much to say on the subject of some of the grants made by the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities. I hope I have not bored the Members of the House with my interest in "comic strips." As I stated to the subcommittee in my testimony, printed on page 89 of part III of the hearings, I am not against culture, the arts, or the humanities. I am one of the founders of the American Humanics Foundation and I serve on the board of trustees of Drury College, an outstanding liberal arts college in Springfield, Mo.

But I am for sound and prudent use of the taxpayers' money in this time of severe strain on the Federal budget and the American economy, at a time when the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations warns, as he warned in his letter of March 14 to all Members, that our planned budget deficit this year could go as high as $18 billion.

Members may well recall that during the debate on consideration of the bill to create the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities there was some lighthearted colloquy on an amendment proposed by my friend and colleague from Iowa, which would have broadened the definition of "performing arts," to include subsidies for "belly dancing"—as the amendment was translated. Of course, few seriously expected that amendment to carry.

But I wonder what the response of this august body would have been if an amendment had been offered on the floor of the House that day, to authorize Federal funds—taxpayers' money, if you will—for a study of the history of comic strips and cartoons. I strongly suspect that such an amendment would have met the same fate as the now famous belly dancing amendment.

But lo and behold, 2 years later, a grant is awarded in the amount of $8,769 to a Professor David Kunzle, of the University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif., for a study of the history and political impact of comic strips and cartoons.

The comic strip grant only served as a most appropriate vehicle for calling the attention of the American people to this unnecessary expenditure of taxpayers' money.

Let us forget, for the purposes of this discussion, the fact that Dr. Kunzle is not a citizen of this country. Let us forget that he is one of the more vociferous and vocal opponents of our defense against aggression in Vietnam.

But let us not forget that this Nation is heavily in debt and going more so every minute. Let us not forget that the American people are being asked by the President of the United States to dig deeper in their pockets for another 6-percent tax increase. Let us not forget that we are in a desperate fiscal situation, that we are the victims of inflation which is the cruelest tax of all; and that this Congress, whether it dodges the issue or not, must have the courage to establish priorities and say "No," when fiscal sanity demands it. I will recognize that displaying such responsibility may well bring heaps of scorn and ridicule on those who offend someone else's definition of intellectualism or "scholar power."

I do not subscribe to a clipping service, but I have seen many editorials resulting from my past criticisms. Although the vast majority of these editorials have been in overwhelming support of my position, including the Wall Street Journal, the Chicago Tribune, the St. Louis Globe Democrat, the Shreveport, La., Journal, the Tulsa World, the Oklahoma City Daily Oklahoman, the Joplin Globe, and others too numerous to mention, it was was very interesting to observe the single-mindedness of those which were in opposition. Admittedly they were few in number, but among them were the Washington Post and the Washington Star, although even the Star's own columnist "The Rambler," took a different outlook. But by a strange coincidence both these papers editorialized on this subject on the same day. By an even stranger coincidence they just happened to use the very same term—"Know-Nothingism"—in describing my position.

Never, not once, not in an editorial in any paper, at any time, have I seen any explanation of how this study of the history of comic strips is going to help our Nation persevere in the study to win the minds and hearts of men. "Fundus Eórum Trahite, Cordes Mentesque Venient."

As I told the Chairman of the Endowment for the Humanities, I admire the art of the comic strips writer and the cartoonist. I just fail to see a single reason why he or they, must be pyschoanalyzed at the taxpayers' expense. They have managed to persevere and prosper all these years without a Federal study, and I suspect, they are the better for it. I simply do not believe that these

expenditures—and I refer to the entire assortment of grants made by the humanities endowment on February 8—can be justified at this time in history when the American people are being asked to dig so deeply in their pockets, and when we are engaged in a war that is depleting our National Treasury at an alarming rate.

Only yesterday, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the Ford Foundation of 1966 report, showing it had approved expenditures totaling $89 million for the arts and humanities. And the Ford Foundation is only one of 175 private foundations which make money available to the academic community for this purpose.

If we do not have the courage and the will to defray expenditures such as this in time of war, then I ask what can we cut back, where can we institute economy, where can we save the taxpayer from our own excesses?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the committee has obviously performed a very fine job in bringing before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union this appropriation measure.

Nonetheless, there are some comments that should be made regarding certain exclusions and inclusions.

Mr. Chairman, a number of the Members of the House are worrying about problems with which they are especially concerned. They are worrying because they do not receive consideration for specific projects.

Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that this shortcoming results from a habit which we enjoy here in the House of Representatives. We authorize, almost with abandon, and then appropriate in a miserly fashion on interior matters.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not blame the Committee on Appropriations for this procedure, because, after all, the committee must be realistic. This is the point at which we start to cut, and it is not fair to blame the committee.

Mr. Chairman, these shortages in appropriations can and do work a hardship on many areas of the country.

It has already been mentioned that the little town of West Branch, Iowa, had depended upon the Federal Government to provide certain funds with which to undertake a project, and now it must wait a year or 2 years or more in order to obtain the kind of funds needed. The community made plans. The lack of appropriated funds causes a serious dislocation in the town.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to appear provincial in mentioning this case, because it represents a number of situations about which I have been concerned in many other States of the Union.

Nationally, right now, we are almost a billion dollars behind authorizations.

The tables which appear in the report, page 1122, show an estimated deficit of $2.7 billion to the year 1977.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, someone must take cognizance of this fact when we call for an ever-widening scope of acquisition. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we have to catch up. We have to hold up authorizations until we can catch up with appropriated funds.

Mr. Chairman, there are many items that should be mentioned in connection with the consideration of this legislation.

I have reference, for instance, Mr. Chairman, to the Bureau of Mines, a bureau of the Federal Government which has the awesome responsibility of locating and managing the mineral resources which we must have if this country is to continue to forge ahead in the future. This means, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress of the United States and the agency concerned must see to the fact that the job is done efficiently and that it is done well. However, they continue to receive far too little money.

We have talked today about the field of the arts and humanities. The State of Alaska has had a tremendous treasure of art and artifacts. That treasure has almost disappeared. This represents a serious crisis, yet I see no special effort made here to take care of the situation.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is my great concern:

In Indian affairs we have spent so many years, and so many dollars, and so much misguided effort trying to improve the lot of the first Americans.

In this budget we have a new program for the Indians. Suddenly after 150 years—someone has staggered onto something new. Do not be fooled. There is nothing in this program which is new. There is nothing in this proposal which will scrap the oppressive bureaucracy and archaic philosophies which have produced generations of failure in dealing with the Indians.

The only bright spot I can see regarding the Indians is that the Indian Bureau has not yet been transferred from the Interior Department to HEW—and that has been proposed. That would indeed be a tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, we refer to the first citizen of the United States as the red man. When we look at the situation of the Indian today, it is our faces which should be red.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay my respects to the committee for making substantial cuts in this bill under the budget recommendations. I know how difficult it is to work with a bill that involves so many different activities and touches so many aspects of life in this country as does this one. However, I would like to call attention to the fact that there is one area in which I think the subcommittee did not make sufficient cuts, and that is the area of jobs in the department. We are talking about an executive department of the Government which has 82,000 people employed in it. About 50,000 or 60,000 of those are in the Department of the Interior, and the others are in what is referred to as related agencies. But, departmentwide, under the supervision of the Department, and covered under this bill, are agencies that employ in excess of 80,000 people.

The reason I am attracted to this particular item, and the reason I think an additional cut can be made here, is because I find that the Department had 4,820 unfilled jobs as of December 1966. In other words they had nearly 5,000 unfilled jobs just 4 months ago. What therefore is the justification for appropriating money for 1,662 additional jobs over these provided in the bill last year when the Department did not fill 5,000 of those jobs it had money to fill last year?

Part of that came about because the Director of the Bureau of the Budget last September imposed a ceiling on employment and required almost every agency of the Government to roll back employment levels to those in effect on July 31, 1966.

Some agencies appealed from that ruling and had some of the jobs restored. Nevertheless, some of the cutback in this Department is accounted for by the fact that the Bureau of the Budget undertook to put what I would call a freeze on employment and to roll back the levels of employment to the end of the preceding fiscal year.

If the Bureau of the Budget, after the Congress appropriates money to fund a certain amount of jobs, can take the responsibility of rolling back those job levels to a period in the past, I think it is an invitation—and an open invitation—to the Congress to quit appropriating money for more jobs than are necessary.

If the Department could operate last year and during the last 4 months of the calendar year 1966 with nearly 5,000 fewer jobs than it had money appropriated for; and if the Department could get along as well as it did with an employment level of nearly 5,000 fewer employees, I think that is an open invitation for us to roll back employment levels also and cut out increased requests for the new budget.

I find that the new budget now under consideration proposes an increase of 2,563 jobs notwithstanding the fact that this Department had 4,800 unfilled positions at that time. It takes a lot of nerve to ask that of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time when the bill is read for amendment, I intend to offer an amendment—not to strike out any programs, but to reduce the level of employment by 2 percent.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, permit me to take a brief moment of the Members' time to call to your attention an item that may become a part of this bill before final consideration.

During the past year or more, the location of a Job Corps camp in my district has created a serious and difficult road problem in Becker County. During the process of establishing the camp and acquiring the necessary equipment, a section of county black-top road has been severely damaged. This occurred because of added traffic and the hauling

of heavy equipment which included draglines and dozers needed in the operation of the camp, over a road which could not carry this kind of load, and some of the hauling being done at a time of the year when the road was in its weakest condition.

The result of this experience has placed a too heavy financial burden on the county, as well as great inconvenience to citizens in the area who normally use the road. Appeal has been made by the county commissioners for moneys with which to repair the road.

During recent weeks and days, it has become known that the Jobs Corps does not have money or authority for such expenditure, even though it is difficult to understand why not, and so because of the camp being located on a game refuge, and with substantial work being done by the Job Corps for the Fish and Wildlife Department, an arrangement is in the process of being worked out so that they might provide these moneys out of their regular construction funds. This item may become a matter of consideration at a later date by inclusion of the amount of money needed by the other body, when the appropriate considerations have been completed. I wish only to call this matter to the attention of the membership at this time, in order that it might be known and adequately considered during the appropriate time, which could involve the conference committee.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], for the outstanding manner in which she has managed this important bill here today. Every member of her subcommittee has contributed to the preparation of this appropriation measure. Untold hours, days, and weeks of work have gone into its preparation. We are all proud of the dignified and able way in which it has been presented by the gentlewoman from Washington. Congratulations to her and her subcommittee.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the distinguished Member from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] and the other members of her subcommittee who I know have given this bill a great deal of consideration. I know they will understand when I express concern and disappointment over two features of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is shortsighted, in terms of the preservation and development of our natural resources, to reduce by nearly $14 million the amount requested through the land and water conservation fund for land acquisition within our national park program. The reduction, for example, completely eliminates funds for acquisition of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which we authorized last year.

I fully share the committee's concern with the cruel escalation of land prices in areas designated for national parks. I, too, realize that the Department of the Interior has not yet come forward with a comprehensive plan to meet this problem. I am particularly familiar with the difficulties at Point Reyes in California, where land speculation played a major role in exhausting the original appropriation for this national seashore before more than one-third of the authorized area could be acquired.

I agree with the committee's desire to put pressure on the Department to find solutions to this problem. But I do not agree that we should make a substantial cut in the funds requested for the land and water conservation fund to accomplish this purpose.

One of the difficulties today, that contributes to the problem of cost escalation, is the time that elapses between authorizing and appropriating funds for acquisition. The Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has testified that this time lag runs anywhere from 18 to 24 months. We need to move more, not less, quickly, but this reduction in funds will only slow that movement further.

I hope that these funds for national park acquisition and development will be restored at an early date. I hope that the Interior Department will concentrate on the critical question of insuring a more adequate source of income for the land and water conservation fund and on the equally critical problem of escalating land costs. The Department, at an early date, should recommend appropriate, remedial legislation to the Congress, and we should give it our prompt consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I am also disappointed that the committee recommended a reduction of some $2.5 million in the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The $6 million requested had already been reduced by $2 million from the original authorization.

I am alarmed that efforts will be made to cut this figure even further. My own view is that the sum recommended by the committee is altogether too modest, but I urge the House to approve it without delay, resolving that in the future we shall raise our sights in the whole field of arts and humanities, in order that the quality of our lives and those of generations who follow us will be richer and more satisfying.

We are of necessity concerned these days with scientific research—because the fruits of this endeavor can offer us a healthier, better life, one in which we are better able to deal with the world around us. We are concerned, of necessity, with the protection of people against military might. But, even as we concern ourselves with science and defense, it is also important that we not lose sight of the human need for expression and for understanding, values with which science and the military cannot primarily concern themselves. The pressures of community responsibility, the necessity of earning a livelihood for self and family, and the conflict and strains inherent to contemporary civilization, all too often contrive to make us forget the contribution which the arts and humanities can make to the quality of our lives.

In the 2 short years it has been in operation, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities has embarked on a dynamic program—reaching from rural Wisconsin to the San Francisco Opera Co. and into each of our 50 States—encouraging the development of creativity and scholarship. This is what we sought when we passed the legislation in 1965, and I believe that the record of achievement warrants our continued support today.

Many are hesitant, in the face of military spending, about concerning ourselves with this program. I would remind them that in a day when we seek improved understanding with peoples all over the world, the language of music and painting and scholarship is practically universal. And encouragement of efforts in these fields at this time may very well bring greater understanding of our Nation and its ideals than will our supremacy in other areas of endeavor.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have taken an active interest in the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, having introduced and cosponsored several of the original measures leading to its establishment in 1965. The efforts made so far by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts, the two co-units of the Foundation have, in my opinion, been a credit to the foresight of Congress in creating the Foundation.

Any early activity is likely to have some elements of trial and error in it. This is certainly not the time, during such a formative period, for any cutback in congressional support. I recognize that the Committee on Appropriations has made an earnest attempt, as it states in its report on H.R. 9029, to strike a balance between those who denigrate the program and those who enthusiastically embrace it. Nevertheless, I view with some dismay the lack of attention to the needs of the Endowment for the Humanities. The reduction from the $4.5 million program budget of fiscal 1967 to only $3 million for grants and loans to individuals and groups and another $500,000 available for matching grants is unnecessary and uncalled for.

We are barely edging above the past levels of interest in research in the humanities which in 1965 found activity in this area equaling only one-half of 1 percent of the Federal research support for the sciences. There is no denying the impact that the concentration on the scientific has had in our daily life. We, as a nation, are far along the route to the goal of that old nursery rhyme, that ends "healthy, wealthy, and wise", as far as the first two categories are concerned.

It is in the third, where we seek not mere knowledge or education but wisdom in making use of our knowledge in our public and private decisions, that we are weak. Yet it is the most important part. To understand, evaluate and appreciate ourselves and our society, past, present, and future, through research, teaching, and the dissemination of what has been learned, is of utmost importance if we are to be the masters of our scientific and technological age, and not its servants.

Progress in the humanities, and public appreciation of the role of the humanities, will not happen overnight. Americans generally have a need and a desire to see immediate, pragmatic re-

sults. Patience and contemplation is not one of our national virtues. To cut back on funds for the humanities, however, will certainly not aid in producing prompt practical applications of this research and related activities. I urge that this Congress not take a step backward from its 1965 position, but fully fund both the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities in our action today on appropriations for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the artificial split between the sciences and the arts. The phrase "the two cultures" has become a popular term to describe a condition that is generally deplored. Here in America our natural inclination for invention and technology has made this split even more a problem. Our strength today as a military and an economic power derives from our great technological skills. And there is a powerful economic incentive for a young man or woman to join the ranks of the scientists and the engineers. The Sunday Times every week is full of ads describing the lures of work in aerodynamics hydrospace, computer design, and scientific occupations whose names we can barely pronounce, much less understand what they are. Prestige and substantial incomes are the reward of the technician and the scientist. But no one takes a quarter page ad in the Times or the Washington Post to hire a historian, an archeologist, or an English professor.

This imbalance between the two cultures, between the sciences and the arts and humanities, has been encouraged by the spending of the Federal Government. In 1967, Federal spending for the sciences generally amounted to $15.9 billion; of this figure $5.6 billion was for research. In that same year, the Federal Government spent $4.5 million on the humanities generally; of this, $2 million went for research. And today we are debating whether we should cut back the sum of $3.5 million to be spent on the Humanities Endowment.

It seems to me that we should think seriously about this imbalance in Government spending. I know that the Committee on Government Operations has given this matter careful thought. After a careful study of all Government research programs, the committee stated, in its 18th annual report in 1965:

> The committee recommends that massively increased support for scholarship and for instruction in the humanities and the social sciences—by some combination of private means, or by Federal, State, and local government support—be accepted as an important national goal.

I would point out that the Humanities Endowment is the logical vehicle for carrying out this recommendation: $500,000 of the $3.5 million appropriation is actually contingent fund to match private donations. If we in Congress fail to support this appropriation, surely private industry and individuals will be reluctant to respond to the challenge of this matching fund.

The lack of adequate support for the humanities is also a source of concern to leaders of the scientific community. The distinguished members of the Board of the National Science Foundation stated in a telegram to the leaders of the Appropriations Committee that they supported the work of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities:

> We are deeply concerned that the power of science and technology be used wisely not only to abolish hunger and promote health, but also to help all people to realize themselves fully as human beings. The decisions necessary to establish peace abroad and a sound society at home must be based on understanding of man's history and of his needs and hopes as revealed by literature and art.

This is eloquent testimony, indeed, for the humanities. For scientists know that without a humanistic culture, they stand in isolated splendor, separated from the community with which they have traditionally interacted to the benefit of both. They know that you cannot have a healthy scientific community inside an ailing scholarly community generally. Scientists are discovering practical solutions for physical problems, but solutions which can only be applied by combining the techniques of the scientist with the wisdom of the humanist.

Mr. Chairman, the unnatural split between science and the humanities is an unfortunate novelty in the 20th century. And it is one that should be discouraged, not encouraged. By neglecting and actually discouraging the study of humanities, we are guilty of "cultural nonsupport." We create a climate where statistics and facts, technology and mechanics, are revered above the wisdom we need to use them. We create a climate in which "nonscientific truth" sells at a discount. The growing restlessness of our college youth reflects a rejection of the neat sterile automated society in which what people think and feel, what they write and create, what they are as opposed to what they can do and earn in some automated enterprise is assumed to be unimportant. We can go a long way to change the image of America as a "no deposit, no return" society by enabling our scholars and our teachers in the humanistic studies to be an influential and important part in creating a life of quality in the midst of our abundance.

Therefore, I support the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the Humanities Endowment.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] as he expresses disappointment as to the deletion of funds for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. I, too, am deeply disappointed that the committee has stricken this money. There is some consolation, however, in the remarks of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] that this action was not intended as a veto of the project. There is no consolation, however, to the people of Indiana and this Nation, who expected this project to get underway this year. Land costs will be greater next year and even greater the next year. Persons owning land within the area authorized for the lakeshore must continue to live in an atmosphere of uncertainty. Indiana has displayed a cooperative spirit in connection with the proposed development of the national lakeshore. It will now be more difficult for the State to plan, design, and develop its own adjoining facility if there is uncertainty as to when the nationnal lakeshore will get underway. In my judgment the House is not acting wisely if this bill should become law without an amount included for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disappointed, and the people of St. Louis are understandably puzzled, by the severity of the budget cuts in the Interior Department appropriation bill. Among the consequences will be extended further delay in the completion of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, where only a small percentage of the work remains to be done. These are the finishing touches necessary to make fully usable a project in which more than $32,000,000 has been invested, and which attracts 5 million or more visitors annually.

The magnificent stainless steel Gateway Arch, designed by the late Eero Saarinen, now soars 630 feet over the skyline of St. Louis, to a height exceeding the Washington Monument. It is breathtaking—spectacular. It has been cited as one of the truly outstanding engineering achievements of the world.

Everyone who has seen the arch has been thrilled by its grandeur and moved by the silent eloquence of its tribute to the pioneering spirit which opened the American West. It was from this spot that Lewis and Clark began their hazardous and fateful expedition to the Pacific.

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial was begun more than 30 years ago when our then mayor of St. Louis, the Honorable Bernard F. Dickmann, reached an agreement with President Franklin D. Roosevelt for the joint venture to which the city would contribute $1 for every $3 of Federal funds. The land was obtained and cleared at a cost of more than $8,000,000 but it was not until 1954, however, that legislation was enacted authorizing the initial appropriation of Federal construction funds, and actual construction work was not begun for several years thereafter.

Now the memorial is nearly finished. But because of the long delays and the complex engineering problems which had to be solved in the construction of the unique arch, the nearly $24,000,000 of Federal and local funds made available so far for construction will not cover such essential work as landscaping and the completion of the visitor center and Museum of Westward Expansion, which will afford visitors an understanding of the historical significance of the arch and the deeds it commemorates.

Therefore, the 89th Congress increased the authorization by an additional $6,000,000 of Federal construction funds, to be matched by $2,000,000 of local funds. After protracted deliberation, the President and his aids came to the conclusion that only $2,325,000 of the authorized $6,000,000 of additional Federal funds should be made available in the forthcoming fiscal year, because of budget considerations, and that is the

amount the Appropriation Committee was requested to approve.

DELAY OF COMPLETION WILL INCREASE TOTAL COST

The committee, however, decided to postpone this request along with a number of others which it placed in the category of deferrable items. I strongly disagree with the judgment. Our experience on this project has demonstrated clearly that deferral of construction work which is going to have to be done—which will eventually be done—almost always costs the Federal Government far more in the long run, while depriving us of the full use of the facility in the meantime. I firmly believe it is a false type of economy. It would show a reduction in 1 year's Federal budget at the expense of a far greater increase in a subsequent budget.

That is why I intend to try my very best to have the Senate overturn this decision. The facts of legislative life are clear to all of us here today that an effort to amend the bill on the House floor for this or any other project left out by the committee would have no chance of success and, furthermore, might rule out the possibilty of House acceptance of a Senate amendment. It is for that reason only that no amendment is being offered on this item.

But I want the record to show that we in St. Louis feel this work should go forward now. We desire to save the Federal Government money by finishing this great memorial promptly. That would be true economy. The splendid arch now rests on a barren spot—periodically a sea of mud—which is to be transformed into a thing of beauty befitting the structure and the concept which led to the memorial's construction.

The visitor center and museum will serve as an inspiration to all who visit the arch, depicting the significance of the pioneering spirit which led Thomas Jefferson to purchase the Louisiana Territory, which sent Lewis and Clark on their great adventure, and which prompted thousands of brave men, women and children to risk all, including their lives, for the new life which could be theirs beyond the Mississippi.

Those of us who have worked so hard for so long to bring this marvel of engineering imagination into existence—as a great curving silvery ribbon of steel which lifts the mind and the heart and the spirit of all who see its beauty and feel it beckoning mankind forward to new challenges—have no intention of permitting the memorial to remain unfinished.

I am sorry that the bill now before the House omits the modest amount the President recommended for this project for the 1968 fiscal year. Surely no one is more deeply concerned than the President about holding down unnecessary or deferrable expenditures at this time because of budget considerations. Had we insisted upon an amount above the budget figure, or upon an appropriation not recommended in the budget at all, I could understand the committee's action on this item. But that was not the case.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering at length the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior. There is one provision of that bill which I hope would be changed before the bill becomes law.

Page 14 of the bill concerns surveys, investigations, and research by the Geological Survey. There is a provision that $13,960,000 shall be available for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations, but that no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any such investigation carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality.

This is the well-established State-Federal matching program to assist the States in planning their future water needs. Over the past years, every State has taken advantage of this sharing provision, and this year, it appears the States feel the need and are prepared to step up their research programs. In all but seven States, the estimated offerings for fiscal 1968 exceed the 1967 program.

The problem, however, is that this $13.9 million Federal appropriation will be insufficient to match the increased funds earmarked by the States. The 1968 budget, as we see it today, provides a total increase of $1,010,000 over the Federal matching funds available in 1967, while the States indicate an anticipated $2,273,800 increase over their 1967 programs. In other words, the States, in 1968, are willing to put up about $1,263,800 which, under this bill, cannot be matched by Federal grants.

I say that if the States are able to see themselves clear to make the sacrifice here, we should certainly do our part. It is my hope the other body will give consideration to this fact. I have talked to members of the Appropriations Committee, and I believe it would be agreeable if this amount was added by the other body, or in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

*Bureau of Land Management*

Management of Lands and Resources

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, $49,013,000.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on behalf of the comic strips and particularly with reference to Little Orphan Annie and the investigation that is contemplated.

If I might, I would like to refer to a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor concerning the problems we face with the philosophy of our comic strips.

The columnist says:

LITTLE ORPHAN ANNIE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.

I am getting pretty anxious about Little Orphan Annie. She's got herself into another jam—kidnaped again. Of course, Daddy Warbucks may turn up; even so, the suspense accumulates.

Little Orphan Annie, as you know, is a syndicated comic strip. She appears in some 400 newspapers with 35 million readers—

If I may interpolate here, she may reach more people than some Congressmen.

Comics, movies, television are part of the arts; they probably affect mass culture as much as the schools, perhaps more.

In Annie's case there's always Daddy Warbucks. He is the eternal father image. The Romans had a name for it, deus ex machina. (Would that be pater bellum lucrum?). He represents a national instinct. If he is around no disaster can befall us, or our country. He will have a simple, forthright answer for any problem, no matter how complex, Vietnam, say. Of course we have to be on the side of the "goodies"—the people of good will. Fortunately we are on that side.

Annie's foster parents demand why the police don't rescue their daughter. The police captain (a "goodie") explains that "the police have known for weeks who hired the gang to try to kill Pete; the price, the whole plan."

Naturally Annie's agonized mother asks, "Why aren't they all in jail, captain?"

"Ah, we're living in a new era," he explains. "Now even admitted violent crime doesn't count! The *legal* question is, how the dickens did the cops find out?"

"But that's crazy!"

"Some of us, in my business, think so, but it's the new law, lady! We also know the men in that group of hired killers! They got back to their home city yesterday; but by a recent judicial decision it's illegal for a cop even to ask a suspect his name!"

"Why, that's incredible!"

"Nope; invasion of the suspect's constitutional right to privacy," said the learned judge!

The angry father springs to his feet: "Whose side are the courts on, anyway?"—

Of course, this is more effective with pictures—

The police captain thinks this is a good question, but he is helpless. He rams the moral home with the clincher, "How long since you've heard of any kidnaper being executed?"

Now this is social criticism of a powerful order even if you feel it is outrageously oversimplified. It is delivered in the Sunday newspaper and the children are being conditioned by it as they spell it out on the living room rug. Ordinary legal processes are corrupt; the courts are aiding the criminals; the best way to get justice is to take matters into your own hands. Any violence will be condoned by Daddy Warbucks.

In Miranda v. Arizona the Supreme Court recently ruled that the police must warn a suspect of his right to remain silent; that he has the right to the presence of counsel and that anything that he says may be used against him. British police have been saying that for some time.

The U.S. Department of Justice isn't able to recall any "recent judicial decision" like that cited above making it illegal for a policeman to ask a suspect his name.

The President's Crime Commission last February noted that back in 1931 the Wickersham commission found that the "third degree" (stationhouse beatings to extort confessions) was "almost universal." Now it is hardly more than a name. The report says: "Few Americans regret its virtual abandonment by the police."

However, the rights of the individual (the suspect) versus society (you and me) still make a red hot issue. Little Orphan Annie offers powerful propaganda, and nobody doubts where she stands in her one-sided argument. "Police procedures must be controlled somehow," the President's Crime Commission declares. Attorney General Ramsey Clark said here last week, "I do not believe court rules cause crime."

But Little Orphan Annie dissents. She may have more effect on the children than the Crime Commission, the Attorney General, or their parents. Wonder how she will get out of her present fix anyway?

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that some study and investigation of our comic strips and what effect that they have on our lives is not out of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I have said repeatedly I do not oppose "comics," but I am against spending for repetitive studies as granted by this Council.

Let us not be beguiled by vague generalities and let us restore some sense of reason and priority in the allocation of Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that during the hearings my distinguished colleague from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, asked Mr. Barnaby Keeney on many occasions whether the work to de done by one of the grantees was a duplication of anything that was done previously, and in every instance the Humanities Endowment Chairman always replied that it had not, or that this would not be a duplication of anything previously done.

I only regret that this question was not asked in the case of the grant for study of "History of Comic Strips and Political Cartoons." It would have been interesting to see Mr. B. Keeney's reply.

I have here, and I invite any Member of the House to take a further look, five books previously written on this very same subject by some distinguished writers, and I doubt very much that our friend Dr. Kunzle can add anything of significance to these works. I might add not one of these were subsidized by the taxpayer.

First, a book written by Gerald W Johnson, entitled "The Lines Are Drawn," written in 1958. Mr. B. Keeney in justifying the grant to Dr. Kunzle cites the work of cartoonist Thomas Nast. I daresay there is more about Nast in this book than will probably ever be written by Dr. Kunzle, even at Federal expense.

Next, a book entitled "Highlights," a cartoon history of the 1920's written by Rollin Kirby, with a foreword by Walter Lippmann. It cost the American taxpayers not one red cent.

Next, a book entitled "Our Political Drama," written by Joseph B. Bishop, describing the impact of political cartooning on American politics. It cost the taxpayers' not one red cent.

Next, the "History of Political Parties," by Samuel Ordway, Jr., replete with political cartoons, and costing the American taxpayer not one red cent. Please excuse emphasis on "red," lest I offend the cultural and sensitive ears of those who deem me a "know-nothing." I should have said "one copper."

And finally, a book entitled "Un-Americana," edited by Charlotte Pomerant.

No previous work, indeed. For a lesson in political cartooning I invite the Members of the House to stop by and see my exhibits, Dr. Kunzle to the contrary.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to justify the grant for comic books. However, I feel very strongly that we will be on a very dangerous course if we try to tell the artists what they should create or the scholars what they should study. We should keep our legislative noses out of the direction of art and humanities, because, if we do not, we will be traveling on the very dangerous and deadly road to thought control by the Government.

Although I am in favor of this program of aid to the arts and humanities, if it should ever mean that the Government will tell artists and scholars what they should create, and how they should think, I would rather withdraw my support than be party to such a perilous course.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as chairman of of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to discuss several matters which affect, I believe, the jurisdiction of that subcommittee and the subject matter over which that subcommittee has appropriately acted for a number of years. I would, for that reason, like to address several questions to the very distinguished and fine gentlewoman from Washington, who so ably chairs the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which has the matter presently before the body today.

I note on page 27 of the committee report, language which appears about the middle of the page as follows:

> The Committee expects that the Bureau will continue the policy of more widespread acquisition by easement instead of purchase in fee which will reduce the cost of the program.

I refer here specifically to the program of acquisition of lands for refuges and refuge purposes to preserve the habitats for migratory waterfowl, a very important program as far as conservation and conservationists and duck hunters of this country are concerned.

I am troubled because one of the things the subcommittee which I have the honor to chair has always maintained a great interest in has been the land acquisition program. I point out to my very dear friend, the fine gentlewoman from Washington, that we have had repeated reviews and scrutinies of this matter within the subcommittee. I am apprehensive lest language of this kind might lead the Department of the Interior to expend money for acquisition of land by easement as opposed to acquisition of land by purchase in fee, where that might be more appropriate. I hope my dear friend from Washington might make some comment to ease my mind on this subject.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that there is need for the acquisition of land for the refuges. However, as we are well aware, there are certain areas of this country where it is impossible at the present time, due to difficulties not only with owners of property, but for other reasons, to purchase the land. So, rather than set aside the flyway area or make it impossible for the orderly progress, the committee has hoped that in these instances, until these problems are solved, that easements can be given, hopefully looking toward the time when this land will be in the area of complete preservation.

The Appropriations Committee is not in the authorization business. We are looking at this as a very down to earth, factual matter, and we would rather see some development made.

Mr. DINGELL. I am very much comforted by this, because it was the intent of the subcommittee, when we considered legislation of this kind, to make very sure that easements were available as a device for acquiring land. The subcommittee is always well aware of the fact that there are areas where it is not possible, for political or possibly other reasons, to acquire good land by outright purchase. There are also a good many tracts of land in the country where acquisition by fee or by purchase is not possible because the land does not constitute a manageable unit or is so small or isolated that it would not be appropriate to be set up as a refuge in the conventional sense.

In this the subcommittee has always been thoroughly sympathetic to the acquisition of an appropriate interest in the land through easements, and would applaud that kind of use there.

I am very much comforted to hear the gentlewoman from Washington, for whom I have the highest respect, say this, because this language, uninterpreted as the fine chairman of the subcommittee has done today, might lead to some interpretation which might be troublesome at least in the subcommittee I have the honor to chair.

I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague from Missouri has had much sport in recent weeks over one minuscule part of the grants by the National Foundation on the Humanities. In the process of his criticism of the grant for the history of the comic books, the gentleman has completely ignored the multiplicity of grants in other areas of scholarship made to scholars in each and every one of the States of the Union.

I suppose one should be impressed by the fact that there are five book titles relating to comic strips on the table here, for all of us to look at.

I wonder, really, if there should be just one title on each subject of human knowledge or on each subject relating to the humanities.

For instance, should there be one book, I would say to a physician, on surgery? One on orthopedics? One on gynecology? Or one on any one of the multiplicity of specialties that there are in the gentleman's other profession?

I remember some time ago suggesting, in the course of the discussion on medicare, that there is not enough specialization in medicine. Why should an opthalmologist, for instance, be responsible

for the treament of both eyes? There ought to be a left-eye man and a right-eye man. Then there would be a body of literature on the left eye and a body of literature on the right eye.

I note with some interest the presence of a distinguished Member of this body who is a historian, who has taught us a great deal about the building in which we meet, and whose hobby is Lincoln. I wonder how many titles there are on the subject of Abraham Lincoln, and whether there should be a restriction to one book on Lincoln—Sandburg's—and burn all the rest, for instance.

Is knowledge to be limited to one or to four titles? Indeed, should there not be a study to compile the whole body of knowledge on each and every subject?

As a matter of fact, there is an undercurrent in the remarks of our distinguished friend from Missouri indicating some political disagreement, some philosophical disagreement with the scholar who is to be the recipient of the grant to which he objects.

We have philosophical disagreements among ourselves all the time. It does not mean, however, that philosophically if a doctor disagrees with a lawyer that the doctor knows more about the law than the lawyer does, or vice versa. Of course, a great many lawyers practice medicine and a great many doctors practice law, especially constitutional law. I think the fact that the criticism is so terribly narrow is a tribute to the grants made by the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I could not agree more than I do with my friend from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] who says that he is in support of this legislation. Let us look at the affirmative side of it. Are we competent, any of us, in any particular field, to judge scholars in other fields? I think that I have in my library at home five versions of interpretations of the sonnets of Shakespeare and there are not a great number of them. Recently there has been developed a whole series, as yet incomplete, on the writings of Mark Twain, who said, incidentally, "It is the will of God that we have Congressmen, and we must bear the burden." He also said that to the best of his knowledge there is only one native probable criminal class, and that is Members of Congress. Well, I do not happen to agree with that, although I think it is very amusing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the subcommittee for recognizing the problem we are being faced with in commerce and by citizens generally that is caused by the blackbirds and starlings of this Nation. Members will realize from past Congresses the attempts of this House to recognize the problem. On page 25 of the report, it says:

> In addition, the Committee directs that of the $800,000 included in the budget estimate for bird control, the major portion of these funds be utilized for the control of blackbirds.
>
> During the hearings, the Committee received extensive testimony of the increasing severity of damage to corn and other crops by blackbirds. The Committee is not convinced that agency officials are giving this problem sufficient attention in proportion to the huge losses in farm income that are occurring.
>
> It is therefore the expressed desire of the Committee that activity in the blackbird control program be greatly accelerated and that the Committee be furnished with quarterly reports during the next fiscal year on progress that is being made in this connection.

It seems to me since the committee has been informed of the tremendous losses occurring every year in agriculture which cost the Department of the Interior some $58 million a year, that it is time we got started on this problem. I am well pleased that the committee has seen fit to make a worthwhile start to do something about this problem that is on the increase throughout the United States. As I pointed out in my testimony before the subcommittee on this subject, not only is this a problem faced by agriculture but it is one faced by everyone who travels by air. As the Air Force reported last year, they suffered some $10 million by reason of bird damage to aircraft alone. And, that in fiscal 1965, there was a total of 1,233 strikes involved. Of this total, 394 represented commercial craft and 839 Air Force planes.

Mr. Chairman, these figures only serve to give to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union some idea as to the magnitude of the problem that the subcommittee has now directed to the agency in charge of this problem in an effort to do something about the solution thereof.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], and to the other members of the committee, "A job well done."

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to state that I have listened with a great deal of interest to the report and to the consideration of this legislation on this historic day by the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington, the first woman to be the chairman of this subcommittee. I do wish to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman upon her report, particularly with reference to her recognition of the escalation of land costs and the speculation which is engaged in with reference to land located in specific areas and the problems that we face as a result thereof.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite disturbed and concerned in view of this situation. And Mr. Chairman, I am rising to express my strong objections to the deletion of $2.7 million requested by the Department of the Interior to purchase parkland to save the view from Mount Vernon across the Potomac River at Piscataway Park, Md.

This pilot program in cooperative parkland purchase and preservation of open spaces by private landowners, nonprofit foundations and the Federal Government has been with us since 1961 when the first legislation authorizing the park was signed into law by President Kennedy after it passed both Houses without objection.

What has happened since then has been both tragic—and amazing. I think I can sum up the recent history of Piscataway Park by saying legislatively this project has been a resounding success. Insofar as securing appropriations to complete the job, it has been a failure.

The only logical conclusion must be that this project is both cursed and blessed. From the standpoint of the appropriations committees the project is cursed. From the standpoint of cooperation by the private landowners and foundations in the park area it has been blessed like no other proposed national park in the Nation.

In a reversal from previous deletions of requested appropriations for Piscataway Park when it spelled out the reasons for its adverse decision, the appropriations committee this year has not directed one word of wisdom in its report on the fiscal 1968 Interior budget as to its reasons for deleting the $2.7 million. I am certain that the Committee is fully aware that if the other body upholds this deletion the Piscataway Park project will go down the drain, because, beginning on August 8, 1967, the first donation of land to the Government, a total of 151 acres donated in fee simple by the Accokeek Foundation, will revert to the foundation because money to complete the Federal share of parkland purchase was not forthcoming. When this reversion goes into effect that will be the beginning of the end for Piscataway Park and our efforts to save the view from Mount Vernon. Another force—one that originally triggered the effort to save Piscataway—will once again become a major threat: Water and sewer service to that part of Prince Georges County where the park is located.

For it was back in 1960 during the 87th Congress when the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, looking around for a location to build a large sewage treatment plant to serve the hundreds of thousands of persons who would soon move into southern Prince Georges County, laid its eyes on Mockley Point and decided the plant should be built there, in full view of the Mount Vernon estate of our first President. It was at this time when I, as a delegate to the Maryland Legislature, became alarmed at the threat of a sewage treatment plant desecrating the Mount Vernon view and the Potomac River shoreline in relatively virgin territory. I helped our delegation prevent, through legislation, the WSSC from locating its plant on Mockley Point. At the same time, in Congress, House Joint Resolution 459 was drafted, introduced, enacted, and signed into law by President Kennedy on October 4, 1961. This was pioneering legislation, and still is, because it based the successful acquisition of Piscataway Park as squarely on the shoulders of private landowners and the nonprofit foundations—as donors of land and scenic easements—as it did on the Federal Government.

It cited as its objective preservation for the benefit of present and future generations the historic and scenic values,

the present open and wooded character of the land, and preservation of "lands which provide the principal overview from Mount Vernon estate and Fort Washington, in a manner that will insure, insofar as practicable, the natural beauty of such lands as it existed at the time of the construction and active use of Mount Vernon mansion and Fort Washington."

Mr. Chairman, nothing has occurred to alter these objectives, except here in the Congress. Here in the Congress it has been, since before I was elected to this distinguished body, an almost futile and discouraging effort to eke out a few dollars for the Federal Government to participate in this project, as authorizing legislation has promised.

It did not take long to prove that the original authorization of $937,600 for Federal parkland purchase was totally inadequate to do the job. The House Appropriations Committee properly acknowledged this and called upon the administration and the Piscataway Park supporters to seek a new and increased authorization. Meanwhile, the same committee graciously appropriated $391,132, after denying the administration's request for the full authorization, to permit the National Park Service to buy the most critical area, Mockley Point. The Park Service acquired 97 acres for $391,132. That is all that the Government has been permitted to purchase by the Appropriations Committee since the original act was signed on October 4, 1961. This is not to take credit away from the committee; indeed, it realized that there were immense pressures on Mockley Point and that it had priority in parkland purchase at Piscataway under Public Law 87-362, the original authorization. But Mockley Point is only a fraction of the whole undertaking. If we are to lose the $2.7 million which was deleted, the National Park Service would still have the 97-acre Mockley Point in fee simple, and it may serve some sort of public purpose even though it is inaccessible to the public because the Government does not own the surrounding land which contains roads.

While the Federal Government was negotiating the purchase of the 97-acre Mockley Point, the Accokeek Foundation was making good its pledge to contribute to the cooperative parkland effort. This progressive foundation, with no ulterior motive in mind but to preserve the overview from Mount Vernon and the Maryland shoreline in open spaces and natural scenic values, donated outright a total of 151 acres to the Federal Government. This land was donated on August 8, 1962, but with one qualification: The donation agreement contains a reverter clause which calls for the Federal Government to substantially complete its portion of the cooperative parkland project or the donated 151 acres would revert in 5 years. The 5 years will expire on August 8, 1967, and no one can argue that by any stretch of the imagination has the Government done its share to substantially complete its portion of the parkland acquisition.

Bearing in mind the August 8, 1967, deadline and the advice of the Appropriations Committee that the original authorization was grossly insufficient, I introduced a bill on July 22, 1965, to increase the authorization to $3.5 million. This too was found to be inadequate by the Interior Department and an administration bill for $4.1 million authorization was drafted and introduced March 9, 1966, by myself and by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who did a very commendable job of carrying the ball in his committee in Congress. We all were gratified to see President Johnson sign the new increased authorization into law July 19, 1966. In a letter to me the President stated that Piscataway Park "is an integral part of our program for the beautification of the Potomac River."

While the Congress was considering the new $4.1 million authorization the administration asked the Appropriations Committee for the balance of the original authorization, $544,500, in the fiscal 1967 budget. The subcommittee disallowed this request on the ground that it is not the committee's policy to appropriate funds for projects concurrently undergoing new legislative authorizations. I can understand this policy and I think it is a wise one. The subcommittee has commented on its report that:

> The committee's action in recommending the reduction of $544,500 for land acquisition in Piscataway Park, Maryland, does not necessarily indicate the Committee's opposition to this proposal.

However, Mr. Chairman, it apparently did in fact indicate the subcommittee's opposition because it went right ahead this year and deleted the $2.7 million administration request for fiscal year 1968 under a completely new authorization that was entirely realistic, and the subcommittee did not even mention one word as to the reason for its action.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot and will not be picayunish about every decision the Appropriations Subcommittee makes in relation to Piscataway Park. However, when all the subcommittee's actions on this park are put into perspective along with several other projects that are designed to protect the Potomac River shoreline and open spaces in Prince Georges County a rather clear picture begins to emerge. Since before I came to Congress in the 89th Congress this picture has been a long string of decisions by the committee against preservation of open spaces and the shoreline in Prince Georges County. I believe that there is a reason for this discrimination against Prince Georges County, but I cannot for the life of me find out what it is. I sincerely would like to know how my county "sinned" against the Congress to be accorded such shabby treatment. I cannot believe that it is being done without some motive, but I have not had the privilege of finding anyone who will tell me.

Going back a few Congresses I would like to review this series of adverse appropriation decisions against Prince Georges County and the Potomac River shoreline.

A major project for preservation of open spaces like Piscataway Park is the George Washington Memorial Parkway, first authorized in 1930 to preserve the shoreline along the Potomac River from Mount Vernon to Great Falls, Va., and from Fort Washington to Great Falls, Md. For all intents and purposes this parkway has been completed in Virginia and Montgomery County, Md., but the appropriations subcommittee has been extremely reluctant to approve any funds for the Prince Georges County segment, which is the only one not completed. It is true that in fiscal year 1961 the subcommittee approved $250,000, and in fiscal year 1962 another $500,000. But these moneys were appropriated with the restriction that none of the parcels to be acquired could be contiguous. Thus, the original purpose for a long stretch of parkland along the shoreline was defeated. Meanwhile, the first administration request for the full $937,600 authorization for Piscataway Park met defeat in the fiscal 1962 budget request, and it was only reluctantly that the subcommittee finally appropriated $213,000 in the fiscal 1963 budget.

In the fiscal 1964 budget the administration again sought the $724,600 balance of the original authorization but it was denied. Restored in the Senate, the appropriation lost in conference. In fiscal 1965 the committee again deleted the request from the budget, which was in a supplemental request. However, the committee did permit the National Park Service to reprogram $180,000 to be applied to the $213,000 it had appropriated in fiscal 1963 to purchase Mockley Point in Piscataway Park. No funds have been appropriated for parkland purchase at Piscataway Park since then.

In continually denying the administration's requests for funds at Piscataway Park the subcommittee maintained, and properly so, that the original $937,600 authorization was totally inadequate. I do feel that the administration should bear some of the blame for not acknowledging the propriety of the position of the appropriations subcommittee relative to insufficient authorization. Clearly, the administration should have gone back to the legislative committee for increased authorization as soon as the appropriations subcommittee announced its position back in 1964. Unfortunately, it was not until July 22, 1965, when I offered my first bill to increase the Piscataway Park authorization that the administration started moving in the same direction. Needless to say, we had lost some valuable time.

The last money that has been appropriated for the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County was in fiscal year 1962. We have not seen a cent since then. Last year the subcommittee disallowed an administration request for $2.9 million in matching funds for land acquisition on grounds similar to Piscataway Park—insufficient authorization. The subcommittee even went so far as to say that:

> In the opinion of this committee, any further extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway should be taken up with the appropriate legislative committees in the House and Senate with a view to obtaining current and adequate authorizing legislation for such extension.

This position was announced after the committee had appropriated over the years millions of dollars for the same parkway along the banks of the Potomac River in Virginia and in Montgomery County under the same 1930 authorization.

In the same report on the fiscal 1967 Interior budget, the subcommittee denied $544,500 for Piscataway Park for reasons I have spelled out earlier, and reasons with which I have no quarrel. But, in explaining its denial of the $2.9 million parkway request for Prince Georges County, the committee made the startling statement that:

One of the justifications given for the acquisition of this land was the preservation of the scenic beauty along the banks of the Potomac River. The Committee heard numerous witnesses on this proposal and is of the opinion that a sufficient attempt has not been made to protect the natural beauty of the Potomac River banks through the acquisition of easements. Before efforts are made to purchase this high cost land, the Committee feels every effort should be exhausted to accomplish the same purpose through the effective use of easements.

Applying this statement to Piscataway Park, which like the George Washington Memorial Parkway is a major effort to preserve the shoreline's scenic and natural beauty in open and undeveloped spaces, I am at a complete loss to understand why Piscataway Park—a pilot program for the Nation in donated land and donated scenic easements—should be killed by this committee.

Every effort has been made, and successfully, at Piscataway to acquire scenic easements, and not through condemnation but through a joint cooperative effort with the nonprofit foundations and the private landowners. It has been a remarkable success.

As I stated earlier the first donation was the 151 acres given the Federal Government on August 8, 1962, with the 5-year reversion clause, which all donations of land and easements contain as a matter of routine. In the same year, 1962, the first scenic easements covering 5 acres was donated to the Government. In 1963 a total of 60 scenic easements covering 82.9 acres were donated. In 1965 a total of 60 were donated, protecting 435.9 acres in Piscataway Park. In 1966, private landowners donated 28 scenic easements protecting 277.7 acres, and so far this year 13 scenic easements protecting 45.5 acres have been donated.

Mr. Chairman, never has there been a park project quite like Piscataway Park. Where else in the United States can you find private landowners and foundations giving away their valuable land and property rights in order that the view from an historic estate be protected in open spaces? And believe me, these lands and property rights are extremely valuable, as we have seen in the escalating authorization, and as we will see very dramatically as soon as water and sewer service is available to the area. Once these water and sewer lines are opened up, we can count down and out everything we have tried to do to preserve the Potomac River shoreline in Prince Georges County at Piscataway Park and along the George Washington Memorial Parkway. We need the $2.7 million for parkland purchase at Piscataway desperately and we must have it before the August 8 deadline.

Piscataway Park is the chance of a lifetime for one of the most economical park projects in the Nation. Those private landowners and foundations, which have more than matched the Federal share in donating their valuable land and property rights should not be let down. Nor should the millions of Americans who pay tribute to Mount Vernon Estate. We should not fail in this pilot project, which could lead the way for establishment of new national parks in scenic open spaces through a cooperative Federal-private landowner program and which could save the Government untold millions of dollars in land acquisition. We should not discourage American landowners from donating scenic easements to their National Government, a concept while not necessarily new, is newly put to test in a highly critical area, and one badly in need of our assistance to make it a success and model for the country.

To impress this body even more with the widespread support the Piscataway pilot project has, our Prince Georges County government is on record in favor of granting a 50-percent tax credit to private landowners who donate scenic easements in the park area. This means money out of the county's revenue, and in the face of coming water and sewer service, this could be a very substantial amount of real estate tax revenue given away for the simple esthetic purpose of preserving open spaces and saving the view from Mount Vernon.

This county tax credit for donated scenic easements would go into effect if we can get the $2.7 million to finish the Federal responsibility at Piscataway Park.

Mr. Chairman, if we were truly in a time of a national war emergency and our national budget was extremely tight I could understand actions by our appropriations committee in making severe cutbacks in the various appropriations bills. But this appropriations bill for the Interior Department is not an economy bill. In fact, it is $32 million higher than the Interior appropriations bill for the current fiscal year. Even then, in paring $78 million from the administration's total request, the subcommittee, I feel, has not given proper consideration to just how economical this Piscataway Park project actually is. Quite frankly, I believe that it is the best bargain in a national park project we have ever seen. In denying $2.7 million to make this cooperative pilot project a reality we are exercising false economy, and the taxpayers' money is not being wisely spent. At Piscataway the taxpayer would in effect get $1 return for every Federal dollar spent, while in other projects the return is half as much, at best.

It is my fervent hope that the other body will take into consideration the many benefits of Piscataway Park and will restore the $2.7 million that the appropriations committee has deleted without comment. If this is successful, then we can finish our job in protecting the view from Mount Vernon, preserving a portion of the Potomac River shoreline in open spaces, free from the threats of high-rise apartments and industry. We will have a model pilot program in joint preservation of open spaces, with the Federal Government working hand-in-hand with the private landowners and other groups to reduce through donated scenic easements and donated land the enormous prices we are having to pay for parkland.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Land and Water Conservation

For expense necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), including $2,775,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interests therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the State or Federal agency concerned, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 of said Act, and to remain available until expended, not to exceed $119,500,000, of which (1) not to exceed $65,000,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount; (2) not to exceed $34,458,000 shall be available to the National Park Service; (3) not to exceed $15,367,000 shall be available to the Forest Service; (4) not to exceed $1,900,000 shall be available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: *Provided*, That in the event the receipts available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund are insufficient to provide the full amounts specified herein, the amounts available under clauses (1) through (4) shall be reduced proportionately.

For a repayable advance to the "Land and Water Conservation Fund," as authorized by section 4(b) of the Act of Sept. 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 900), $9,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want the RECORD to show that I do not agree with the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations in striking from the bill the funds requested to create the new Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. I offered an amendment in committee to restore a part of the funds so that the work could begin. Unfortunately, my motion was defeated.

I consider the committee's action discriminatory. It is true that the dunes bill went through the last Congress only after a bitter fight. But it did go through, and it should now be funded together with other approved areas. But the committee said no. It made funds available for every other new development except the dunes. That is why I say the committee's action is discriminatory.

Delay will not help the situation. Prices for the land will not go down; they will rise. The record before the committee shows that the price of land for the parks goes up at least 10 percent a year. Acquiring the land for the dunes which was to be purchased this year will inevitably be higher next year.

This is a critically important recreation and park area for the Chicago metropolitan area. It is one of the last remaining places where people who live in the cities can go for rest and relaxation, where they can escape from the noise and hurly-burly of urban life. I

hope the area will not be lost to economic development, desirable though that may be. This is a unique location. It must be preserved in its pristine elemental beauty. It is perhaps the only remaining inland dunes area. America's generations to come will have lost an irreplaceable national treasure if the committee's action is sustained.

I hope and trust its vetoing action will be overturned in another body.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHWENGEL

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWENGEL: On page 10, line 21, strike out "$119,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$119,900,000".

On page 10, line 24, strike out $34,458,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$34,858,000".

On page 11, line 1, insert after "National Park Service" the following: "(of which not to exceed $400,000 shall be used for land acquisition for the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, West Branch, Iowa)".

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I file this amendment to gain some time in order to ask some questions of the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking Member regarding the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, West Branch, Iowa, and some of its problems; also to receive some further enlightment and some commitments regarding the future of this project.

Before I ask the questions, I would remind you—and I have this report from the Department of the Interior—of some matters that may have not come to your attention, and may need further consideration.

They point out that the $470,000 requested in the President's budget represented the amount of money required to complete the Herbert Hoover project at a very early date. They point out that exceptionally good progress has been made on this acquisition, and all of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1967 have been committed. Thus go on:

In fact, options have been taken during the last month or so looking forward to the availability of the remaining balance for land acquisition for fiscal 1968 so that we would be able to transfer our land acquisition officer to Munsing, Michigan, for opening of our Picture Rocks acquisition program.

We are very limited in the number of employees we have available for this important work, and we must manage and utilize them as effectively as possible if we are to operate with the effectiveness, dispatch and frugality that Congress also desires.

The possible loss of this appropriation, of course, disrupts the timing and does not permit the maximum efficient utilization of our manpower.

More important, to the local people, is the fact that if we are unable to accept the options we have taken in anticipation of completing this project early in the 1968 fiscal year, we will have to let them expire, and this will likely create hardship on some of the landowners who may have obligated themselves to purchase new homes or homesites outside the park boundary.

I point out that while those options do not legally obligate the Government and were taken with full knowledge and understanding, they were dependent upon the continued appropriation. It at best is poor public relations to inform them that they cannot be accepted because of the lack of such an appropriation.

There is more of significance in this letter which I shall not read at this time but I will turn now to some correspondence I received from a very responsible citizen at West Branch which points out the gravity of the situation at it relates to the people there.

I will quote partially from the letter I received from him in which he says:

It disturbs us greatly here to learn of this cut by the government because this would mean the complete halting of the project. Things are literally in a hell of a mess. Houses have been moved, lots have considerable debris upon them, the Park Service claims a lack of funds to keep lawns mowed, weeds down, etc. Furthermore, if this project is to be stopped at this point for a period of a year or two or three, the entire town and its economy will be stymied and stifled.

Then he mentions the problem of just taking care of the debris and the economy of the city just is such that the city is not able to take care of that problem. The Department of the Interior says they do not have the money to take care of it.

So I would like to ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], the chairlady of this committee, for some explanation as to what may be done in this kind of a situation and also for some further assurance, if this problem can be pointed out, if it is more critical than we think or if it becomes more critical or is more critical if future consideration will be given to some alleviation of the problem.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman has asked a question which many Members of the House might ask—"Why is this item not in the budget in the full amount?"

I tried to cover this in some depth in my opening statement.

We are in a critical budget year. We have the problems of paying for a war. Few individuals are enthusiastic about paying additional taxes, and we also have millions of people asking for recreation facilities in some very desirable areas.

The committee has tried with a great deal of conscience and in good faith to select those areas which are of the highest use to the maximum number of people, and which have the utmost value for recreational purposes.

A sum of $630,000 was appropriated for the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site in 1967. There was a reprograming in November 1965 of $50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 3 additional minutes, so that the gentlewoman may be able to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. This provided a total of $680,000.

There was $527,814 obligated as of April 21, leaving a balance of $152,186—plus the $70,000 provided in this bill.

This makes over $222,000 available.

There are some projects that are highly desirable which do not have one thin dime in this bill.

So I ask the gentleman from Iowa to exercise the same restraint that the other members of the committee have used in this critical budget year. This is a part of a loaf and we are genuinely regretful that it cannot be the whole loaf.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Will the gentlewoman tell me whether or not at some time priorities will be given to this project?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I can assure the gentleman that the committee will consider every request with the same care. There is no prejudice against any single project in this subcommittee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, may I have an assurance from the senior minority member of the committee that I can extend to the people at West Branch with regard to this matter?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa will have every assurance that the gentleman from South Dakota can give, for the person honored by that national monument was one of the men whom he has revered since childhood. I remember one of his sayings:

This country owes me nothing. It gave me, as it gave everyone, a chance and an opportunity. It gave me an opportunity for service and honor. In no other country village could a boy from an uninfluential family without funds look forward with unbounded hope.

I suppose because I know of this great American as one who was conservative, by the nature of his early youth in Iowa, I believe he would approve of our attempting to find some ways in which to conserve in our budgetary efforts in this committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer if the Committee would agree would raise the amount of money available to the National Park Service for land acquisition purposes by $400,000. The funds would be used to continue the land acquisition program at the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa.

I was quite disturbed when the committee made its decision to reduce the $470,000 request for the program at West Branch to $70,000. The cutback will mean that the land acquisition program, now half completed, will come to an abrupt halt for at least 1 year.

The Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch is the location of the

birthplace of the late President Hoover and is also the location of the final resting place for him and his wife. The Herbert Hoover Library, containing the Hoover Presidential papers and memorabilia which illustrate the outstanding national and international career of an outstanding public servant, is also located on the historic site.

The master plan, agreed to by the Congress, calls for the development of a 175-acre park at the West Branch site. A 28-acre tract now is under the supervision of the General Services Administration. On this tract are the library, the grave sites of the Hoovers, the birthplace cottage, and the blacksmith shop of Herbert Hoover's father. This tract of land, except for a few acres on which the library is located, will be turned over to the National Park Service on July 1, 1967.

Under the provisions of Public Law 89–119 the National Park Service was given authority to acquire the necessary land to insure an adequate historic site to honor President Hoover. The plan, as agreed to by local officials in West Branch, calls for the acquisition of 155 acres in addition to the original 28-acre tract.

By the end of fiscal year 1967 approximately two-thirds of the 38 parcels of land which were to be acquired will have been purchased or will be under option. This accounts for one-half of the total land area to be acquired. This means that one-third of the parcels and one-half of the land must still be acquired.

The $70,000 which is made available for land acquisition by the bill before the House will do very little to enhance the completion of the program at West Branch. To delay the program will increase the eventual cost of the land and will add also to the administrative expense of the Park Service.

The cutback will affect adversely the economy of the town of West Branch. Residents have been making plans on the assumption that the program would be completed on schedule. Landowners affected have been making plans based on this assumption as well. The disruption of the project resulting from the proposed cutback would be injurious to the economy of Herbert Hoover's hometown.

The Herbert Hoover National Historic Site is both the birthplace and gravesite of President Hoover. As far as I know, there is no precedent for denying the funds for the completion of a project of this type. It honors a former President whose achievements and record finally are receiving the high accord they justly deserve.

The Herbert Hoover Foundation first purchased the land on which the gravesite, birthplace, and library are located. The foundation built the library. Overall, the foundation has invested well over $1 million in what is now the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site. The land and library have now been turned over to the Federal Government. We have an obligation to complete this fitting memorial to President Hoover as soon as possible.

The Congress appropriated $15½ million for a cultural center to honor the late President Kennedy. In addition, $1.7 million has been appropriated for an adequate gravesite for our martyred President.

Please do not misconstrue my remarks. I am not quarreling with the propriety of the memorials to President Kennedy. The point I wish to make is that the request for the $400,000 to help complete the Hoover site is not unreasonable or inconsistent with actions taken by this House on other occasions.

The total land acquisition cost for the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site probably will not be over $1.3 million. Other memorials, fitting and proper as they may be, have gone through this House almost without question.

Therefore, I ask for your support at some early date to insure that the memorial to President Hoover is completed as soon as possible. The adoption of the amendment I offer will mean that the work can proceed on schedule. It will mean that a fitting memorial to President Herbert Hoover will mark his birthplace and grave.

I will withdraw the amendment I have offered with the assurances that the project at the Herbert Hoover Historic Site will be given every consideration for possible funding at the earliest possible date.

I will continue the fight to gain approval of the funds necessary to complete this project. It is my hope that the other body, in its wisdom, will see fit to reinstate the funds cut here today.

THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

The areas of arts and humanities are becoming increasingly important to all Americans. As this Nation grows and prospers, as it is confronted with more changes and complexities, more effort must be devoted to encouraging a better understanding and appreciation of this broad area we call the humanities. We are living in a time of stress and strain and of misunderstanding. There is a lack of appreciation of many things—especially of the arts, humanities, and the character of America. This will come through, finally, if we do as all mature nations do, begin encouraging the various modes and values through expression.

The United States of America has a great heritage in the field of literature. We have a great musical and singing heritage as well. We have a wonderful culture in America, the development of which needs encouragement and growth. There are people today with new desires, new ambitions, and the opportunity to express this desire and ambition should be broadened.

The National Foundation of Arts and Humanities can and will encourage these opportunities. It was a noted American, August Heckscher, a Presidential consultant on the arts who said,

> You cannot travel about this country today without finding in every city there are plans afoot to do something new with the life of that place: to build a cultural center, to create a symphony orchestra, an opera group, to make that city a place of culture and arts.

I suppose it could not be said that any political administration has created the interest in culture, but it can be said that there is an urge to continue to create, develop, and share a culture. The National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities can help achieve these goals.

It is timely and with some pride that I commend to the attention of my colleagues the unique contribution made to the development of the arts and humanities in my home State of Iowa. The University of Iowa is one of the most distinguished centers of learning in this country and I think it is fitting and proper for me to describe the many contributions to the cultural growth that Iowa through the University of Iowa has given to this Nation. The achievements of this great university and the pioneering which has gone on in all of Iowa come as a result of the leadership which has been shown there. It is in full accord with the goals and achievements of the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities.

The University of Iowa has provided outstanding leadership in the area of the arts and humanities. Significant to us is the fact that these contributions are home-grown products that stem from our State's talents and from those who our university has attracted to work and study there. They have, as you can see, developed exceptional abilities there.

The fact that the University of Iowa was the first school in the United States to accept work in the creative arts for all degrees is a record of which we are proud. Since then, other institutions have followed this example. An achievement of note, we believe, is that the University of Iowa pioneered in this field more than 30 years ago.

The university has perhaps the finest print workshop in the United States. It was established and is headed by Mauricio Lasansky, a native of Argentina, now a U.S. citizen. He came to Iowa in 1945. Mr. Lasansky's work has been nationally and internationally acclaimed. He has won more than 100 competitive prizes in our country and abroad. The Whitney Museum of New York recently accorded him a major exhibition. This is an example of the kind of cultural climate which exists in Iowa. It brings dignity to my State.

There are other examples. Charles Treger, of the university's department of music, was the first American to win the Wieniawski Violin Prize. Competitions for this award are held in Poland. In the field of the violin, it is considered the highest possible accolade. In the field of music, also, the university's string quartet toured European countries a year ago with great success, and it has received equal praise from our own Nation's music experts, including the critics in Washington, D.C. Its excellence has recently been honored by a presentation of Stradivarius instruments.

Paul Engle, a native of Iowa, was appointed by the President to serve on the National Council on the Arts, which is advisory to the Arts and Humanities Foundation. He founded the university's program in creative writing and was its director for 25 years. It is worth noting that among the many awards won by students and staff who have participated in this program are: The Pulitzer Prize

for poetry, the Pulitzer Prize for fiction, the National Book Award for poetry, and the National Book Award for fiction. Again, these are our country's outstanding literary honors.

It is also worth noting that Iowans have given generously to this program. There is a significant partnership between cultural leaders and the business leaders in my State. In Cedar Rapids, the following firms have contributed: The Collins Radio Co.; the Iowa Manufacturing Co.; the Merchants National Bank; the Iowa Steel & Iron Works; John B. Turner & Son; the Quaker Oats Co.; Iowa Light & Power Co., Cedar Rapids; and WMT–TV and radio. From elsewhere in Iowa contributions have come from Amana Refrigeration, of Amana; the Burlington Hawk-Eye; the Fisher Governor Co., of Marshalltown; the Iowa Power & Light Co., of Des Moines; and the Maytag Co., of Newton. Private philanthropic individuals and organizations have also contributed, including the Fred Maytag Family Foundation of Newton.

This is timely to mention because a major purpose of the Arts and Humanities Act is to help encourage added private support for the arts, and to provide new and urgently needed "seed money" for our cultural advancement.

It was good to learn that the humanities endowment created under the act by Congress has provided a grant to the university's international writing program. This, as many know, brings leading writers from all over the world to Iowa, so that they can learn at first hand about our country and increase their own knowledge and ours.

Truly, the arts have a long heritage in Iowa. Davenport has an arts center, Des Moines has one of the finest arts centers in the country. There are centers for artistic excellence and growth in Sioux City, and in Cedar Rapids, to name two more; and I would also like to point out that the city of Waterloo has established an arts council, to which tax dollars are contributed. All these activities both deserve and need additional support, and it is encouraging for me to know that the Iowa State Arts Council, representative of both cultural and business interests, has been formed. This year it has received a grant of $25,000 from the Arts and Humanities Foundation to further develop cultural progress.

It is obvious to me that the arts and humanities add dignity and value to human life. It seems equally obvious to me that Iowans should be justly proud of the contributions they have made in this very important field of human endeavor.

I believe the investment we make in the Arts and Humanities Foundation is of great worth. There is nothing unusually daring, nothing contrary to the American way of life in this legislation. The expectations and hopes it has raised among thoughtful people go across the country. And we have thoughtful people in Iowa who see its merits, see its potentials, see what it can mean for this generation and those to follow; for we have witnessed those same merits, those same potentials in our own State. Through our own experience, we have witnessed just what it is that the Arts and Humanities Foundation is helping to nourish and provide more fully, more abundantly and for all citizens.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Office of the Secretary*

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $6,776,500.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIEGLE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIEGLE: On page 28, line 23, strike out "$6,776,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,498,900."

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I salute the committee for its hard work in drafting this appropriation bill. My disagreement with the bill at hand relates solely to the amount of money this country can afford at this time for Interior-related activities.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am worried about our national priorities at this time. The plain and simple fact that we face is that we do not have enough money to go around to solve all the problems we have. Unfortunately, due to the rising costs of the war in Vietnam, we do not have enough money available today to effectively confront even our crisis social problems that we are facing in this country. I would like to cite very briefly, examples of some of the problems we have had to set aside in order to take up the kinds of activities defined in this appropriations bill today. I have the pleasure of serving on the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, under the excellent chairmanship of Mr. NATCHER. We have had to cut item after item out of that bill in committee. That appropriation bill later was approved by this House. The item cut most was the field of education. I quote my chairman when he said:

We had to cut more in schools than in any other item.

Needed construction funds for schools in excess of $40 million were cut out. In the area of the summer program for slum children, it was cut by $1,250,000. We also cut the money available for parks. This is just an example.

The District of Columbia is a disgrace. We do not have the funds to address so many of these critical problems. It is not just a matter of the level of money that is available. We do not have enough money available to solve these problems. I have in mind the Harlems of our big cities and other slum conditions in this country, and I ask whether we have money for all the items detailed in this bill.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I join with my friend from Michigan in attempting to save money. I wish he would advise this Committee at this time of the particular duties and services of the Department of Interior that he is cutting out of the funds.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do that. It was pointed out a few minutes ago, in discussing the trends of last year, that there were 4,800 unfilled vacancies in the Department of the Interior. That is unfilled vacancies. The appropriation as outlined calls for an additional number of people in this Department of 1,600. When we cannot fill 4,800 vacancies, I cannot understand why we need 1,600 additional people.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RIEGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, how is the gentleman able to relate these vacancies to this particular cut the gentleman proposes in this appropriation?

Mr. RIEGLE. I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman suggests that there are 4,800 vacancies. I wish to know how he has related those reductions he now proposes with the 4,800, because some of those vacancies are under the hold order we have at the present time from the executive department.

Mr. RIEGLE. I have not undertaken to make that relationship and I will not today. I think that job is a job that ought to be done by Secretary Udall.

My point is this: I do not feel we are meeting our critical national social needs in education and mental health and many other fields.

Yet we are asked to consider and to fund additional Federal growth in what I consider to be nonessential spending areas. If they are essential, that essentially escapes me.

I believe the American people are fed up with the idea that we have to continue to incur this secular growth in every department of the Federal Government across the board. There are areas which are essential, in my judgment, in which we are not spending sufficient money.

I hope that at some point someone here is going to start to say "No" to these automatic increases.

I believe the amendment I have just offered is one step in that direction. It is a small step, and one I believe the Department of the Interior can live with.

We talk about economy in government, but we do not have very much economy in government. The only way we are going to obtain it is to start cutting back some of these appropriation bills. I believe that the sooner some of the nonessential Federal activities and

the bureaucrats that administer them get the message that the Federal free lunch is over, the quicker we will have some money available to solve some of the critical problems that we are now ignoring.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understood the gentleman to say that the District of Columbia appropriation bill had been cut very severely. Would it be more accurate to say that we increased substantially the District of Columbia appropriation for education over that for last year, but we did cut the budget request? Is that not a more accurate statement of what occurred?

Mr. RIEGLE. I would expand what the gentleman has just said to add that we have not been able to fund the needs. That is our problem today.

The money we need to meet these urgent social problems and others is competing against these activities we are trying to fund in the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I shall not take 5 minutes, but ask the gentleman from Michigan to give me his attention.

As I understand the amendment, as read, all the gentleman proposes to do is to reduce the item for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior below the substantial increase voted by the subcommittee over the sum appropriated last year to run that Office; is that correct?

Mr. RIEGLE. That is exactly right.

Mr. JONAS. On page 56 of the committee report Members will find that the item for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior for 1967 was only $4,998,900. For 1968 the budget request is for $7,570,000, an increase of $2,571,000 for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary alone. The committee reduced that requested increase by $793,500, but recommends an increase of $1,776,600 over last year. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would simply make an additional reduction in the increase proposed for this Office but even if his amendment is adopted the Secretary will still have a substantial increase of funds available to run his immediate Office over last year. Is that correct?

Mr. RIEGLE. That is exactly right.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has not had the opportunity of serving on the subcommittee, where he might sit in review of all the activities of this revenue producing bill. This is one bill that today generates income nearly equal to the total amount it provides by appropriation.

I would remind the Members of the House that this is to be a general cut in the Office of the Secretary, not necessarily for application to personnel only.

The Secretary is responsible for executive management and coordination of water pollution problems, water research, acquisition of lands, and management of our natural resources, to mention a few of his responsibilities.

These are important activities. These are activities in connection with which our committee was critical because sufficient funds had not been provided in the budget estimate for their total efficient management.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, we have a reserve of about 2 trillion barrels of oil.

This oil is important not only to the economy of the United States but to the defense of the United States, if you please.

Now, we did make measurable cuts in the Office of the Secretary, but I think there is not one of us who would want to make cuts so severe as to endanger the management of our natural resources.

Now, on the question of personnel, I would like to say one thing. We have reviewed the question of personnel very carefully. I will probably have an opportunity to say more about this later. The Bureau of the Budget imposed ceilings, and we have provided cuts. I fail to see that $828,500 taken from the management of our resources, is going to be particularly economical.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This affects only the Office of the Secretary, does it not?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. That is right. The Office of the Secretary, may I explain, is that group of top people who do or should do, the finest kind of a job in the management field. It is just as if General Motors were on this floor today, and all of a sudden $1 million was taken off their top sales force in a critical year.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Does not the Office of the Secretary also include the Assistant Secretary for Water Pollution?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Of course.

Mr. JOELSON. And the Water Resources Council?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. JOELSON. And would not this amendment strike out some funds for these purposes which the gentleman from Michigan described as nonessential?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Of course. The life of America, the land of America, is what a great many men are dying for now.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also accurate to say that the Secretary of the Interior is a Cabinet officer, principally responsible in the field of Indian affairs and in the problem areas associated with Indians and that we have as severe a problem economically among the Indian people as we have in the District of Columbia or any place else? When you start striking at the Secretary of the Interior and his finances, you are hitting right at the action agency that is dealing with one of the most severe problems facing our country.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. You would be restricting an action agency, peoplewise and moneywise.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to do these things in considering this amendment: First, check the size of the budget of the Interior Department intrinsically and compare the size of that budget with that of other departments. Then look at the budget in regard to the net cost, expenditures over income. Then check this year's budget in comparison with that of last year and check what this committee has done with this year's request by the Department of the Interior. If we are to be responsible in cutting these expenditures, this is not the point at which we should act.

Mr. Chairman, the point at which we should act logically and responsibly is in the authorization. I state this because there is no prudent reason for this House of Representatives to continually ask the Department of the Interior to take on additional duties, and then say in effect that it has to operate with less funds than it had the year before, or with a slight difference in the total amount of funds as represented by this proposed amendment.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment and urge its rejection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings with respect to the budget for the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior indicate that much of the funds about which we are talking here today deal with water. They asked for positions with which to coordinate the program of the Department of the Interior for water resources, but more importantly, to provide funds for staffing of a new office, the office of an Assistant Secretary for Water Pollution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] talked about nonessential services. However, I cannot think of anything more important than clearing up our terribly polluted waters.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, what I do not understand is how we are going to solve these problems with 4,800 vacancies? How can the gentleman explain the fact that we are to add 1,600 jobs to a request which already includes 4,800 vacancies, and thus solve these problems?

Mr. JOELSON. The 4,800 vacancies did not exist in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, but existed in the entire Department of the Interior.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Ninety-five are in the office of the Secretary himself.

Mr. JOELSON. That is correct. But, I would like the gentleman from Michigan to tell me how many positions the gentleman wishes to take away from this new division having to do with water pollution? This is a blunderbuss approach, and that is the trouble with his amendment.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed about the fact that 95 of these positions are in his office. How are we to solve these problems if we do not fill these jobs and we do authorize the additional money?

Mr. JOELSON. Does the gentleman from Michigan know how many jobs were asked for by the proposed Division of Water Pollution, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. RIEGLE. I would be happy to——

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan does not know or does not have any idea how many positions were requested for the water pollution program, then I suggest to the gentleman that he check further into the matter.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Can the gentleman from New Jersey tell me that number?

Mr. JOELSON. Not offhand, and that is why I did not offer an amendment.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, did not the Committee on Appropriations have any testimony with reference to the pollution which now exists in Lake Michigan?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], in order to respond to that interrogation.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No; we did not have under consideration water pollution per se. However, in related discussions during almost all of the hearings, the question of pollution in our streams and lakes came up for consideration and was discussed at length.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I read an article in one of our national magazines with reference to the pollution of Lake Michigan, in which the article stated that the fish in Lake Michigan will die and as a result thereof the commercial fisherman cannot catch the amount of fish they have on previous occasions, in the old days.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that one thing which is important is the control of water pollution and the control of water pollution, particularly, in a body of water of the size of Lake Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that a Member of this Congress, coming from the Michigan area, from an area not only important to the State of Michigan, but to the surrounding States, would propose such a reduction in this pollution control appropriation.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that contained in this bill is a provision for a Water Control Commission, which is primarily engaged in the solution of these problems in the area of water resources.

Mr. JOELSON. Water resources are distinct from water pollution. We are asking for a new operation in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior in order to handle the serious problem of water pollution, which effort could be nullified if the amendment which the gentleman from Michigan has offered is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it is an ill-considered amendment and therefore, I urge that it be rejected.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the problem of water resources in this country is probably one of the most critical that we face. It is a problem which is countrywide.

Mr. Chairman, we had a gentleman from the Delmarva area appear before our subcommittee who testified on what the effect would be in that area unless they obtained specific knowledge as to the quality and the kind of water that is available in that area.

We have no complete answers to any of these water problems; but the problem of water per se is one of the most vital to our lives—the very life of this Nation.

Thank you.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to ask the gentlewoman from Washington a couple of questions:

First, referring her attention to page 32 of the committee report, under the section that we are dealing with, the Office of the Secretary, next to the last paragraph, where it discusses this increase in funds over last year, or the cut in the budget, however you want to term it, and the last sentence in the paragraph, reads:

> This of course resulted from the transfer of various functions and funds, some of which the committee is not inclined to question.

I wonder if the gentlewoman would just clarify that. I would also ask that she save me enough time for one more question: Which function transfers does the committee question, and which ones the committee does not approve. Apparently the subcommittee does know of this transfer of funds that is going on.

And if I might continue I will go ahead with my next question, and then the gentlewoman can perhaps answer them at one time.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would say to the gentleman that perhaps it would be better if I answered them one at a time.

The committee had no question on the transfer of funds to finance the activities related to the Water Pollution Control Administration recently transferred from HEW, neither did it question fund transfers for the Office of Survey and Review.

I would say that the committee likes to have an orderly use of appropriated funds, so that if we fund a particular activity of an agency we can be sure that is where the funds will be used. We do encounter certain situations where it is proper and practical to have fund transfers to a certain extent.

Mr. SNYDER. The other question refers to the last statement on that page:

> Notwithstanding, the committee wishes to go on record that it will not countenance the continued manipulation of appropriated funds to the extent that has occurred during the past few years.

I am curious as to what manipulation of funds the subcommittee has found going on during the past few years, and whether or not this has to do at all with the question that is before the Committee of the Whole on this amendment?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. No. It is a question of minor fund transfers, where funds were used to expand the Office of Equal Opportunity, for example. And there are other minor instances the committee questioned, such as the establishment of the Office of Ecology without prior approval of the committee. We think $x$ number of dollars appropriated for $x$ activity should be expended accordingly unless prior approval for any change is secured from the committee. That is exactly what was meant by the statement in the report, and it should be interpreted accordingly by the Department.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, I would certainly agree with the gentlewoman. I would question whether or not the legislation that has been brought before us today has any particular new clause or new sentence or new phraseology that might keep the office in line with the thinking of the committee, and might make them not manipulate funds such as you have found.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. There is no specific language in the bill. I believe it is the duty and the responsibility of every appropriation subcommittee to recommend in the report wherever possible, and provide through its hearings, directions for the best kind of administration management possible, particularly in a department where there are so many various activities.

Mr. SNYDER. I wish to thank the gentlewoman for this report, and I would say I commend the gentlewoman for this language, and I hope there will not be any further manipulation of funds.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I believe before the debate on this amendment closes, in explanation of the proposed action by the gentleman from Michigan, attention should be directed to page 55 of the committee report which shows that there is a separate item for the Office of Water Resources Research, and the committee increased the funds in that office by nearly 100 percent over last year.

The bill contains $11,130,000 as opposed to $6,894,000 in 1967, an increase of $4.25 million in this 1 year in that office.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right. There is $11 million appropriated or suggested in the area of water resources research. I am amazed that there is no activity in that area which would aim itself at the question of water pollution. I am likewise disturbed, if we were to cut the Secretary's budget as I suggested, and as I hope we will, I would be worried if he would choose to make these cuts in the area of water pollution. I would hope he would make cuts in other areas and not in this area.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] took the floor and spoke of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, he was immediately reminded that while the District of Columbia appropriation bill was cut below the budget, it was still above the spending figures for last year.

So that bill is no different than this one. This bill was cut below the budget request but it is still $22 million above spending for the same general purposes last year. So that argument falls pretty flat.

It is my understanding that in the Office of the Secretary there has been a $500,000 increase this year above the spending for the same general purposes last year—at least $500,000.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. I think in all fairness, it should be kept in mind that water pollution is only this year the function of the Department of the Interior and that accounts for an almost $300,000 increase. It used to be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but it now has been transferred to the Department of the Interior and that accounts for almost $300,000 of that increase, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman continues to talk about water resources.

Mr. JOELSON. No, this is water pollution.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, water pollution—and so on and so forth. There are other areas of activity in the Secretary's office; are there not?

Mr. JOELSON. I do not doubt that. But I was just trying to point out that the increase of almost $300,000 is due to the new function in that office.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently, the Committee cut that request; did it not?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, it was cut.

Mr. GROSS. Why did you do that if it is so important?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes, but almost $300,000 remains, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. But I am asking you—and I am in favor of the cut—but I cannot understand why you are bleeding at every pore now after you, yourselves, cut it.

Mr. JOELSON. Well, just because it has been cut does not mean that it should be slaughtered.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, I see—you want to wield the ax according to the way you think it ought to be wielded.

Mr. JOELSON. I do not want to wield an ax—I would rather use a fine instrument when it comes to cutting expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. But if anyone else wants to make a cut, whatever the logic, you oppose it.

You have 95 positions, as I understand it, which are unfilled in the Office of the Secretary, and yet you want to add more employees; is that correct? If so, how can you possibly justify it?

Mr. JOELSON. It is not correct.

Mr. GROSS. What is incorrect?

Mr. JOELSON. All I am saying is that this is a blunderbuss approach and it would very definitely damage the anti-water pollution work.

Mr. GROSS. We know the facts and the figures both as to the employment and vacancies that exist in the Secretary's office, plus the committee's proposed increase in the number of employees and the amount of money. What is blunderbuss about it?

Mr. JOELSON. Because it is not selective. It is just across-the-board. It gives to the Executive the very discretion that we have been trying to retain in the Congress. I have heard a lot of talk about the Congress relinquishing its powers and this goes right toward that tendency and gives the Executive that discretion.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that this amendment is specific.

Mr. JOELSON. No, it is not specific.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. JOELSON. It is for that entire office as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. That is what it is aimed at.

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I recall in the last session of the last Congress, we adopted a reorganization plan which transferred water pollution control from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior.

As I understand this debate and the representations made by the members of the committee from the majority side, part of the increase about which we are talking in the Office of the Secretary results from the transfer of this authority. I supported the reorganization plan, and I think perhaps the plan was adopted partly because of investigation and findings of the Committee on Government Operations upon which I served formerly. That committee discovered that various water pollution activities were dispersed throughout various departments and agencies. It does seem to me that it is better to have all the water resource and water pollution activities concentrated in the Department of the Interior.

I can see justification for increasing some appropriations in the Department of the Interior to carry on this additional responsibility. However, the point I want to make at this stage of the debate is that since these water pollution activities are being transferred from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior, it will certainly be incumbent upon the Appropriations Committee to see that corresponding cuts are made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill so that we do not have the same appropriations continue in that Department for activities which no longer exist there but which have been transferred out of that department to the Department of the Interior.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I remember during the hearings I specifically questioned whether or not there would be overlapping, and I was assured that there would not be. I would join the gentleman in saying that this item should be localized so that there will be no duplication of expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RIEGLE) there were—ayes 31, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows, page 36, line 6:

*Commission of Fine Arts*

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, $115,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIEGLE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIEGLE: On page 36, line 14, strike out "$115,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$50,000".

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of additional amendments which will come later, and I would like to submit these at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman

wish to offer these to this section of the bill?

Mr. RIEGLE. No. They are to later sections, but I would like to have them considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that a series of amendments he desires to offer be considered en bloc.

Is there objection?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are these amendments to this section of the bill?

Mr. RIEGLE. No, they have to do with later sections.

Mr. YATES. Are they related to the same subject?

The CHAIRMAN. Are they related to the amendment the gentleman offers?

Mr. RIEGLE. Yes, they are. They refer to the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members would like to know. Will the gentleman take the microphone and explain?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to have them considered en bloc?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation?

Mr. RIEGLE. The amendments which I will offer, which will come later in this bill, are three, having to do with the Smithsonian Institution, and, likewise, the cuts are in that.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I recommend this cut in the spending for the Commission on Fine Arts for one reason: That we do not have the money. If we are going to pay for this, we will have to borrow money. We are already deeply in debt with the cost of the war in Vietnam going up, as is the spending in other areas. I do not think we should spend money for this activity that we do not have at this time.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I would remind the gentleman from Michigan and Members of this House that this appropriation item relates to the planning and the continuing development of our Capital. The people who serve on this Fine Arts Commission are rendering a valuable service to the people of this country. I believe this is not a practical place to try to balance the budget, and it is my sincere hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities*

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, to remain available until expended, $10,700,000, of which $4,500,000 shall be available for carrying out section 5(c) and functions under Public Law 88–579; $3,000,000 for carrying out section 7(c); and $2,000,000 for carrying out section 5(h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11(b) of the Act, amounts equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by each Endowment, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the Act, but not to exceed a total of $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated for the purposes of section 5(c) and not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated for the purposes of section 7(c) shall be available for program development and evaluation.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HALL: On page 39, line 20, strike out "$10,700,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000,".

On page 39, lines 20 and 21, strike out "$4,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000".

On page 40, line 1, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000,000".

On page 40, line 3, strike out "That," and all that follows down through and including *"Provided further,"* on line 9.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to contemplate what would have happened if, after I read the annual report of the Council on the Arts and the Humanities, and made a simple query, the Director had simply acknowledged an error and said, "I am sorry. We will try harder." The other reaction is a matter of record.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I propose is very simple in nature and easy to comprehend. It would merely keep the expenditure at the same level of appropriations as last year. It is not a reducing amendment or a cutting amendment.

In fact, I commend the committee for the cuts it wisely saw fit to make in the appropriation request. But I believe adoption of my amendment would emphasize this point and make clear its dissatisfaction with the way this program is being operated. I regard it as a reasonable compromise.

I would much rather see these grants drastically reduced, but at the very least I do not believe they should be increased. That is the purpose of this amendment.

What kind of grants might be curtailed by this reduction in funds for the National Council on the Arts and the Humanities to last year's level?

First of all, it would be up to the Director, but in addition to the comic strip and cartoon grant, on which so much work has been done in the past without Federal subsidy—to wit, the references on the desk here in the well—consider these, which are construed to have some important public benefit.

There is a grant of $12,000 for a University of Texas Folklore Archive. No doubt that study will delve into the most fascinating cases of Texas folklore, possibly "the Saga of Ballot Box 13," down where the River Pedernales flows.

Or there is a $5,000 grant for the bibliography of criticism of Edgar Allen Poe. When asked if such a bibliography had already been accomplished, Mr. B. Keeney's response was, "Not an international bibliography."

And then there is $18,800 for a study into the question, "Did Edmund Burke write the 18th century journal, the Annual Register?" Mr. Keeney explains this is an effort to answer a question which is of considerable importance in the history of conservatism. I do not know who will be doing this study at Federal expense, but if he is anything like Dr. David Kunzle, who is doing the comic strip study, I shudder to think of the Federal image that will be attached to conservatism. It may well be like the fox being asked to make a study of the chicken coop.

And then there is a grant of $25,000 to the American Oriental Society to hold an International Congress of Orientalists in the United States. Mr. B. Keeney states we are criticized abroad for our lack of hospitality in international congresses of scholars.

I have just been invited to a $25,000 peace on the waters, or vice versa, international meeting here in Washington. I do not know whether we need one on orientalists or not, but I doubt it very much. I know the work of the Breasted Institute on the University of Chicago campus.

There is $25,000 to prepare a history of book publishing in America. I simply cannot bring myself to believe that this would not be a duplication of the writings on this subject which have been done previously without Federal subsidies. I defy anyone to check this with the Library of Congress and tell me otherwise.

Then there is $15,000 for a dictionary of American popular beliefs and superstitions. If you believe in superstitions, by all means vote against this amendment. If not—and I think not—I hope it will be accepted.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri was guilty of a Freudian slip or not, but the Chairman of the National Foundation on the Humanities is Dr. Barnaby Keeney and not Mr. Bikini. As a matter of fact, although he is a great scholar and was a distinguished university president, I do not think that the Chairman of the Foundation on the Humanities would be particularly attractive in a bikini, even.

The gentleman from Missouri I think argues very well in opposition to his own amendment. With all due respect to him, I might say it would be most interesting when the moneys for medical research come up, which are in excess of billions of dollars, if they are the subject of his careful and scholarly scrutiny as have been his objections to the history of comic strips.

As a matter of fact, if the gentleman would take the time to go to the Library of Congress, which is essentially our Library, the gentleman would find its bibliography is incomplete. There is going to be a requirement and there is a requirement that in order for scholars throughout the United States to avoid the need for coming to Washington and going to the various libraries throughout the United States, there be a centralized bibliography on all subjects, even on ones of which the gentleman approves. It is an absolute need.

It is perfectly easy to ridicule scholarship and perfectly easy to say, "Well, what need is there for a history of the folklore of any area, including the Pedernales or the Ozarks?" As a matter of fact, some of the great folk music of our land and some of the most poignant literature on the American scene comes from those very areas. It ought to be studied and it ought to be a matter of scholarship just as there ought to be scientific scholarship. Disease and pestilence are not the only enemies of man. Ignorance is just as great or perhaps the greatest of all enemies.

This is nothing more or less than a mischievous amendment and it should be defeated. Are we to be told as civilized human beings that this great land of ours cannot afford the very small amount of money for the arts and humanities which is contained in this bill? Yet we walk in here and without question—and not necessarily improperly, either—vote in excess of $2 million an hour to support our military effort in Vietnam. Does anyone in this chamber really and honestly and truthfully believe that we cannot afford a few million dollars for the appreciation and the learning which is so essential in a civilized society when we can afford billions of dollars a year to protect that society? What are we trying to protect? A nation of ignoramuses? I think not.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. By what standards are civilizations remembered? By what standards do we remember the Greeks? We remember them from Pericles and the Greek philosophers.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The Greeks are not Americans, you know.

Mr. YATES. It still relates to the subject.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Some people are very dangerous.

Mr. YATES. We remember the art and the culture. Our civilization will be great depending on the arts and the humanities. The emphasis being placed in this House for these cuts being made on the basis of a war going on overlooks the fact that when peace comes it must be made by those skilled in the arts and the humanities and we cannot get the cuts back.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman. No one has a higher regard for the gentleman from Missouri than I. He knows the regard in which I hold him. And, Mr. Chairman, I do not look upon the gentleman's amendment as being frivolous. However, I do believe it is misguided.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything which I believe we would want to guard against——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes; I yield further to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that if there is anything against which we should guard in this Nation at any and all times, it would be an imbalance in our education.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to remember the fact that some years ago, during the period in which the Wright brothers were attempting to obtain a hearing before a committee of the Congress, they were completely laughed out of the hearing room; and, so were the supporters and followers of Marconi.

Mr. Chairman, there existed an imbalance against this type of progress—this type of technological progress—and there existed an imbalance in the other direction. Just as disturbing, who is to be the judge of what scholarship is? Who is to be the judge of what the humanities are? Is it going to be individuals, or is it going to be the community of scholars themselves?

Mr. Chairman, I can say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], and to my distinguished friend from Missouri, that I do not believe a more competent individual occupies a position in Government than the distinguished former president of a great American university, Dr. Barnaby Keeney, to whom reference has been made, and who serves as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The country is equally blessed to have a very distinguished citizen, Roger Stevens, as chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly support the position of the gentleman from New Jersey and hope that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will do likewise.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey yield to me at this point?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am delighted to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States in submitting his budget, undertook to use a great deal of restraint in respect to the request for appropriations for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations is of course aware of the concern on the part of Members of the House generally for a wise spending policy.

Mr. Chairman, the committee does not want to go overboard on this subject, because the members thereof realize that it is controversial and somewhat difficult.

So, Mr. Chairman, we made a reduction of well in excess of $4 million here. The total amount in the bill, I believe, is about $11.7 million.

Mr. Chairman, this is a small program, but the implications of this program are tremendous. They are important. They represent an evidence of cultures and refinements and ambitions and hopes and dreams of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, we do not always agree upon all of the things involved, but we do agree that the things of the heart and the mind and spirit are the greatest things in all the world, the greatest things in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we do realize that man cannot live by bread alone. We have heard that someone said, "If you have two loaves, go quickly and sell one and buy a flower, because the soul also must be fed."

It seems to me that we should go along with this relatively small sum for one of the great programs which, generally, must be performed by the people and not by the Government, and support these men, Roger Stephens and Dr. Keeney, gentlemen who are trying to afford leadership in this important work, the humanities and the arts.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rises, I shall ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks, and to insert as a part of my remarks, a list of the grants reflecting the fields of scholarship in which grants have been made by the Foundation on the Humanities.

They represent the brightest young scholars, the most promising young scholars from nearly every State in the Union, and they are indeed a great contribution.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey and to say that I was reared in the community of the gentleman who offered the amendment. Generations of my ancestors lie buried there. I am sure that that community also believes in scholarship. So I trust the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

I particularly hope that we do have a consideration of the American comic strip. As a child I remember—happily—that I sat on my father's lap while he read the Katzenjammer Kids. I trust that we have some understanding of comic strips are, and what the effect has been upon American life.

I also believe that if we were to do a little survey on the superstitions and beliefs of the people of the district of the gentleman from Missouri we will find that a good many of those superstitions and beliefs go back to Elizabeth I.

Mr. Chairman, I personally urge the defeat of the gentleman's amendment, and I support the position of the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the appropriation of $11.7 million. Personally, I would support the full amount of $16,370,000, requested by the President for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Foundation has worked creatively in the State of New York and throughout the Nation to encourage artists, authors, playwrights, and the members of the dance.

In addition to grants to a number of talented individual New Yorkers in several fields, national organizations based in New York City have also received assistance from the National Endowment for the Arts. For example, the Academy of American Poets received a matching grant to launch a lecture series entitled "Dialogs on the Art of Poetry," for high school teachers.

The American Lyric Theater Workshop received a grant to create a special theater laboratory for professional actors, writers, musicians, and dancers, under the direction of Jerome Robbins. The Educational Broadcasting Corp. received a matching grant under a program to enable educational stations throughout the country to provide additional programing in various art fields. Other grants indicative of the diversity and creativity of the Foundation's endeavors went to the American Playwrights Theater, the New York City Opera Co., the New York Shakespeare Festival, and the New York State Council on the Arts—the first State arts council.

These endeavors give earnest of our concern at the national level for the arts, and they should be, in my judgment, fully supported. But more than this, I believe it is essential. And with all due respect to my distinguished colleague from Missouri, I believe it is one thing to have Government support of the arts on the one hand and congressional evaluation of the arts, on the other. I believe Government support is necessary, but equally there should not and there must not be any Government control or direction over the arts. I believe that should be separate. The role of the critic and the judge should be left to Roger Stevens and Dr. Barnaby Keeney, and to their distinguished councils.

The Congress has the right and clearly so to appropriate funds for the encouragement of the arts, but we should not deal with specific grants which, in my judgment, would be a grave error. We must—as the House of Commons has for two decades—uphold independence for the arts free from political interference.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would also say, as he has pointed out, this Congress yearly appropriates over $24 billion in armaments for the war in Vietnam, with hardly a ripple of opposition in this House. I would also call attention to the fact that we yearly appropriate approximately $5 billion for the space program, again without a ripple of dissension in this House.

Certainly the amount recommended for the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities is a drop in the bucket compared with these other programs.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated, and that the recommendations in the committee report prevail.

It seems a worthy investment in the means by which future generations may know that America, in the second half of the 20th century, was populated by more than transistors, printed microcircuits, and antimissile defense mechanisms.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished Congresswoman who chairs the subcommittee for her work on this most important and complicated bill. The subcommittee has imposed significant reductions where these could be made in the interests of economy without damaging the overall efficiency of the programs involved.

The amounts recommended for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities would seem to be the minimum necessary to continue the important and very worthwhile work of the Foundation.

The recommended figure is $4.6 million below the amount requested for fiscal year 1968. This represents a cut of approximately 25 percent in the Foundation's budget request for the coming fiscal year. This must be considered a drastic reduction by any standard. Any further reduction would seem to dictate an extensive retrenchment in their program for the coming year.

In view of the significant progress already achieved by the Foundation, compared with the relatively small investment we have made so far, I strongly recommend that the committee's recommendations be approved.

So far some 287 fellowships have been granted to scholars and teachers in the humanities at 190 institutions in 44 States and the District of Columbia. This represents an increase of 35 percent in the number of such awards from public and private sources and a 90-percent increase in awards to postdoctoral scholars. In addition, 83 projects have been approved totaling some $1,459,000, and involving 130 American scholars in an activity which will give new meaning and insights to American letters. The projects will involve literary, historical, philosophical, and archeological subjects.

Additional programs under the endowment have also made important strides in the field of educational broadcasting. These programs will bring over 1,600 recorded works in the humanities to the almost 2 million Americans who cannot read because of blindness or other physical disability. Federal assistance is also being given to the Nation's museums and historical societies who, like many fields of education, are in great need of upgraded professional staffing. By imposing cuts in the committee bill, we will widen the already broad gap between the number of grants approved and the number of requests which are received. So far only some 414 grants have been approved of the 1,575 requests received.

Mr. Chairman, in the 89th Congress I was sponsor of a bill to establish a National Foundation on the Humanities. Many of the features of my bill, along with similar bills of my colleagues, were incorporated in the legislation which finally established the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. In stressing the need for this kind of activity in Government, the point was made repeatedly that the humanities had become a neglected field in this age of science and technology. The tremendous imbalance in favor of science was cited, and it was agreed that more attention must be given the humanities, without which the log of history and of our great American heritage could not be written. The competitive atmosphere of international relations has hardly lessened since the establishment of the Foundation, and the imbalance in support of science and technology has likewise increased. If anything, it is more important now than ever that we support the humanities to the fullest extent possible, and, again, I respectfully urge that we accept and approve the judicious recommendations contained in the committee report.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will put in the RECORD all of the data he has on what is being programed and what is contemplated. I have been handed two little items that I believe are worth calling to the attention of the House at this time. One is the endowment research and support for an American historical association project to assist scholars by organizing the vast amount of material not fully available to American historians. Another is to provide uniquely valuable source material on the career of Dwight D. Eisenhower. I believe this is very important.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might not fully agree.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that the fundamental disagreement with respect to this amendment between the gentleman from Missouri and I which has run on through the RECORD for a period of time has nothing whatsoever to do with personalities. It is simply a fundamental disagreement and I hasten to disabuse anyone's mind as to any implication other than that.

I thank those who have joined me in opposing this amendment and fervently hope that it is defeated.

Mr. Chairman, following are most informative statements relating to the grants and activities of the Humanities Foundation. I submit that they are spectacularly useful and profound:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES FELLOWSHIPS ANNOUNCED

FEBRUARY 1, 1967.

The National Endowment for the Humanities today announced the award of its first fellowships, totaling $1,900,000.

In the belief that national progress in the humanities depends upon increasing the pool of effective and dedicated humanistic teachers and scholars, as fellowships in the sciences have increased the nation's pool of outstanding scientists, the Endowment has established three programs of fellowships. Two of the programs are directed toward younger scholars, one of them providing support for a summer of study and research and the other support for a period of up to eight months. The third program provides support to senior scholars for a year of uninterrupted study and writing which will enable them to make contributions of major significance to their individual fields.

Today's awards, representing 190 educational institutions located in 44 States and the District of Columbia, and including scholars unaffiliated with academic centers, consist of: 100 Fellowships for Younger Scholars, 130 Summer Fellowships, 57 Senior Fellowships.

A list of awards follows:

ALABAMA

*Summer fellowships*

James M. Miller (History), Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham.

Hugh A. Ragsdale, Jr. (History), University of Alabama, University.

ALASKA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

William H. Wilson (U.S. History), University of Alaska, College.

*Summer fellowships*

Edward H. Hosley (Social Sciences), University of Alaska, College.

ARIZONA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Richard Oakley Davies (Social Sciences), Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

Nicholas A. Salerno (English Literature), Arizona State University, Tempe.

*Summer fellowships*

Larry A. McFarlane (History), Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

John K. Yost (History), University of Arizona, Tucson.

ARKANSAS

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Barbara Meacham Jarvis (Spanish Literature), University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

CALIFORNIA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

George P. Blum (History), Raymond College, Stockton.

Seymour L. Chapin (History), California State College, Los Angeles.

Alan Stanley Curtis (Music), University of California, Berkeley.

Richard Whitlock Davis (History), University of California, Riverside.

Kurt Mueller-Vollmer (Comparative Literature), Stanford University, Stanford.

John F. H. New (History), University of California, Santa Barbara.

David Fate Norton (Philosophy), University of California, La Jolla.

Alexander Rabinowitch (History), University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

*Summer fellowships*

Norman S. Cohen (U.S. History), Occidental College, Los Angeles.

Thomas K. Dunseath (English Literature), University of California at San Diego, La Jolla.

Robert H. Fossum (American Literature), Claremont Men's College, Claremont.

Frank J. Garosi (History), Sacramento State College, Sacramento.

Helen C. Gilde (English Literature), California State College, Long Beach.

Robert Griffin (French Literature), University of California, Riverside.

Carroll B. Johnson (Spanish Literature), University of California, Los Angeles.

Alice M. Laborde (French Literature), University of California at Irvine, Irvine.

Murray Lefkowitz (Music), San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge.

Michael N. Nagler (Comparative Literature), University of California, Berkeley.

David C. Young (Classical Studies), University of California, Santa Barbara.

*Senior fellowships*

Marija Gimbutas (History), University of California, Los Angeles.

Mary R. Haas (Linguistics), University of California, Berkeley.

Richard Hostetter (History), University of California, Riverside.

Theodore C. Karp (Music), University of California, Davis.

Vladimir Markov (Russian Literature), University of California, Los Angeles.

Edward N. O'Neil (Classical Studies), University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Rollie E. Poppino (History), University of California, Davis.

W. Kendrick Pritchett (Classical Studies), University of California, Berkeley.

Gilbert Reaney (Music), University of California, Los Angeles.

Carlo Pedretti (Art), University of California, Los Angeles.

Hugo Rodriguez-Alcala (Spanish Literature), University of California, Riverside.

Avrum Stroll (Philosophy), University of California, La Jolla.

Larzer Ziff (American Studies), University of California, Berkeley.

COLORADO

*Senior fellowships*

J. Glenn Gray (Philosophy), The Colorado College, Colorado Springs.

*Summer fellowships*

John M. Koller (Philosophy), Colorado State University, Ft. Collins.

Courtland H. Peterson (Social Sciences), University of Colorado, Boulder.

CONNECTICUT

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Jack M. Davis (English Literature), University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Stephen L. Dyson (Classical Studies), Wesleyan University, Middletown.

Cyrus Hamlin (German Literature), Yale University, New Haven.

*Summer fellowships*

Richard O. Curry (U.S. History), University of Connecticut, Storrs.

*Senior fellowships*

John Morton Blum (American Studies), Yale University, New Haven.

Robert Sabatino Lopez (History), Yale University, New Haven.

Jaroslav Pelikan, (History of Religion), Yale University, New Haven.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Helen James John (Philosophy), Trinity College, Washington, D.C.

*Summer fellowships*

Robert W. Kenny (History), George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Shirley S. Kenny (English Literature), Catholic University of America, D.C.

Jeane C. Wilke, (U.S. History), Trinity College, Washington, D.C.

FLORIDA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Charles C. Crittenden (Philosophy), Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Kenneth Alden Megill (Social Sciences), University of Florida, Gainesville.

*Summer fellowships*

Robert Detweiler (English Literature), Florida Presbyterian College, St. Petersburg.

John G. Gardner (English Literature), Biscayne College, Miami.

Frank P. Norris (Spanish Literature), University of Miami, Coral Gables.

William H. Scheuerle (English Literature), University of South Florida, Tampa.

S. L. Weingart (English Literature), Florida State University, Tallahassee.

George D. Winius (History), University of Florida, Gainesville.

*Senior fellowships*

George Alexander Lensen (History), Florida State University, Tallahassee.

GEORGIA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

William Franklin Boggess (Classical Studies), University of Georgia, Athens.

*Summer fellowships*

James H. Davis (French Literature), University of Georgia, Athens.

Eva K. Harlan (Philosophy), Emory University, Atlanta.

Allen B. Skei (Music), The Woman's College of Georgia Milledgeville.

HAWAII

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Alan Gavan Daws (History), University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

*Summer fellowships*

Hugh Hi-woong Kang (History), University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

*Senior fellowship*

Wilhelm G. Solheim (Social Sciences), University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

ILLINOIS

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Keith M. Baker (History), University of Chicago.

Rudolph W. Heinze (History), Concordia Teachers College, River Forest.

Peter R. McKeon (History), University of Chicago.

Douglas H. White (English Literature), Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago.

*Summer fellowships*

Thomas W. Blomquist (History), Northern Illinois University, DeKalb.

Mervin R. Dilts (Classical Studies), University of Illinois, Urbana.

Herbert L. Kessler (Art), University of Chicago.

Taimi Maria Ranta (Social Sciences), Illinois State University, Normal.

John A. Tedeschi (History), The Newberry Library, Chicago.

C. David Tompkins (U.S. History), University of Illinois, Chicago.

*Senior fellowships*

Charles A. Knudson (French), University of Illinois, Urbana.

INDIANA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

John T. Canty (Philosophy), University of Notre Dame.

Robert Harlen King (Philosophy), DePauw University, Greencastle.

Theodore Kermit Scott (Philosophy), Purdue University, Lafayette.

*Summer fellowships*

Jack M. Balcer (History), Indiana University, Bloomington.

Thomas J. Jemielity (English Literature), University of Notre Dame.

William L. Rowe (Philosophy), Purdue University, Lafayette.

*Senior fellowships*

Willi Apel (Music), Indiana University, Bloomington.

Wu-chi Liu (Drama), Indiana University, Bloomington.

Nicholas Lobokowicz (Philosophy), University of Notre Dame.

Calvin O. Schrag (Philosophy), Purdue University, West Lafayette.

IOWA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Warner Barnes (American Literature), University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Richard S. Hanson (Middle Eastern Studies), Luther College, Decorah.

*Summer fellowships*

James T. Clemons (History of Religion), Morningside College, Sioux City.

William S. Cobb (Philosophy), Grinnell College, Grinnell.

Galen O, Rowe (Classical Studies), University of Iowa, Iowa City.

John H. Sieber (History), Luther College, Decorah.

*Senior fellowships*

Stow Persons (History), University of Iowa, Iowa City.

KANSAS

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

John G. Clark (History), University of Kansas, Lawrence.

John O. Rees (American Literature), Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Janet Eloise Tupper (Music), Ft. Hays Kansas State College, Hays.

*Summer fellowships*

John C. English (History), Baker University, Baldwin.

Victor R. Greene (History), Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Ronald W. Tobin (French Literature), University of Kansas, Lawrence.

KENTUCKY

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Joseph Polzer (Art), University of Louisville, Louisville.

*Summer fellowships*

Eric C. Hicks (French Literature), University of Kentucky, Lexington.

LOUISIANA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

John Robert Moore (History), University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette.

*Summer fellowships*

Victor J. Voegeli, III (U.S. History), Tulane University, New Orleans.

MAINE

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Dorothy Koonce (Classical Studies), Colby College, Waterville.

MARYLAND

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Don William Denny (Art), University of Maryland, College Park.

*Summer fellowships*

Kariofilis Mitsakis (Comparative Literature), University of Maryland, College Park.

Jerome F. O'Malley (Classical Studies), Loyola College, Baltimore.

*Senior fellowships*

Don Cameron Allen (English), Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

Adrienne Koch (History), University of Maryland, College Park.

MASSACHUSETTS

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Daniel R. Borg (History), Clark University, Worcester.

Charles Edwin Clark (U.S. History), Southeastern Mass. Technological Inst., Dartmouth.

Robert W. Doherty (History), University of Massachusetts.

Arthur Ralph Gold (English Literature), Wellesley College, Wellesley.

John L. Heineman (History), Boston College, Chestnut Hill.

*Summer fellowships*

Marie-Rose Carre (French Literature), Smith College, Northhampton.

Samuel Y. Edgerton (Art), Boston University, Boston.

James D. Ellis (Drama), Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley.

Robert A. Hart (History), University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Paul C. Helmreich (History), Wheaton College, Norton.

Alan H. Schechter (Social Sciences), Wellesley College, Wellesley.

Gordon S. Wood (History), Harvard University, Cambridge.

*Senior fellowships*

James Franklin Berar (American Literature), Clark University, Worchester.

Ruth J. Dean (French Literature), Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley.

Einar Haugen (Scandinavian Literature), Harvard University, Cambridge.

Baruch A. Levine (Linguistics), Brandeis University, Waltham.

MICHIGAN

*Fellowship for younger scholars*

Donald N. Baker (History), Michigan State University, East Lansing.

William C. Bryant (Spanish Literature), Oakland University, Rochester.

James Horace Jones (English Literature), Northern Michigan University, Marquette.

William W. Freehling (U.S. History), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

*Summer fellowships*

John G. Blair (Comparative Literature), Oakland University, Rochester.

Joseph F. Hanna (Philosophy), Michigan State University, East Lansing.

*Senior fellowships*

Kenneth Ray Scholberg (Spanish Literature), Michigan State University, E. Lansing.

MINNESOTA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Allan H. Spear (U.S. History), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

*Summer fellowships*

Jooinn Lee (History of Religion), University of Minnesota, Morris.

Toni A. H. McNaron (English Literature), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Jacqueline T. Schaefer (Comparative Literature), Carleton College, Northfield.

MISSISSIPPI

*Fellowship for younger scholars*

Leon E. Boothe (U.S. History), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

*Summer fellowships*

Thomas L. Connelly (U.S. History), Mississippi State University, State College.

William K. Scarborough (U.S. History), University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg.

MISSOURI

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Richard L. Admussen (French Literature), Washington University, St. Louis.

*Summer fellowships*

S. Pendleton Fullwider (U.S. History), Stephens College, Columbia.

Orland W. Johnson (Music), Washington University, St. Louis.

Sheldon J. Watts (History), University of Missouri, Kansas City.

NEBRASKA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Edward L. Homze (History), University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

*Summer fellowships*

Frederick C. Luebke (Social Sciences), Concordia Teachers College, Seward.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Richard Lloyd Regosin (French Literature), Dartmouth College, New Hampshire (Hanover).

*Summer fellowships*

Thomas Vargish (English Literature) Dartmouth College, Hanover.

NEW JERSEY

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

James M. McPherson (U.S. History), Princeton University, Princeton.

Edwin Masao (History), Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick.

*Summer fellowships*

Robert K. Faulkner (Social Sciences), Princeton University, Princeton.

William W. Fortenbaugh (Classical Studies), Douglas College, New Brunswick.

Dan Warshaw (Social Sciences), Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck.

Stanley B. Winters (History), Newark College of Engineering, Newark.

*Senior fellowships*

Arthur Mendel (Music), Princeton University, Princeton.

NEW MEXICO

*Summer fellowships*

John A. Mears (History), New Mexico State University, University Park.

NEW YORK

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Carol Rothrock Bleser (U.S. History), Adelphi Suffolk College, Long Island.

Leonard G. Bonin (Philosophy), State University College of New York, Oswego.

Briton Cooper Busch (History), Colgate University, Hamilton.

Arthur L. Clements (English Literature), State University of New York, Binghamton.

Raymond Joseph Cunningham (U.S. History), Fordham University, Bronx.

Lynd Wilks Forguson (Philosophy), State University of New York, Buffalo.

Joan Gadol (History), City University of New York.

William D. Grifin (History), St. John's University, Jamaica.

Baruch Hochman (Comparative Literature), Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson.

Jerome J. Nadelhaft (U.S. History), State University College, Genesco.

Lucy Freeman Sandler (Art), Washington Square College, New York.

Harold I. Shapiro (English Literature), Hofstra University, Hempstead.

Barton Sholod (Comparative Literature), Queens College, Flushing.

David Sidorsky (Philosophy), Columbia University, New York.

Hendrik Vanderwerf (Music), University of Rochester, Rochester.

Joseph Wiesenfarth (English), Manhattan College, Bronx.

*Summer fellowships*

John R. Aiken (U.S. History), State University College, Buffalo.

Nicholas Capaldi (Philosophy), State University College, Potsdam.

James K. Graby (Philosophy of Religion), Keuka College, Keuka Park.

Leo J. Hoar (Spanish Literature), Fordham University, Bronx.

Michael G. Kammen (History), Cornell University, Ithaca.

Berel Lang (Philosophy), C. W. Post College of Long Island, Brookville.

Michael Mallory (Art), Brooklyn College of the City University of N.Y., Brooklyn.

Eugene P. Nassar (English Literature), Utica College.

John M. O'Brien (History), Queens College, Flushing.

David C. Pierce (History of Religion), Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson.

Richard P. Roark (Social Sciences), State University College, Geneseo.

David Rosand (Art), Columbia University, New York.

Thomas B. Settle (History), Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

Sandro Sticca (Drama), State University of New York at Binghamton.

J. Stuart Wilson (English Literature), State University College, Fredonia.

*Senior fellowships*

Seeger A. Bonebakker (Middle Eastern Studies), Columbia University, N.Y.

Lionel Casson (History), New York University, N.Y.

Edgar Baldwin Graves (History), Hamilton College, Clinton.

Howard Hibbard (Art), Columbia University, New York.

Norman Kelvin (English Literature), City College of the City University of N.Y.

Arthur Mizener (English Literature), Cornell University, Ithaca.

Ernst Oster (Music), New York, N.Y.—Unaffiliated.

Marc Raeff (History), Columbia University, New York.

Melvin Richter (Social Sciences), Hunter College, New York.

A. William Salomone (History), University of Rochester, Rochester.

Bernard S. Solomon (Philosophy), Queens College, Flushing.

NORTH CAROLINA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Randolph M. Bulgin (English Literature), University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

William Brown Patterson (History), Davidson College, Davidson.

John Marion Riddle (History), North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

John M. Schnorrenberg (Art), University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

*Summer fellowships*

Richard C. Barnett (History), Wake Forest College, Winston-Salem.

Roger A. Bullard (History of Religion), Atlantic Christian College, Wilson.

William J. De Sua (Italian Literature), University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

J. Rodney Fulcher (U.S. History), St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg.

Jean Gordon (History), University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

*Senior fellowships*

Henry C. Boren (History), University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Anne Firor Scott (Social Sciences), Duke University, Durham.

NORTH DAKOTA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Theodore I. Messenger (Philosophy), University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

*Summer fellowships*

Richard F. Hampsten (English Literature), University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

*Senior fellowships*

Demetrius J. Georgacas (Classical Studies), University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

OHIO

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Jasper Hopkins (Philosophy), Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland.

Zane L. Miller (U.S. History), University of Cincinnati.

Frank Rosengarten (History), Western Reserve University, Cleveland.

Jack Ray Thomas (U.S. History), Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green.

David P. Young (English Literature), Oberlin College Oberlin.

*Summer fellowships*

Matthew E. Baigell (Art), Ohio State University, Columbus.

Norman S. Care (Philosophy), Oberlin College, Oberlin.

Gary R. Hess (History), Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green.

Mary K. Howard (History), John Carroll University, University Heights.

William C. Morgan, III (History), University of Toledo, Toledo.

Lee Daniel Snyder (History), Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.

*Senior fellowships*

Hugh M. Davidson (French Literature), Ohio State University, Columbus.

John R. Spencer (Art), Oberlin College, Oberlin.

OKLAHOMA

*Summer fellowships*

Charles M. Dollar (U.S. History), Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

OREGON

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

John M. Tomsich (U.S. History), Reed College, Portland.

Darold D. Wax (U.S. History), Oregon State University, Corvallis.

*Senior fellowships*

Earl Pomeroy (U.S. History), University of Oregon, Eugene.

PENNSYLVANIA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Allan Cutler (Social Sciences), Temple University, Philadelphia.

David Allen Grimsted (Social Sciences), Bucknell University, Lewisburg.

Anne Coffin Hanson (Art), Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr.

Susan Snyder (English Literature), Swarthmore College, Swarthmore.

Charles L. Tipton (History), Lehigh University, Bethelehem.

Martin M. Tweedale (Philosophy), University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.

*Summer fellowships*

James M. Bergquist (U.S. History), Villanova University.

Bruce L. Clayton (U.S. History), Allegheny College, Meadville.

Dennis N. K. Darnoi (Philosophy), Immaculata College.

Charles G. Dempsey (Art), Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr.

Paul R. Evans (Music), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Ira Grushow (English Literature), Franklin & Marshall College, Lancaster.

Allan I. Ludwig (Art), Dickinson College, Carlisle.

Robert D. Sider (Classical Studies), Messiah College, Grantham.

*Senior fellowships*

MacEdward Leach (English Literature), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Helen F. North (Classical Studies), Swarthmore College, Swarthmore.

RHODE ISLAND

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Margaret Dalton (Russian Literature), Brown University, Providence.

*Summer fellowships*

Jaegwon Kim (Philosophy), Brown University, Providence.

*Senior fellowships*

William F. Church (History), Brown University, Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

William Sanderson Kable (English Literature), University of South Carolina, Columbia.

*Summer fellowships*

Robert B. Patterson (History), University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Frederick F. Ritsch (History), Converse College, Spartanburg.

TENNESSEE

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Philip Houston Kennedy (French Literature), University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Ljubica D. Popovich (Art), Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

*Summer fellowships*

B. J. Leggett (English Literature), University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

James F. Kilroy (English Literature), Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

Louis C. Stagg (English Literature), Memphis State University, Memphis.

TEXAS

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

William F. Holmes (U.S. History), Arlington State College, Arlington.

Alexander P. D. Mourelatos (Philosophy), University of Texas, Austin.

John W. Velz (English Literature), Rice University, Houston.

Robert M. Weir (U.S. History), University of Houston, Houston.

*Summer fellowships*

G. Karl Galinsky (Classical Studies), University of Texas, Austin.

Charles D. Peavy (American Literature), University of Houston, Houston.

*Senior fellowships*

John P. Sullivan (Classical Studies), University of Texas, Austin.

VERMONT

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Ursula Heibges (Classical Studies), Middlebury College, Middlebury.

*Summer fellowships*

Victor L. Nuovo (Philosophy), Middlebury College, Middlebury.

VIRGINIA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Woodford D. McClellan (History), University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

*Summer fellowships*

Thomas K. Hearn (Philosophy), College of William & Mary, Williamsburg.

H. Marshall Jarrett (History), Washington & Lee University, Lexington.

Harold S. Wilson (U.S. History), Old Dominion College, Norfolk.

*Senior fellowships*

Clifford Dowdey (U.S. History), Richmond (Unaffiliated).

Irvin Enrenpreis (English Literature), University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

WASHINGTON

James E. Broyles (Philosophy), Washington State University, Pullman.

Norman H. Clark (U.S. History), Everett Junior College, Everett.

Richard L. Greaves (History), Eastern Washington State College, Cheney.

WEST VIRGINIA

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Barton Hudson (Music), West Virginia University, Morgantown.

WISCONSIN

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Alan David Corre (Middle Eastern Studies), University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

James W. Tuttleton (American Literature), University of Wisconsin, Madison.

*Summer fellowships*

Vlad I. Thomas (English Literature), Wisconsin State University, Whitewater.

Chauncey Wood (English Literature), University of Wisconsin, Madison.

*Senior fellowships*

Gian N. G. Orsini (Comparative Literature), University of Wisconsin, Madison.

WYOMING

*Fellowships for younger scholars*

Gene M. Gressley (Social Sciences), University of Wyoming, Laramie.

*Summer fellowships*

Steven M. Foster (English Literature), University of Wyoming, Laramie.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL GRANTS ANNOUNCED

FEBRUARY 2, 1967.

Barnaby C. Keeney, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, today announced grants totaling $403,000 to further the study and dissemination of the humanities through educational projects.

In announcing the educational grants, many of which are aimed at strengthening the teaching of the humanities in secondary schools, Mr. Keeney said, "The significant curricular developments in the humanities at the secondary and elementary school levels of education have only partially been disseminated into the nation's school systems. Good basic curricula exist in many fields but the gap between development and application remains large. Many of our programs are aimed at closing that gap."

The grants indicate that the Endowment is concentrating on the individual, through Fellowship grants and through educational programs designed to increase the knowledge and potential of the individual teacher of the humanities from primary school to university. Development of teaching aids such as Instructional Television, and workshops, seminars and programs conducted by leading university professors in the various fields of the humanities are some of the means emphasized through which teachers may deepen their own interests and develop a greater ability to disseminate their knowledge to their students.

Announcements of individual research grants and other major programs will be issued within the next few weeks.

INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION COMPETITION

To foster national interest in Instructional Television and to bring added color and excitement to the teaching of the humanities in secondary schools, a grant of up to $100,000 was approved for the WGBH Educational Foundation in Boston, Mass.

The project will involve producers of Instructional Television (ITV), university staff and creative television experts in the production of five television programs relating to various fields of the humanities for classroom use.

A national competition will be held in five regional areas and the best presentation and treatment of ideas from each region will be selected by panels in each area. The panels will be made up of a Project Director, scholars in the fields of the humanities, and representatives of instructional television, educational television and commercial TV.

Each program will be of one-half hour duration and will develop the relationship between two or more fields of the humanities. The programs selected by the panels will be produced at WGBH, Boston, under the supervision of a program director, a leading TV producer and an outstanding "humanist" in the fields covered by the program.

The programs will be disseminated by WGBH which will make them available to the National Center for School and College Television in Bloomington, Indiana and to NAEB and NET meetings. With each film there will be a study guide for the use of classroom teachers. The project director will also make field trips throughout the country to show the films and to discuss their potential use with high school and television personnel.

COUNCIL FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, BOSTON, MASS., PROGRAM OF READING AND BOOK EXPOSURE FOR CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

A grant of up to $39,000 was approved to the Council for Public Schools in Boston to carry out two programs to allow children who perhaps have never owned or even read a book to become familiar with reading as a pleasure.

The project will give more than 1,000 elementary school children in disadvantaged areas of Fall River and Boston, Massachusetts, a more individualized exposure to books and related activities than they normally have at home or at school.

Children will be encouraged to borrow books from public libraries and will receive four gift books during the year to stimulate awareness that a book is something to own and to prize. In this way the project will emphasize the point that reading is enjoyable and will develop a child's ability to select books which interest him. College-educated parents in the community will serve as volunteers in this project and will be recruited through civic organizations, churches and schools.

It is hoped that through widespread dissemination of information about the program, comparable communities will be encouraged to adopt similar programs.

TALKING BOOKS PILOT PROJECT

A grant of up to $100,000 was approved for a pilot project to be undertaken by Recording for the Blind Inc. in New York, in order that this medium may be used to bring the resources of the humanities to the 1.5 million Americans who are unable to read for reasons other than blindness. Since many of these people are confined to hospitals the grant will support a demonstration program in four participating hospitals. Taped "talking books" will be produced in the general field of the humanities including literature, history, philosophy and the social sciences. Titles will be selected by the librarian of Recording for the Blind in cooperation with the Endowment. More than 1,000 books will be produced and a master tape of each title will be made with a tape copy of each title for program use.

Tapes will be made available on a circulating basis to each of the participating hospitals which include initially, the Rhode Island Hospital, Providence, R.I., The Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine of New York University Medical Center, Goldwater Memorial Hospital, and Bellevue Hospital all in New York City. After full circulation has been reached the tapes will be given to the Library of Congress for duplication and circulation through its regional libraries.

Under the new law, the Library of Congress is enabled to extend its services to handicapped persons other than the blind, so it is possible this program will be continued under their auspices.

Evaluation of the project will be carried out by Dr. Lawrence Gold of the City University of New York, over a two-year period. This research will help determine patient reaction, type of books most in demand and other pertinent factors.

STUDY PROGRAM FOR CRITICS

A study grant of up to $8,000 was approved to New York University School of the Arts to plan a program which would enable 10 to 15 critics of the arts from newspapers, little magazines and quarterlies, and academic critics to come to New York for an academic year of instruction in five areas of the humanities. A seminar in criticism, also in the planning stage, would enable critics to enlarge their competence in a particular field and to attain greater competence and knowledge in correlated fields.

Newspapers in large metropolitan areas are able to have specialists in the various areas of the arts and the humanities, but newspapers in smaller cities throughout the country have a need for critics who are grounded in two or three or even more fields. While journalistic competence is requisite, the approach of this project would be to widen the scope of the critic's knowledge in the humanities.

PROGRAMS FOR HISTORIANS AND HISTORICAL AGENCIES

Two programs dealing directly with bringing about a better understanding of state and local history on the part of directors and staff members of historical societies were approved by the Council.

There are 3,500 historical societies in the United States and these programs are designed to help them work more effectively with the material at hand so that the public may be more easily made aware of what America is and the past that made it so.

The grants were approved to:

The American Association for State and Local History in Nashville, Tennessee. Up to $55,850 was approved for the purpose of holding two regional seminars of three weeks each for 20 participants on the administration of historical societies and museums. The seminars which will be held in St. Paul, Minnesota, and Portland, Oregon, will stress the importance of analyzing unexplored but accessible material, dramatizing it and making it more readily available to schools in the field so that the nation's historical societies and museums may contribute more effectively to the American public's understanding of its past.

There will also be a Publications Institute of one week's duration to be conducted at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee for 25 participants.

The State Education Department, Albany, New York, was approved a grant of up to $9,300 for a two-day conference to which will be invited the 1,000 local historians in the various New York State communities. The conference will be pointed toward giving the participants a broader, more exciting knowledge of their field and encouraging them to relate local history to the wider scene and to coordinate their available materials so that better dissemination is possible. The program will feature lectures by six historians of national prominence.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, INTERNATIONAL WRITING PROGRAM

The University of Iowa, five years ago, inaugurated a Translation Workshop in conjunction with its highly successful creative writing program. Under this program writers from all over the world have come to the University to study and to translate their own works into English and American works into their own tongues including Turkish, Polish, Japanese, Chinese, Korean and Bengali. The project serves the dual purpose of making American literature more available abroad and of giving the United States the opportunity of having excellent translations of important hitherto unavailable foreign works. A grant of up to $10,000 has been approved to the University to support this program.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, SUMMER HUMANITIES INSTITUTE

Twenty teachers and a group of gifted students from the Louisville, Kentucky high schools will be given the opportunity of participating in a dual demonstration program taught by members of the University of Louisville's humanities faculty.

The Endowment will support this program with a grant of up to $30,000 seeing in it an opportunity for high school teachers and university staff to work together to improve and broaden the teaching of the humanities in area schools.

Community resources will be drawn upon including the noted Louisville Symphony Orchestra. The teachers will take two courses taught by the University faculty: "Philosophy, Science and Religion in Modern Culture" and "Arts and Music in Modern Culture."

Then they will apply the new ideas and methods developed in these courses in the teaching of a six-week demonstration class made up of the selected high school students.

The application of teaching ideas devel-

oped in the seminars for teachers and the demonstration classes for students should have an important effect on the regional humanities curriculum.

DOVER SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, DOVER, DEL.

A planning grant of $6,500 was approved to the Dover Special School District to enable the faculty of each of the eight schools in the district (five elementary, two middle schools, and one high school) to work on a program designed to improve the comprehensive humanities program already existing in the Special School District.

One purpose of the planning grant is to enable the school district to analyze its resources, determine how best to make them serve the humanities teacher. Two important facilities whose role will be analyzed are the University of Delaware Computer Center, which now aids in scheduling, testing and in developing pilot projects; and the State Educational Television studio which has assisted Dover in teaching programs. Another purpose is to enable the school system faculty to have released time to consult with university faculty on materials and plans for curricula. Tentative arrangements have been made with a professor of education from the University of Delaware and a professor of American civilization from the University of Pennsylvania.

ALASKA METHODIST UNIVERSITY, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, CONFERENCE ON ALASKAN HISTORY

A grant of up to $9,850 was provided for the Alaska Methodist University, Anchorage, to enable it to hold a conference of 11 scholars from all parts of the United States and 40 elementary and secondary school teachers from Alaska on the occasion of the Alaska Purchase Centennial.

The invited scholars will be, for the most part, people who have written books on the history of our 49th State and who have explored the history of the Eskimos.

Primary objectives of the conference are to stimulate teaching interest in Alaskan history which is almost neglected in the majority of history textbooks now in use and to revitalize interest in historical sources which are rapidly disappearing.

AQUINAS COLLEGE, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., SUMMER WORKSHOP

Emphasizing the effort on the part of the Endowment to strengthen and dramatize the teaching of the humanities in secondary schools is a summer workshop program planned at Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, for which a grant of up to $8,976 was approved. Seventy-five teachers who are now or will be teaching literature in secondary schools will be enrolled. Two-thirds of the participants will be drawn from public schools in Western Michigan, the rest from private schools.

The course, which will demonstrate how trends in the content and style of literature are expressed in the other correlated arts of theatre, painting, music and the cinema, is designed to stimulate creativity in teaching and to give the secondary school teachers the opportunity to receive fresh ideas through their contact with the college faculty. Basis of the course will be selected prose and poetry from 19th and 20th century British, Irish and American literature. The results of the workshop will be published in education journals and should bring about statewide changes in how the humanities are taught.

GREAT LAKES COLLEGES ASSOCIATION

The Council approved a planning grant of up to $13,500 for the Great Lakes Colleges Association to work out the establishment of a humanities teaching network involving the Great Lakes Colleges Association and Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, and the University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Ultimately wider college-university cooperation will be established within the Ohio, Michigan and Indiana area which will facilitate the exchange of faculty; enable doctoral and postdoctoral university scholars to familiarize themselves with college teaching; and allow college faculty to do part-time teaching and research at a university, thus strengthening the teaching of the humanities at both college and university levels through this cooperative effort.

Initially a college-university workshop will be set up to work out details of the cooperative plan. This will be followed by a college-university regional conference on a contemporary sub-cultural problem. Member colleges of the Great Lakes College Association are: Antioch College, Denison University, Kenyon College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan University, DePauw University, Earlham College, Wabash College, Hope College, and Kalamazoo College.

TRAVEL STUDY INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

To enable 30 teachers of visual arts and anthropology at school and college levels to utilize the unique resources of Latin American museums, the Endowment will support a demonstration program by the University of Georgia with a grant of up to $22,000.

A four-week tour of Mexican and Guatemalan Museums will enable the teachers to acquire a knowledge of Latin American culture and have a better understanding of the indigenous art of their hemisphere.

The primary objective of this program is to broaden the artistic knowledge of these teachers, who will be drawn from Georgia and neighboring states and who may not have had the opportunity to visit great museums in this country or abroad. The experience of actually seeing excellent examples of pre-Columbian as well as Colonial and modern Latin American Art should stimulate an interest and excitement which will be communicated to their students.

The tour will be preceded and followed by a week in class at the University so that the participants will not only be briefed on what they will see on their tour but will have time for evaluation on their return.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should reemphasize the fact that out of a budget recommendation of $16,370,000 the Committee on Appropriations is recommending $11,700,000 or a reduction of $4,670,000. So it has not been extravagant or profligate. Yet the gentleman from Missouri urges even deeper cuts.

In recent decades we have appropriated billions upon billions of dollars for the military and we will do it, I am sure, for years to come because we believe that it is the answer to the question of whether we will survive.

But the next immediate question is, "How will we survive?"

I believe, that when the history books of our troubled era are written, our times will not be judged by the number of thundering bombs, screaming missiles or whining bullets that mankind has been able to produce, but it will be judged on the quality of its poetry and its art and its scholarship and its humanity and its philosophy.

I would urge you as a measure of encouragement to the arts and humanities to support this appropriation. We can add luster to our generation, and we should do so. We must not dump billions and billions of dollars upon our generals and let our poets wither and our scholars perish.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to say just a few words about the National Foundation for the Humanities which was the subject of so much discussion earlier.

In moving to curtail the funds for the National Endowment for the Humanities, the gentleman from Missouri brings sharply into focus the basic question as to the worth of this program.

For this, this House and the country owe him a debt—for this Congress now has the opportunity to finally bury that issue.

And bury it we shall, when we defeat the gentleman's amendment.

There was a revolution in American thinking when the Soviet Union put Sputnik I into orbit, and became the first nation to orbit a space satellite. We rushed to our schools and demanded more science. We rushed to our legislatures and demanded more money for science. There was a frenzy to make America No. 1 again, and we have been working to that end ever since.

But in our haste to create new and distinguished men of science, I am afraid we lost sight of some of the other values which may, in the long run, have a significance far greater than the question of who can get to the moon first.

It is inconceivable to me that this small sum should be so seriously questioned, when its purpose is to increase our knowledge of our fellow man by encouraging the examination and dissemination of human knowledge.

The essence of the humanities is the study of man, his languages, his literature, his philosophy, his history, his culture.

In short, it is an effort to view the totality of man's efforts in the past in order that we may separate from that past what is good and true and apply it in our daily lives.

And we have much to learn.

For if we have learned to orbit the moon and to split the atom, we have yet to learn how to live in peace.

We have yet to learn the corollary to that phrase that everyone knows: "History tends to repeat itself."

That corollary is: "Those who do not know the past are condemned to relive it."

We cannot afford to relive a past that has been and even now is fractured by man's inability to live at peace.

Our society today is preoccupied with achieving justice for all. But, we cannot achieve this unless we are aware of the whole history of man's struggle against injustice. This is the business of the humanities. We are preoccupied with acquiring the means to accomplish greatness, but we are spending very little to discover what greatness may lie in the individual and in the Nation. Yet, unless we concern ourselves with this search, we may find ourselves with enormous capacities and no sense of direction.

Mr. Chairman, America has been the land to which men dream of coming, but they do not dream of finding science in America. They dream of finding freedom. From its very foundation, it has been a land of freedom, a land where one

does not merely live, but one lives richly in the incomparabe heritage given us by our Founding Fathers. This is a heritage of humanism. It is a heritage that tried to give to man the dignity which man should have—and to give that dignity, our Founding Fathers were profound students of the dignity of man, of humanism.

I have voted with enthusiasm for the money which we have spent in support of science, in the hope we may produce another Isaac Newton, another Einstein.

I have every confidence my colleagues will defeat this amendment, and will vote to spend the small amount asked. It may well produce another Jefferson—or another Lincoln.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of the full amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities. I regret that it is necessary in this House to defend this modest sum for the study of our history, our arts, and our literature. But in rejecting efforts to cut back the money appropriated for the Humanities Endowment, I feel that I am only paying respect to the traditions for which this body stands. It is after all in this House that Madison, Monroe, Clay, and Lincoln sat; it is this Capitol Building where every day we walk past marble memorials to Jefferson, to Webster, and to the great men of our past, some known and some unjustly forgotten; it is here that in the early days of the Republic the Supreme Court made its historic decisions.

In this Chamber, we deliberate on the great issues of our own time, surrounded by the ghosts and memories of our predecessors who in their time wrestled with problems as great as ours.

Mr. Chairman, this building is a great encyclopedia of our history; as we work here we know that the words we speak and the actions we take will be part of the history of tomorrow. A sense of history has stood by us as our Nation grew; our ability to draw from the wisdom of the past has helped us to face and to solve the ever-renewed problems of the present.

The great men who built our Republic and who wrote our Constitution drew their inspiration from the past. Anyone who reads the writings of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, of George Mason and James Madison, of Benjamin Franklin and Alexander Hamilton, sees the knowledge and the wisdom they drew from the history and the literature of Greece and Rome, from the political thought of the Italian Renaissance, from the precedents and experience of English history and law.

No computer wrote our Constitution; no data processor programed the wisdom of the past for easy readout by constitutional technicians. Living men read and studied the lessons of history, and by their hard won decisions turned inherited knowledge into the reality of their time which became in its turn our bequest of wisdom to which we still turn for guidance in 1967.

Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that the item which is the subject of this amendment should appear in the $1.3 billion Interior appropriations bill. In this same bill, we are voting to preserve and to maintain our natural heritage, to memorialize the battlefields of our history, and to maintain the physical monuments of our heritage. Quite rightly, we do not stint ourselves for conservation and preservation. But are we to remember the greatness of our past only in objects—in parks and forests however beautiful, in statues and monuments however impressive?

Mr. Chairman, I would ask this House whether Bradford would rather be remembered for the Mayflower Compact than for the Plymouth Rock Monument, whether Jefferson would rather be remembered for the Declaration of Independence than for Monticello, and whether Lincoln would rather be remembered for the Gettysburg Address than for the Lincoln Memorial?

Mr. Chairman, it is a sad comment on our time that we can spend more than $70 billion on our national defense, that we can spend additional billions on space efforts, but still quarrel about a comparatively small sum to study the thoughts and the words that make up our heritage of Western civilization. I will vote for the full funding recommended by the committee in good conscience; to me this is a small measure of respect to the men whose thinking, whose writing, and whose actions have made our past a great resource of strength to us now, and as a small gesture to the scholars who make our past and our heritage a very real part of our present.

Now, of all times, we cannot ignore our history or our culture. Now, obsessed as we are by the arts of war and the techniques of destruction, we cannot turn our backs on the "humane studies." Never was there a time when we needed them more.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

A FUNNIES THING HAPPENED ON THE WAY TO THE LOUVRE

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the full appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

I do so even though there has been criticism of one grant by the Foundation for the study of the effect of the political cartoon and comic strip on American life.

I rise in support of the Foundation with great assurance because I have support for such a grant from that most unlikely of all sources, the France of General de Gaulle.

Mr. Chairman, for many years President Charles de Gaulle has done everything he could to downgrade anything American in France.

Recently, however, that most French of all French institutions, the Louvre Museum, unveiled an exhibit of that most American of American institutions—the funnies.

For years the French Minister of Culture, Andre Malraux, has been trying to bring the best of eastern and western culture to France. But, imagine the temper of the Chambre des Deputes which has been inculcated by De Gaulle's anti-American attitude when the Deputies learned that French taxpayers' dollars had been spent by the Museum des Arts Decoratifs to show an exhibit of American comic strips.

Mr. Chairman, if I were a Member of the Chamber of Deputies, I might feel compelled to object to the expenditure of many thousands of French francs for an exhibition in the Louvre of not French—but of American—comics.

Mr. Chairman, if I were a Member of the Chamber of Deputies, I would certainly make a speech about Monsieur Claude Moliterni, director of the French Society of Research in Illustrated Literature. Monsieur Moliterni said that "French comic-strip thinking is at least 40 years behind the American counterpart."

That is language which should be brought to the attention of the Un-French Activities Committee, if such a committee exists.

If I were a Member of the Chamber of Deputies, I would point out how much more sensible and economical America was with respect to this particular art form where the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities expended only $8,789 for a study, not of foreign, but of domestic political cartoons and comic strips

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not a Member of the Chamber of Deputies I am happy to be a Member of this body and to be able to use the French exhibition as reported yesterday evening by Dan Gregory in the Washington Star, who wrote about the American comic-strip exhibit in the Louvre and quoted the Director as saying:

> We are highly encouraged by attendance so far both from the public and professional circles. This is an exciting climax to the 18-month campaign we have been conducting to inform the French public on American comic-strip concepts.

Mr. Gregory's article concluded with the following words:

> Burne Hogarth, Mell Lazarus and Lee Falk, among Americans on hand at the opening ceremonies, hailed the exposition's acceptance at the Louvre as a major step in recognizing the cultural and artistic impact of comics, both in the United States and abroad.
>
> "Some French artists are revising their thinking, and this is directly attributable to American influence," said Moliterni. "This exposition and the large contribution by American creators will go a long way toward developing this trend in France."
>
> The exposition is scheduled to go to Switzerland, Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy this year and early in 1968. Negotiations are in progress for it to go to New York by the summer of 1968.

Mr. Chairman, if France and Switzerland and Belgium and the Netherlands and Italy can recognize the cultural and artistic impact of American comics, I think it not improper for an American foundation to do likewise

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

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I believe that art and humanistic studies find their own verity in themselves—ars gratia artis—art for the sake of art, scholarship for the sake of scholarship.

But I think as practical men we can also agree that studies and research projects in the arts and humanities additionally provide the wellspring, the inventory of humanistic thought that provides the foundation for much worthwhile practical application in day to day affairs. Many programs that our Congress has funded, such as pure research in the physical sciences, have provided a wellspring for specific, practical advances in medicine, engineering, industrial, space and defense technology and other applied fields.

We have in the arts and humanities program provisions for studies in the fields of architecture, planning, the quality of urban environment, the urban design, and urban planning.

If sufficiently creative and thoughtful studies are done in these areas, they may give us great guidance in organizing and directing some of our ongoing federally assisted programs where we are spending literally billions of dollars in remaking American cities—in our housing, transportation, air pollution, model cities, and education programs. Experience has pointed up many flaws in these programs; in many ways they have proven imperfect and have failed to meet our expectations. Many of these programs have been the subject of criticism on the floor of this House.

Perhaps with some fundamental thinking and study of the quality of the urban environment and the quality and design of urban communities made possible under the terms of this legislation, we may seek to achieve more both in the quality and in the cost-benefit impact of these ongoing programs.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say these questions are raised on the Fine Arts Commission. I believe we should recognize the British Art Council, which is the forerunner of our Arts Commission, was formed during World War II, when there was a much greater war effort going on in England. They decided it was important to spend money for the very things they were fighting for.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with all the very distinguished Members of this House who have spoken in opposition to the amendment. As I pointed out earlier, the humanities have contributed to the forming of America itself. A cut here today can only be equated in terms of a cut in the sum of human knowledge. This would be tragic indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested to hear the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. MAHON, talk about the modesty of the President in asking for funds for spending this year.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I was talking about the President's budget request for the arts and humanities activities—the request for some $16.3 million.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman was talking about the total bill.

Mr. MAHON. I think we might say that the President exercised some restraint on the bill generally, but I was speaking only to the arts and humanities item. Certainly the committee has applied additional restraint, as the report of the committee clearly shows.

Mr. GROSS. The modesty of the President is well expressed, I believe, in the fact that the committee saw fit to cut the President's request by nearly $93 million. If it is Presidential modesty to ask for $93 million more than a liberal committee will approve, I do not know the meaning of the word "modesty," but perhaps the gentleman has some other interpretation of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, of interest to me is this item in the hearings entitled "Linguistic Atlas of Japan." I wonder if the gentlewoman from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, can give us some information as to what is here being attempted.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this was discussed before this committee as set forth on page 856 of the hearings. The decision was made that it was necessary to understand all these background languages, and this is one project that came up for approval of a grant. I can see exactly why they might want to fund the exploration of the background of any language that adds, as I said a moment ago, to the total fund of human knowledge. That is not a bad thing to do.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentlewoman think that if we have perfected a Linguistic Atlas of Japan, that it could help solve the situation that has grown out of the expropriation by the Japanese of an American hotel in Tokyo just recently?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I believe perhaps the study of the dialects of the people of Japan might enable the people of the world to better understand the people of Japan.

Mr. GROSS. We could communicate with them and tell them we do not like the fact that they expropriate American investments in Japan?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. The gentleman is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I am sure he will communicate that message.

Mr. GROSS. On page 852 of the hearings I find this colloquy:

Mrs. HANSEN. Now, tell us about the 27th International Congress of Orientalists.

Mr. KEENEY. This is a group of distinguished scholars of the Orient that have been meeting for half a century, I guess. It has met all over the world. It has never met in the United States. One of the things that this country is most criticized for abroad is its inhospitality to conferences, learned conferences of this sort.

One of the best ways to make learned people of other countries understand this country better is by bringing them to this country and letting them associate on intimate terms for a week or two with Americans.

Mrs. HANSEN. And a grant of up to $25,000 will take care of the costs of this conference?

Mr. KEENEY. No; this will take care of setting up the conference, organizing it. This will not be used to pay the expenses.

Mrs. HANSEN. They pay their own expenses?

Mr. REDDING. Yes.

Mrs. HANSEN. And those attending from our own country will pay their own expenses.

Mr. KEENEY. Unless they can get their university to do it.

I recall not so many years ago when an international conference was staged in Washington, D.C., and the House restaurant downstairs was opened so that they could feed the international conferees. I do not know whether they were attached to the arts or to the humanities, or to both.

At any rate, Congress was adjourned, the restaurant was opened, and the foreigners were to pay for their meals.

What happened was that the House of Representatives picked up the expense for a lot of unpaid food bills.

I do not know where they get this "inhospitality" label. I do not know what we have to do to convince them that we are a hospitable people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. So, Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how the promoters of the humanities and arts business, or foreign moochers could label us as being inhospitable.

I assume, as I started to say a moment ago, when I was interrupted, that the nonpayment for food by some of those attending that international conference was charged to the expense of the operation of the restaurant. Members of the press probably would say that House Members do not adequately pay for food in the House restaurant, and that is the reason why there are deficits.

Yes, let us have more international conferences, and let the conferees eat us out of house and home, to add to the deficit of the House restaurant.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Methinks they protesteth too much who would prove their own culture.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that no one in submitting this amendment or in any other comment that has been made here today, has been against scholasticism. No one is against the social graces, the arts, or the humanities. And no one is even against the bleeding hearts versus the realists.

The option is not one of choice against what we must do. One wonders whether the military as compared with poetry

and culture is indeed a choice or not. The Greeks were not subsidized in developing their culture.

Mr. GROSS. No, and if the gentleman will permit me, neither was the originator of the Katzenjammer Kids that was alluded to a little while ago. He was not subsidized so far as I know. But that was back in days when people were self-reliant and the arts and humanities were only a gleam in some spender's eyes.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I was coming to that. We have heard from the Northeast, the Katzenjammers, and the Ozarks. I am certainly not against cartoons. There will be many originals found on the walls of my office of a political nature and which are interesting to me. The point I want to make and why I appreciate the gentleman yielding is that what you hear is not all of these questions or whether or not there is a choice but the question is for those who would read history or whether they believe art is for the grace of art or not, and whether we have come to the place that Lord Macaulay described, when commenting on Randall's biography of Thomas Jefferson; namely, that we "are a republic which will survive only until we find we can vote ourselves largess from the Federal Treasury."

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman I support his amendment, but it does not go anywhere near far enough. This ought to be cut down to real size.

Mr. HALL. I agree and I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. GROSS. I am thankful for small favors. I would just like to add this: I think we can save this $2.7 million and devote it to the humanities and humans in the District of Columbia, to those people who have to appear, for fear of their lives, before a congressional committee as witnesses did yesterday with hoods over their heads in the nature of Ku Klux Klan hoods. I think we could well devote more money to the protection of our citizens, those who live in fear of being killed by thugs, than to expend it on some of the silly things that are being paid for under this appropriation and as set forth in the hearing record we have here dealing with the arts and humanities. Let us do something for our own people here at home.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding for one last remark. I appreciate the statement of our distinguished majority leader about a grant to study the history of Dwight David Eisenhower. I thought it was being done in Kansas already, but it does not compare with the study already granted and appropriated for by the council on "the mating dance of the Amazonian butterfly."

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. If I have time.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I believe the gentleman made a statement that arts and literature were not subsidized in ancient Greece.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say anything about ancient Greece. I was not there at the time.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL, I believe, made that statement.

Mr. GROSS. Well, he may have.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Your learned colleague. I do not pretend to be a deep student of the classics or the Golden Age of Greece, but I would like to point out that arts and literature were probably more heavily subsidized at that time, relative to the resources of the community, than in any other period of history.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 29, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Smithsonian Institution*

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, including research; preservation, and exhibition, and increase of collections from Government and other sources; international exchanges; anthropological research; maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901, 80 Stat. 299), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $23,790,000.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. RIEGLE

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer certain amendments.

Mr. Chairman, there are three amendments, all relating to the Smithsonian Institution, amendments which come at various points in this appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for them to be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to consider en bloc a series of related amendments, all relating to the Smithsonian Institution.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 41, line 16: strike out "$23,790,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,608,000".

On page 42, line 5: strike out "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,316,000".

On page 43, strike out lines 1 through 7.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, these three amendments are all, in my judgment, reasonable reductions in the operations of the Smithsonian Institution for the forthcoming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I would summarize these three amendments, briefly, in this manner:

The first amendment, Mr. Chairman, proposes a reduction from the item of salaries and expenses in the amount of $182,000.

Mr. Chairman, the second amendment proposes to do away with the increase in the museum programs and related research. If adopted, this amendment would keep that program at its present size.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the final amendment, if adopted, would delete $803,000 of construction funds for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.

Mr. Chairman, within the item of salaries and expenses there would still be an increase remaining, if my proposed amendment is adopted, in excess of $1 million.

Mr. Chairman, I offer these three amendments at this time for this reason: They are small, and I think the American people are quite ready and willing at this time to make some small sacrifice in order to indicate their desire to help us out with the financial crisis which faces this country.

Then, Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the American people are quite willing to use the Smithsonian Institution next year at the same level of services which it provides this year.

Mr. Chairman, there are more than sufficient funds contained in this bill with which to increase and improve the services the next time around, even if these three amendments are adopted.

But, Mr. Chairman, if we do expend these additional moneys, this will represent money which we will have to borrow.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I need not have to remind the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that we are already some $14 billion in debt, and over 10 percent of our national income goes for the payment of interest on that debt. That does not represent productive expenditure. We must resist, I believe, the easy choice of slipping deeper and deeper into debt.

Mr. Chairman, this year we are looking toward another record budget and we are looking toward another record deficit, some say a deficit of $20 billion and some say they will be glad if it is no higher than $20 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I think what must be said is this: it is the policy of the majority party that has brought about this massive deficit, by bringing in bills such as this one where we do not dare make any reduction, where every dollar requested is sacred, and we are told there is no place where reductions can wisely and prudently be made.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents an increase over the amount which was appropriated for the present fiscal year, and we do know that it is going to increase this record deficit. We also know that it involves two other things, higher taxes and more inflation.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the American people by a very decisive vote just a few months ago—and I see 47 vacancies on the Democrat side of the aisle—indicated they desired fiscal responsibility on the part of the Federal Government and did not wish to have to suffer the burden of higher taxes and increased inflation.

There is only one way around that, and that is to cut all the spending we can. These are moderate cuts. They are the kinds of cuts the American people, I believe, want us to make. And if

these cuts are not made then this excessive spending will cause the inflation that steals from the paychecks of the working men and women in this country, and from the meager resources of the people who are on social security. They are the ones who are at stake today. Expenditures like these are causing it. I hope we can pass amendments of this kind, and make a beginning in reducing and reversing this inflationary trend, and stop the trend of ever-increasing spending of borrowed money at the Federal level.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read from the committee testimony, and in particular the testimony of the Director of the Smithsonian Institution. This appears on page 906 of the committee testimony. The Director said, when he was talking on the money that was in this bill:

In the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery, we have come to the moment of truth. These two galleries are scheduled to be opened in 1968.

These are the funds I have referred to in my amendments.

He then said:

This is going to be the principal cultural event before the next election, in the city of Washington.

He said "before the next election."

Now, Mr. Chairman, he has something else on his mind besides just serving the interests of the American people.

I hope we can cut this down in at least some amount. Certainly the people of the country will welcome some long overdue economy in government.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, this is an overall cut. The buildings have been built. Do we want to say to the people who come here to visit that we have no lights; we have no staff; and we have no interpretive assistants?

The second part of the amendment relates to counterpart funds. The third part of the amendment relates to the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. The United States is the recipient of $25 million worth of art.

Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do with it? Put it down at the end of the Mall some place, and bury it?

Mr. Chairman, I would say to those who say "cut, cut, cut," that we had better tell the American people to stay away from Washington and stop visiting here.

In 1966 the Smithsonian Museum had 12,663,451 visitors. In order to make the Smithsonian more available for people for a longer period of time this Congress, through the activity of our committee, made sure that the hours were extended. Why are we interested in the Smithsonian Institution? Because we hope the young people of this city, as well as the young people from around our Nation visiting here, will become interested in our tremendous past and our exciting future. We hope they will begin to use these facilities for their improvement, morally and culturally, rather than becoming juvenile delinquents and engaging in crime. This is one expenditure that is for the benefit of all Americans in this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JONAS: On page 45, immediately following line 17, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. No part of the aggregate of the appropriations in title I hereof, or of the aggregate of the appropriations in title II hereof, shall be used to pay the compensation of any persons numbering in excess of 98 percent of the aggregate number otherwise provided for in such titles."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I explained the purpose of this amendment in general debate and therefore will not take the 5 minutes due to the fact that we have been debating this bill all afternoon and Members have work to do in their offices before the day is over.

The amendment would merely fund 98 percent of the jobs programed in the bill. It would, in effect, make a reduction of 2 percent in the jobs contemplated to be filled by the appropriation for next year.

I wish to remind members of the Committee that the Department of the Interior has 82,000 jobs, about 60,000 of which are in the Department proper and the others are in what is called related activities.

I would remind the Committee also that as of December 31, 1966, the Department had 4,820 unfilled jobs under the levels appropriated for last year.

Some of these job vacancies came about by reason of the circular issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget last September directing that employment levels be rolled back to the level of July 31, 1966, in order to reduce employment.

Part of the vacancies came about as a result of that directive, but part also came about because of the inability of the Department to fill the jobs on a timely basis due to delays in recruitment and other delays incident to the filling of the jobs.

It has been said here today that most of these new jobs provided for in the bill are in very important activities such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Park Service, and so forth.

I would call your attention to page 118, part I of the hearings, in which there is a list showing where these vacancies occur; 1,907 of the 4,800 job vacancies are in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and 828 of the vacancies are in the National Park Service.

I submit to you that if the Department of the Interior could operate throughout 1966 with 4,800 fewer jobs than were appropriated for last year and do a good job as it has done, I cannot see why, in view of the critical budget situation that we face and the deficit that is contemplated next year, the Department cannot do so in the new year without increasing employment by 1,662 jobs as contemplated in the bill before you today.

I would also call the attention of the committee to the statement of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which appears on page 78 of part II and I quote:

Mrs. HANSEN. Another area of concern to the committee is the ceilings being placed on personnel by the Budget Bureau shortly after the appropriation is available. You fellows come up here and justify your personnel needs, in some cases indicating the whole program will fall apart if you don't get what you are requesting in personnel. Then after the committee recommends an appropriation in good conscience, we find you don't need as many personnel as you claimed you did.

That is exactly the situation we are now in. They did not need and did not fill the jobs we gave them last year. They wound up on December 31, 1966, with 4,800 vacancies. They do not need the new jobs they are asking for next year. I do not believe my amendment will adversely affect any activity of the Department and believe it deserves the support of the Committee today. Let us strike a blow for economy and fiscal responsibility. The country is counting on Congress to hold the line against excessive and unnecessary spending. Let us today measure up to our responsibility in that regard.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have very carefully tried to take cognizance, as the gentleman from North Carolina said, of the excess positions in certain areas. I believe it is well for us to remember where some of these position vacancies were. They were among teachers in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and services such as that.

Also it is well to remember that the Bureau of the Budget imposed personnel ceilings, and there were not as many positions to be filled. Fund reductions recommended by the committee will tend to reduce the number of positions by about 900. But when you reduce the number of positions and automatically put a ceiling such as that which the gentleman has suggested you shall have said, "Don't do some of the work." Many of the positions in the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior are connected with vital activities such as firefighting and the care of Indians in hospitals, and so forth.

We have discovered also that sometimes when we curtail personnel, there is a tendency on the part of the agencies to contract for the work, and in many instances it has been far more costly than using in-house personnel. If you put a blanket ceiling on personnel, suppose a forest fire breaks out some place and there is necessity to put it out. Shall we let the fire burn? The same principle is true with respect to a group of sick Indians in a hospital. Shall we allow them to lie there without care?

I think credence must be given to a committee's attempt to reconcile the

work that must be done. And again I remind you of the revenue-producing work, and its relationship to employees. The committee has carefully analyzed this whole matter, and I do urge that you vote down the amendment.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret that I must oppose my distinguished friend from North Carolina. He mentions the Indian Bureau and the vacancies they have had. There has been the rollback, freeze, or whatever you may want to call it, having to do with the employees in that particular agency of Government, keeping employment at levels that existed on July 1.

The schools of the Indian Bureau are scattered from Alaska to Florida. They are in North Carolina, Missisippi, all throughout the Midwest, and from the Mississippi River clear out to the west coast. These schools are in isolated areas. It is difficult to get teachers to go to them because salaries are higher in public schools, and teachers do not want to put up with the isolation. It is only the most dedicated who want to help those who are in need who will go out to those places, and by the time the Bureau of Indian Affairs has gone out to get teachers to man these schools, the public schools have already had their choice.

Many teachers are reluctant to go into the Bureau of Indian Affairs school program because of the isolation, so the lowest point at which we would have teachers employed in the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be in July, because the schools do not start until September. Many of the positions are not filled even after the school starts. Then the schools are closed in May, so the teachers leave then. That accounts for many of these so-called vacancies that are reported. We have a teacher on the job for, say, 7 months or 8 months, and that is only seven-twelfths or eight-twelfths of a man-year.

I have been to some of the hospitals on recent visits to the Indian reservations. The personnel ceilings have affected them, so that they are not able to get doctors and nurses to come to the hospitals. As the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] has pointed out, these are small agencies scattered in different parts of the country. The bureaus and other agencies of the Government are in the same situation in the Interior Department. It is not easy. If they were all one monolithic group in one body in an agency, we could cut personnel 2 percent across the board and not reduce the services that are so important and so needed in the classrooms and in the hospitals.

Last fall I visited a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries installation. They had an outstanding scientist, who was dealing with the breeding of fish, and who had discovered a way of hatching fish and growing them from the small egg to maturity—the first time this has happened in the history of biological science—and yet, because of these cuts that are arbitrarily made; were it not for a student on the university campus who would devote his time without charge to help the professor with this project, the tremendous work that was done and much of the information would have been lost.

I hope the members of this Committee will vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONAS) there were—ayes 36, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 45, immediately following line 17, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered five times last year and once this year. It should not require any further explanation. I will explain it briefly, however, just so your recollection may be refreshed as to what it would accomplish.

It would limit the expenditure of funds appropriated in this bill so that expenditure thereof would not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for in the bill beyond 95 percent of the amount which the President's January budget estimated would be spent by these agencies in fiscal 1968.

To the extent that there are 1-year appropriations in the bill, and a great body of appropriations are for 1 year, the effect of the amendment would be to reduce the funds in this bill by 5 percent and the President's proposed 1968 spending by about 5 percent. To the extent that there are multiple-year appropriations in the bill, the amounts of the reduction in the bill and in the President's planned spending would depend upon the availability of carryover funds which the President could use to finance activities of agencies provided for in the bill.

The amendment does not affect the spending of previously appropriated funds and it does not cut any individual appropriation item in the bill. Simply put, it limits the President's total proposed spending in fiscal 1968 to 95 percent of the aggregate amount that would otherwise be spent by the agencies provided for in the bill.

Since the amendment goes to the aggregate spending rather than to spending on individual programs, it would give the President substantial flexibility in determining where cuts could be made without any crippling effect upon the essential services of government. As a matter of fact within the framework of the bill, the President would have the same flexibility in determining where individual cuts should be made as he had last fall when he announced a budgetary cutback of $5.3 billion in Federal programs in an effort to save $3 billion from planned spending during the current fiscal year.

Of course, the expenditure limitation amendment would make the reductions mandatory and the administration would not be in a position to rescind the cuts as has been done recently with respect to the President's proposed $3 billion reduction in 1967 spending.

If Congress fails this year to curb Federal expenditures, then spending on nondefense programs, exclusive of interest, will have almost doubled—97-percent increase—in the 8 years since 1960, when the budget was last balanced. We simply cannot escape the fact that necessary expenditures for the War in Vietnam are increasing, and they probably will continue to escalate for the foreseeable future. Never before in our Nation's history have we attempted to fight a war on the one hand and on the other continue business as usual with respect to nondefense spending. The continued pursuit of such a policy at this time can only result in further price inflation, either increased taxes or an unmanageable deficit, and the threat of debility in the economy's private sector should a recession develop from the present slowdown in economic growth. For these reasons, I urge you to support the amendment.

It has been suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey that an across-the-board cut such as this would take away from the House the opportunity to allocate where cuts should be made. I am sure the gentleman knows, as do the other Members of the House, that the President does not have to spend any of the money we appropriate, so we do not direct him where to spend the money. If he wants to cut down any place he can, so this is not taking away from the House of Representatives any of its prerogatives. The President has that power already. We only appropriate, and he spends what he wants to spend where he wants to spend it.

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

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I am sure the gentleman will concede that under the present arrangement the Executive cannot spend more than we appropriate.

As I understand the gentleman's amendment, in this 5-percent area it would give the Executive unbridled discretion.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is completely wrong. We only say to him that he can spend no more than 95 percent of the amount he estimated in the budget for 1968 would be spent. That does not give him an opportunity to spend any more in any field. He is limited by the amount in the budget estimate.

He did that last year, as the gentleman well knows, after Congress adjourned. He did exactly this sort of thing. He held up $5.3 billion.

When the Director of the Bureau of

the Budget called me and told me the President was going to do this, and wanted me to know it, I said, "This sounds very much like the Bow amendment to me." With the exception of highways, it was pretty much the Bow amendment.

So the President did it anyway.

I say we are not taking away the powers of the House of Representatives, because the President has that power now. What the House of Representatives will be saying to the President is that we are now exercising the powers of Congress and saying to him, "Mr. President, you cannot spend beyond 95 percent."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Bow was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. BOW. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman, so that I may have 2 minutes.

Mr. JOELSON. I take only a half minute to tell the gentleman how delighted we are that he is back here again, hale and hearty, fighting away, even though we disagree.

Having said that, I take the other half minute to say that the 5 percent still would give to the President discretion as to how he would diminish that 5 percent of spending.

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman that the President already has the authority. He used it after the Congress adjourned by freezing $5.3 billion and he used his own discretion as to where he would do it. This will give the House the opportunity to say to the President, "You cannot spend beyond 95 percent." This is the way really to get at this budget and begin to get some cuts in it. Then we can go back to the people and say, "Congress has done it." In doing it we will not affect any essential service of the Government.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Would it not be fair to say it is absolutely the only way Congress can exercise any control over spending?

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not think I need to go into any great depth on this subject, because the House has discussed it repeatedly. I took my oath of office as a Member of the legislative body. I am not about to abdicate one small part of it to the discretion of any other branch of the three branches of Government. I do not propose after spending all the time that we have spent on a subcommittee determining those items we felt logically and properly belonged in a budget, that we should finally say, "Mr. President, here, you just do what you please with it." Otherwise, why should it not be more sensible to appropriate the full amount of his budget and say to him, "You go ahead and spend it any way you please as long as you take off 5 percent."

I would like to point out that there is already a 6.3 percent cut here. I would like to point one other thing out, too. Those programs the Executive might not think are the proper programs, in spite of what you and I think, and might be the very ones that would be included in the reduction. Frankly, I prefer to retain my prerogatives as a Member of Congress.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I will not take the 5 minutes allotted me but merely emphasize what the chairman has said. We worked diligently on this budget and recommended a 6.3-percent reduction. It just seems to me we have gone as far as we can in this regard. I hope this amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 42, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia: On page 45, between lines 17 and 18, insert:

"SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for any purpose relating to the charging of entrance fees to any recreational sites owned by the United States."

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, on Friday, April 14, this year, the Corps of Engineers announced that they would be charging this year, at 168 recreational sites throughout the United States, fees in accord with the so-called Golden Passport program.

Mr. Chairman, this represents an increase of some 16 sites over the number of sites at which fees were charged last year.

The fees that are charged are fees charged not only by the Corps of Engineers, but they are also charged by the National Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, as well as the Bureau of Land Management, and the Corps of Engineers in the water recreational areas.

Mr. Chairman, from 1944 until 1965, there were no fees charged, in fact, the Flood Control Act of 1944 specifically prohibited the charging of fees.

In 1965, as the result of an act of Congress, this prohibition was deleted by section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

What this means is simply this, that we will be charging the people of the United States a fee for using the various recreational sites throughout the country and which were constructed with their tax money.

There are a number of areas, of course, that are involved in this situation.

Mr. Chairman, since this announcement was made on April 14, I have received several inquiries from constituents, whom it is my honor to represent, primarily because Lake Lanier, one of the newly included areas, is located near my district.

There were approximately 8 million persons who visited this facility last year, according to the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Chairman, I recall very, very vividly that when this lake was constructed, we were told that the people of the area would be given free access and free recreational use of this facility, in addition to the generation of hydroelectric power, and that they would be able to go on picnics, water skiing, and hiking without charge.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I can afford the $7 charge or the $1 charge if I go for a visit to one of these facilities. However, there are so many people who live in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent who simply cannot afford this fee. They may be able to afford enough gasoline in order to get their car to the site but the payment of such a fee is going to deprive them of the money which they need for the support of their families.

Mr. Chairman, we have had in Washington this week the National Letter Carriers who are asking for a raise in pay. These hard-working people, after having served for a period of 21 years, will make as much as $7,200 per year. And, Mr. Chairman, they need every penny they make. However, if you charge these fees to someone who is attempting to send his child through school on an income of $600 a month, this is going to work a hardship upon him.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we hear the cry that there are going to be riots throughout the country this summer unless certain recreational facilities are made available to the people.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit to the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that by charging fees for the use of recreational areas, we will encourage these people to remain in their ghettos, because many of them supply cannot afford the cost, the entrance cost, into these particular areas.

I would like to appeal for support from both sides of the aisle. These areas have been developed with the taxpayers' money. They are to be used by all the people. Now they are charging the $1 fee per person. This is not an exorbitant fee to me, but it is going to be to many people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment in order to prohibit any of the funds from this act being used for the purpose of charging fees to the people, for the recreational facilities that have been built with the taxpayers' money.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do—and this is a very short and quick summary—it would repeal the entire land and water conservation fund program. There is no faster way to unbalance the Interior Department budget than by the adoption of this amendment. This is a matter for consideration in the authorizing committee. We have discussed it with our Committee on Appropriations and with the chairman of the authorizing committee—who will speak on this in just a few moments—but this is something that

should not be done at this particular point in time, for this would negate the authorizing legislation and eliminate a sizable amount of the funding in the budget without any further consideration or discussion. To my mind this would be absolutely the most imprudent thing this House could do, and I sincerely hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is an instance where this House spent years and years trying to get a program that would work. We are still interested in listening and talking to those who still have some reservations about the program. This amendment has taken us completely by surprise this afternoon, the amendment that the gentleman from Alabama has offered.

I would suggest that if each one of the members of this committee would stop and think a moment and try and realize what this amendment will do to the recreational program, not only in this one area of Alabama but throughout the entire United States, he will oppose the amendment.

If the Members wish to change the authorizing legislation, why, of course, that is their prerogative, and that is their responsibility, and the committee which I chair will be very glad to hear them. But if they want to gut this bill insofar as recreation is concerned, if they want to gut the outdoor recreational program which is an outgrowth of the Outdoor Recreational Review Commission's suggestions and recommendations, then all they have to do is to accept amendments such as this without proper hearing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time principally to state a position that I know is shared by a good many on both sides of the aisle, which is a position in sympathy with the amendment which the gentleman from Georgia has presented here on this floor this afternoon.

I believe there are many of us on our side of the aisle, as well as on the other side of the aisle, who question the wisdom of the entrance fee approach in connection with our outdoor recreational program.

Further, I believe that we have had evidence presented very recently to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs indicating that among the administrators of this program there has been a great deal of disappointment in the revenues derived from the fees, and that they are reviewing at this time the fee system and its effectiveness.

At the same time, I will agree with the gentlewoman who is the chairman of the subcommittee, and with the chairman of the full committee, that this is not the proper time or the proper piece of legislation with which to deal with this subject matter.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman has stated a position that will have many friends on future dates, and in this forum. I believe the experience of this year may very well bring the administration itself to the point of recommending a complete change with reference to the fee system that is now in use.

But I do think they have made a good case before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for being permitted to continue the use of the fee system through this current year and to see just how it works out in the recreational areas of the country.

I hope the amendment will be rejected at this time with the understanding that the experience of this year may very well lead a number of us to support a subsequent piece of legislation to deal with this subject in the next session of the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], concerning the ridiculous determination that has been made by the Department of the Interior to charge the local citizens living near the Wichita Mountain Refuge user fees for access to the eight recreational areas in the park.

I have been contacted by many of my constituents in the southwestern part of Oklahoma in regard to the charging of these fees. The public reaction of the charging of these fees under the so-called golden eagle program has been one of unanimous disapproval.

There have been no new facilities constructed in the eight recreational areas in the Wichita refuge since the CCC days of the depression. The refuge does attract some tourists but because of its remoteness most of the visitors are simply a constant turnover from the local area or from the Fort Sill military installation.

In my opinion the business of charging user fees for facilities which were constructed 30 years ago not only positively constitutes double taxation but at the same time simply does not constitute good commonsense. I would hope that the Secretary of the Interior would ask the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to reconsider their determinations and remove the unnecessary and burdensome fees from this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take time to say that I think the House of Representatives owes a vote of thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington, for the very efficient and knowledgeable manner in which she has handled this bill.

This is the first time a woman Member of the House of Representatives has ever managed an appropriation bill on the floor. The gentlewoman from Washington has set a precedent that all Members could well emulate.

Mr. Chairman, I know that we all join in commending her.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma and I would like to express my appreciation to the Members of the House today who have been so patient. I also want to say that no bill is possible without all of us working together. I do express my deepest appreciation to each and every Member of the House of Representatives for your courteous consideration and your kind understanding and cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9029) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 45, immediately following line 17, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond ninety-five percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] demands the yeas and nays.

Members in favor of taking the vote by the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted.

A sufficient number have arisen.

In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement of April 20, further proceedings on the bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 9029.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## BILL TO HELP CURB MISMANAGEMENT AND WASTE IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the proposed fiscal year 1968 budget has received considerable criticism in this Chamber and many Members are hoping certain nondefense programs can be trimmed or eliminated. The President wants a surtax imposed to reduce the size of the contemplated recordbreaking budget deficit. Yet, amid the talk of reducing expenditures, far too little attention is given to waste, inefficiency, and mismanagement of public funds.

In the 89th Congress, I introduced a measure which was designed to get at the sources of much of the mismanagement and waste in the executive department. It went to the roots of these problems which lie in improved administrative procedures and the ferreting out of individuals and practices underlying the misuse of our tax dollars. Today I resubmit a slightly revised version of my earlier bill because the problems it seeks to solve remain. They have undoubtedly grown in the last 2 years. Let me again review the principal objectives of this legislation:

First. To require publication in General Accounting Office reports of the names of Government employees personally responsible for failing to comply with the laws or administrative procedures in spending public funds after this has once been reported by the Comptroller General to the appropriate agency head.

Second. To require that before one cent of taxpayers' money can be spent by a newly established Federal agency, the head of that agency must consult with the Comptroller General to become well acquainted with requirements for the disbursement of funds and contracting procedures.

Third. To suspend from all agencies whose accounting systems have not been approved by the General Accounting Office within 2 years after passage of the bill, and requiring all new agencies to meet these approved standards within 2 years after they begin operation.

Fourth. To require that every agency which receives General Accounting Office recommendations because of findings of mismanagement of funds must submit to the Bureau of the Budget a report of corrective action to prevent recurring waste.

Now let us consider the provision to require the Comptroller General to publish the names of persons responsible for improper handling of public funds.

First, it is a basic concept of American government that all activities of public employees should be open to inspection, excepting only those of a purely personal nature or involving the national security. Accordingly, persons charged with the authority to disburse public funds should be publicly held accountable for their actions. To hide by anonymity or pass the buck through the "chain of command" is a great disservice to the American people. It is with this in mind that I submit the Comptroller General should publish the names of persons whose fiscal or legal decisions have cost the taxpayers unnecessarily through inefficient operations.

I believe in rewarding those in Federal service whose suggestions and good judgment merit recognition. Through the Government employees' incentive awards program, 67,731 awards, averaging $36, were given for superior job performance in 1964. More than 118,800 suggestions were adopted with awards averaging $40 presented to many thousands of officials. If such an expansive program can be conducted for promoting good work, surely it is only proper to seek to identify and obtain disciplinary action or dismissal, where justified, for those failing in judgment, training or intent, to meet the standards of responsibility with which they are charged.

The Comptroller General presently has the basic authority for access to records of Government agencies but does not regularly publish the names of individuals involved in deficiencies in his periodic reports. However, former Comptroller General Campbell believes it desirable to identify these decision-making personnel and has stated this in a letter addressed to me on March 18, 1965:

> In order to achieve for the Congress and the agency involved the greatest benefits from our findings, it is our policy not only to clearly demonstrate the existence of deficiencies and their actual or potential adverse effects, but also to determine, insofar as practicable, the underlying causes. In this respect, we consider it desirable to closely relate the deficiencies we find, not only with the specific practices and procedures, but also with the organizational units and individuals who are responsible for the existence or occurrence of the deficiencies since we feel that there is no substitute for a strong sense of personal responsibility in conducting the Government's affairs.

The legislation I propose requires that when the Comptroller General finds that a particular Government employee is not complying with the prescribed procedures for dispensing funds, property or assets for which he is responsible, this information must be called to the attention of the head of his department or agency. If, in a subsequent audit, the Comptroller General finds the same individual guilty of the same or similar deficiencies and corrective or disciplinary action has not been taken against him, then the name of this individual shall be published in the General Accounting Office reports on that agency. With the names of such persons and a documented report on the deficiencies involved, appropriate committees of Congress can conduct investigations, draft new legislation or otherwise determine what action is needed to rectify these situations.

This bill goes to the heart of a great many of the wasteful practices which are often repeated. I believe it is essential that every accounting system must be adequate to properly and prudently dispense Federal moneys in accordance with statutory provisions and good business practices. My bill will require executive departments and agencies to bring their accounting procedures into conformity with the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act within 2 years. This 2-year limitation will also apply to all new agencies. If a department fails to comply, all expenditures of public funds must cease until the Comptroller General approves the agency's accounting system.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about Federal spending over a period of years we are referring to astronomical figures in the hundreds of billions of dollars. We should also not overlook these facts: In 1963, the Comptroller General presented evidence of potential savings of $218,380,000 and for 1964 the figure was $294,323,000. When we speak of accounting systems we are speaking of 128 such systems within the civil departments and agencies subject to General Accounting Office approval. These agencies have had more than 14 years to improve and modernize their accounting systems. Look at the results: Only 41 complete systems and parts of 15 others had been approved through May, 1964. In 1964 the Comptroller General made the following statement regarding the delinquencies in improving their systems:

> In the nearly 14 years that have gone by * * * the number of executive agency accounting systems that have been modernized, improved and brought into conformity with the requirements of law and the broad principles and standards prescribed by our office is disappointingly small.

This bill would require that all agencies receiving Government Accounting Office recommendations for improved procedures or policies submit a report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on whether the agency has complied with the recommendations and, if not, why. The President has pledged his administration will fight waste, so, through this bill, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget must review the progress of executive departments and agencies to eliminate recurring waste. A compilation of the reports to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will be submitted to Congress annually for re-

view, particularly by the Government Operations Committee and Appropriations Committee.

While a basic problem in any government is the ability and judgment of personnel at every level of decisionmaking, the administrative officer should be quick to take remedial action when a Government Accounting Office recommendation is brought to his attention. Presently, except for the initiative taken by an administrator and the encouragement in that direction contained in the Bureau of the Budget's Circular No. A-50 of April 1, 1959, little coordination or control is maintained over recurring waste.

The President, in his far-reaching legislative program, has proposed a number of completely new agencies, and at least one new cabinet department. I believe the Congress has a responsibility beyond simply criticizing Government officials after waste has been discovered. We should build, develop, and reinforce administrative practices to keep newly hired officials in full and accurate compliance with the statutes under which new Government establishments must operate. The heads of all new agencies are required to consult with the Comptroller General on principles, standards, and related requirements for accounting and legal disbursement of public funds in my bill. This procedure is mandatory because only by a thorough review of the contracting and expenditure systems can an accounting system function with minimum difficulty and maximum efficiency.

The Acting Comptroller General submitted a report and comments on this measure to the House Government Operations Committee on November 22, 1965. His statements were constructive and largely favorable. Mr. Weitzel indicated that in most cases his investigators can and do ascertain the causes and identify persons directly responsible for undesirable conditions although presently names of such individuals are not normally included in audit reports. The GAO would consider all contributing factors before placing the name of an individual in a report. Such prudence and latitude are allowed in the bill I propose. It was suggested that perhaps the Bureau of the Budget rather than the GAO be the recipient of such statements of personnel deficiencies. My bill would place this responsibility with the GAO because it is an arm of Congress. The Bureau of the Budget is part of the Executive Office of the President and has no particular sensitivity or responsiveness to the Congress.

Improved standards of auditing practice by executive agencies is the purpose of section II. I am pleased the approach contained in the bill has been embraced by GAO. Mr. Weitzel stated:

> We are, of course, in agreement with the objective of section 3 of the bill, namely, to accelerate development, installation, and effective management use of financial information produced by a modern accounting system in each executive agency.

This section, as well as others, may be modified to make them more administratively suitable and I welcome suggestions such as were presented by the GAO. The GAO position helps to confirm the necessity for adopting this or similar legislation.

Abundant examples to document the need for this bill are available to my colleagues and the American people. I simply refer you to any annual report of the Comptroller General, the Comptroller General's periodic reports to Congress, and various hearings and reports of the House and Senate Government Operations Committees.

This measure is particularly timely. I hope the overriding need for economy as expressed in this Congress will bring this bill to active consideration by the House. Here is a measure to save taxpayers dollars, not appropriate more of them. What a refreshing exercise it would be to enact a law such as I am proposing rather than continue to appropriate funds which result in mountainous waste accruing through the vast Federal bureaucracy.

## TANZANIA'S UNION DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, April 26 marks the third anniversary of Tanzania's Union Day which celebrates the creation of the United Republic of Tanzania from the former countries of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.

Tanzania is a vast and often strikingly beautiful land of 362,000 square miles with a population of more than 10 million diverse peoples primarily engaged in agriculture. Contained within her borders are some of the most beautiful vistas of Africa—the mighty snow-capped Kilimanjaro soaring nearly 20,000 feet, the vast rolling plans of Serengeti, and the sparkling beaches lining the Indian Ocean.

For centuries Tanzania has been an important trading terminus for the peoples of many lands. Boats from the Persian gulf states, from India, and in ancient times, from as far as China regularly plied the ocean routes to Dar es Salaam, Kilwa and Zanzibar; and the Sultans of Zanzibar ruled an area extending from Mozambique to Somalia.

Today Tanzania, like so many of the newly independent nations of the world, is seeking her own place in the sun. Under the guiding hand of the vastly talented Julius Nyerere, a personal friend of mine, the peoples of Tanzania are working together with talent, industry and dedication in building a new and brighter future for their young nation.

We as Americans contribute greatly to this process of nationbuilding in Tanzania. Already hundreds of Americans in the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development and many other organizations have helped by teaching skills and by assisting in building an economic infrastructure. Today we honor the leaders and people of the United Republic of Tanzania for what they have accomplished and for their unquenchable determination to seek a better future for their country.

My sincere good wishes go today to the people of Tanzania and their able and devoted leader, the great Julius Nyerere.

On the wall of my office in the Rayburn Building hang two photographs of Julius Nyerere. Ours has been a long and enduring friendship with its commencement long before independence had come to his country. When independence did come, Tanganyika, the land of his birth and of his affection, it was my happy good fortune to be present as a representative of my country as the Union Jack was lowered and the flag of a new sovereign nation was unfurled in the tropical winds of Africa.

Several times I had flown from Dar es Salaam to Zanzibar and my visits there and my friendly conversations with the people of Zanzibar had left me with a sense of enthrallment.

Mr. Speaker, the future of Africa is in the hands of the Africans. I have complete and abiding confidence in the brilliance of that future. With faith and confidence we can leave the pattern of Africa's tomorrow in the hands of today's Africa to mold. I venture to predict that the spirit of union will be increasingly reflected in the building of that pattern, and the union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar that we celebrate today well may be the forerunner of other unions to come.

Again my heartfelt good wishes to the government and the people of Tanzania.

## PASSOVER AND ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, during this historic and meaningful time of the Passover holidays, so sacred to the Jewish people all over the world, so significant in terms of deliverance from bondage and oppression, I feel that it is particularly appropriate that I should address the House to offer my best wishes and affectionate regard to my Jewish friends and to the Jewish people.

I was pleased to join the Members of the House who recently signed the joint statement on Soviet anti-Semitism.

It seems to me that this is a matter which deserves widespread support, and I hope that the able, distinguished gentleman from New York, our esteemed friend, Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM, and his associates, will have additional good results in enlisting a representative number of House Members in behalf of this imperative intercession.

I want to commend these able, distinguished Members, not only upon their Joint Statement on Soviet Jewry, but also upon the timing of their protest to coincide with the commencement of the sacred Passover season, which at the time of the release of this manifesto will be in the process of faithful observance by Jews all over the world.

I have addressed the House before on the subject of repression and supression of Jewish religious and cultural life in the Soviet Union.

It is an incredible thing in this advanced day and age that any nation should restrict within its boundaries the right of citizens, or others living under the jurisdiction of its government, free worship of the God of their own choice, or to deny them any of the rights which we in America have cherished for so many years, and the people of the world have come to know as human rights.

To be sure, the Jewish people have long been exposed to despicable persecution, hostility, and discrimination. But thank God, in recent times, these detested marks of tyranny, bigotry, and prejudice have been disappearing at a rapid rate and there are now relatively few civilized nations in the world where they can be practiced.

It is incomprehensible that the powerful Russian nation which professes and prides itself on its high level of economic advancement and interest in the people should still permit, in any sense whatever, palpable discrimination and the denial of freedom of worship and cultural rights to any of its citizens, or for that matter, any human being living within its borders.

I reiterate the views that I have previously expressed in this matter, and again urge our State Department to make known through diplomatic channels, and by collective action wherever that can be effected, in or out of the United Nations, or in any other way, to try to prevail upon the Russian Government to put an end to this kind of prejudice and discrimination, so that there will be true deliverance from oppression and tyranny of this kind for a courageous, God-fearing, undaunted race of people, who place the worship of the fatherhood of God above their personal safety and their personal affairs.

I am also forwarding my views to President Johnson, advising him of my deep interest in the restoration and recognition of minority, religious rights of the Jewish people in Russia, and urging him to use his own good offices in every way that he can, as head of this great, powerful government, to bring an early end to every vestige of suppression of religious worship and cultural rights and other human rights of the Jewish people.

Religious freedom is a basic cornerstone of this Government, and one of the most conspicuous marks of an advanced civilization. I hope and pray that the Soviet Union will recognize and implement this principle in its relations with our Jewish brethren, and thus give all believers in God to know that it upholds the right of every human being to practice his own religious faith and his own familial and cultural patterns and beliefs.

## ARMENIA DESERVES FREEDOM

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Armenia is an historic state dating back to the fourth century with a language, culture, and church structure of its own. One of the tragedies of history is that the Armenia people do not enjoy their independence.

On April 25th we commemorated the 52d anniversary of the Turkish genocide of the Armenians, recalling not only the great self-sacrifice of this virile and ancient nation in the cause of good government and human rights, but also the important contributions made by the Armenian people to the Allied war effort of 1915–18. The Armenians, although the smallest of the Allied nations to participate in World War I, contributed more to the Allied cause in terms of casualties than any other single Allied state, large or small. Such great sacrifices and devotion to the cause of freedom must not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Members that at a time when Communist aggression is increasing in Vietnam and it is clear that the major culprit is the Soviet Union, we must maintain our interest in the restoration of freedom to the people of Armenia and the other captives of communism.

Surely, a nation that has suffered so much is deserving of its freedom.

## LETTER FROM BROOKFIELD, ILL., POSTMASTER

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office Committee I have benefited by the constructive comments of postmasters, supervisors, clerks, and carriers who write to express their concern over problems facing the Department. Very often they offer very thoughtful and constructive suggestions. Postmaster Michael Colgrass, of Brookfield, Ill., is dedicated to his career in the post office and recently wrote to me expressing his views on the size of certain bulk mail items. In view of the fact that the House Post Office Committee will soon delve into the matter of postal rates, I believe this letter from a dedicated postmaster merits attention:

U.S. POST OFFICE,
*Brookfield, Ill., March 21, 1967.*

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
*Congressman, Fourth District, Illinois,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The unprecedented volume of mails, together with constant turnover of manpower has taxed the resources of my office to the maximum. I find the same condition in most all post offices in metropolitan Chicago. Postmasters gather at regular monthly meetings, hold a round-table discussion for the good of the service and the predominant points of discussion generally lead to the manpower problem, and particularly the constant handling of unusual heavy volume of third class bulk rate permit mail received in *chunk size*.

Large articles of a nonpreferential nature, serviced under bulk mail permit at a reduced postage rate, involving all stop or nearly all stop listing of chunk size samples, is presenting a grave problem not only in cost but also delay of delivery within the lawful 48 hour period in many cases.

March 14 I clocked at my office a complete city distribution listing of a 20 page Easter sale Korvette flat mail at two hours. For comparison, I clocked a city distribution all stop mailing of free samples containing sandwich bags which come in chunk size 9½" x 2" x 2", mailed by Scott Paper Co. at a total of 16 hours.

During the week of March 13–18, this office also received chunk size samples of Pampers Diapers, 8¾" x ⅝" x 4½" under bulk mail permit from Procter & Gamble; chunk size cereal samples 5⅝" x 4⅛" x 1⅛" from General Mills; Mashed Potato Buds samples, 4" x 2¾" x 1 9/16" chunks from General Mills, all at special reduced rate bulk mail permit.

Our office or any other postoffice to my knowledge, is not equipped to case chunk mail. In your school days, you will remember the time you carried mail part time. I am sure you can now vision the slow handling of this type of mail. If chunk mail cannot be cased, naturally it will have to be rotated and strapped separately.

The largest sample article mentioned above was too large to strap, therefore they were relayed loose, a portion each day; the plastic sandwich bags were strapped 16 to a bundle; the cereal samples, strapped 10 to a bundle; the Potato Bud chunks 12 to a bundle.

Mr. Congressman, with your postoffice experience you can readily observe the snails pace chunks are processed. The relay mail box space available daily is limited. This mail is not only costly to the Department, it also creates a backlog.

The next operation for the mail carrier is to lay out these chunks from relay boxes to mail bag. A much slower operation than bundles of letter size or bundles of flat mail.

The delivery of chunks to homes also presents a problem. Mail boxes are constructed to contain letter size mail, magazines and other flats, but not for chunks. We try to put samples between the house door and storm door if a storm door is installed and unlocked. Or we place it on the doorstep and ring the doorbell. When no one is home this type of mail is unprotected from inclement weather.

I have served as Postmaster for 33 years. In all these years I have been able to keep my expenditures close to man-hour allowance authorized by the Department. In the past twelve months our post office and other post offices in our area have received all stop bulk mailing of letter size, flats and chunks to the extent that it has continuously raised the cost of operation for auxiliary assistants and overtime to record proportions. For years this office has had fairly stable routes. In 1966 the increased volume of mail required all route adjustment. This year I will be forced to again adjust all routes. This will continue to raise my cost of operation.

Because of the continuous increase in the cost of operation, I took a cost analysis of chunk mail, using the sandwich bag sample 9½" x 2" x 2". The all stop number of sample pieces received is 6,097. The Department revenue for this article per piece is 3.6 cents. The cost to deliver the chunk piece at this office is as follows:

| | *Hours* |
|---|---|
| City distribution to carriers | 16 |
| Carrier time to case | 15 |
| Tie and sack for relay | 20 |
| Special afternoon relay, 3 days at 2 hours per relay | 6 |

| | Hours |
|---|---|
| One-fifth minute delivery per piece (6,097) | 23 |
| Total | 80 |
| 80 hours at average cost of $3.24 per hour | $259.20 |
| Cost to deliver 1 piece [1] (cents each) | 4.24 |
| Post office revenue (cents each) | 3.60 |
| *Loss* to the Department at this office (cents each) | .64 |

[1] $250.20 divided by 6,097 pieces delivery cost equals 4.24 cents each.

This, of course, does not take into consideration the cost per piece at office of sender from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19105, the sectional centers, nor the transportation cost of this mailing.

The cost to the Department for the sample articles which we refer to as chunk is tremendous. This type of mailing is constantly on the increase. The loss to the Department is obvious from the moment we accept this type of mail.

As our Congressman and a member of the House Post Office Committee may I respectfully request that consideration be given to change the law pertaining to bulk mail permit privileges for *chunk size* mail. This type of mail does not fit in the carrier case nor our patrons mail box and because of the tremendous loss of revenue, consider this type of mail as odd size and to charge the company a regular piece rate instead of bulk rate, which will bring additional revenue to the postal service.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL COLGRASS,
*Postmaster.*

## RIGHT OR WRONG—MY COUNTRY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, many who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regularly are aware, I am sure, of the famous editorial entitled "I Am a Tired American." It was penned by a fearlessly outspoken patriot, Al McIntosh, of Luverne, Minn. After first appearing in Al's paper, the Rock County Star-Herald, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it went on to receive numerous honors and awards and has become one of the most widely reprinted editorials in modern history.

Mr. Speaker, Al has done it again. I am proud, indeed, to insert in today's RECORD another McIntosh editorial certain to swell the hearts of Americans:

RIGHT OR WRONG—MY COUNTRY

Time was when you stood up for America. Proud.

Standing tall and straight even tho you were only four foot high.

Time was when patriotic songs and readings weren't taboo, like Christmas, in our schools.

Time was when every school boy knew these great lines.

"My country—may she ever be right; But right or wrong—my country."

And American citizens believed in that creed—and they lived by that creed. Love of country flamed like an eternal torch with fierce pride and tender love of country.

Our officials didn't go round from door to door of world capitols humbly explaining and cravenly "justifying" our policies and unashamedly trying to buy "friendship" and "cooperation."

Our citizens didn't buckle at the knees at the onslaught of foreign propaganda.

We didn't wear shin guards in the diplomatic corps because foreigners weren't kicking us on the shins—with impunity and immunity.

Heart breaking isn't it.

Our shilly shallying, our "explanations", our "rationalization", our apologies didn't gain us one inch of stature in the world.

We've come off with nothing more than the title—"losers."

We Americans need a transfusion. We need an infusion of something precious. You can't buy it at any store at any price, but you can live it—free — — — the love of America.

The men in Viet Nam have it.

The folks at home need it.

Flag waving? You bet it is.

We are not one of the "raunchy brigade" who think patriotism is for the birds. (We're so happy that our parents migrated here from another country.)

A tolerant nation. Where else can Stokely Carmichael and his breed of vermin preach "we won't go?"

Where else in the world can ministers preach sedition and get away with it?

Where we let the scruffy unwashed parade with picket placards of hate!

Where else do intellectuals sneer and deride government policies?

Where else . . . but in America? And we protect them . . . as we should.

Republicans or Democrats, the great majority of Americans know that we are in a full scale shooting war where every day more Americans than we care to think about—pay the total price for patriotism. A war we didn't—and don't want—but on whose outcome the survival of the free world depends.

Because we won't cut off the war and devote that money to civil rights demands, then sedition is being openly preached in the streets.

This nation does have a troubled conscience. It hasn't done as well as it could, or should, in many ways. Civil rights included. But first things come first—and survival is "first" in America. If we don't maintain and preserve the United States then we'll guarantee our street demonstrators they won't find any "rights" in a Communist prison camp.

The grab baggers of the world misinterpret us.

Our enemies are convinced by the clamor in America's streets and in public gatherings, that our nation is hopelessly split into two armed camps. And in that "split" they see hope. The hue and cry has excited "Uncle Ho" in Viet Nam into resolute determination. He is convinced that if he can hang on another year or two, that because of America's "division," he can achieve the final victory.

It's time we Americans got some starch in our spines and mustered up our courage to say "this is it." And mean it. And to draw the line and say "cross it . . . if you dare."

We don't want to model after Russia but isn't it a paradox that for all her 50 years the Russians have never had a "public relations officer."

They (the Russians) have answered protest with rebuffs and abuse.

They have answered appeals with insults.

They have apologized for nothing—even when caught red handed in lies and espionage.

They have met the proffered hand of friendship with espionage and arms.

They have answered independent action by brutality.

When the Hungarians revolted, that nation was brutally smashed to its knees by Soviet armor and troops.

The Russians theme is "so what?" Fait accomplis! Tragic isn't it?

Russia has achieved more rapport and understanding with other nations . . . more respect . . . than we have ever created with all our hat in hand apologizing in the capitals of the world.

What are we going to say is not said with conceit.

Or false pride.

Nor is it said with complacency.

"If any man or woman can point his finger at any other nation on the face of the earth and truthfully say:

"This nation is a greater nation than the United States.

"No other nation offers greater freedoms to everyone regardless of race, religion or color.

"No other nation offers greater opportunity to achieve the good things of life in a material or spiritual way.

"No other nation has such willingness to succor those oppressed, to empty its purses for those in need.

"No other nation has so much concern for the welfare of the sick, the elderly, the poor."

If any man can look me in the eye and tell me that, with proof of a better nation than America, then we'll join a 20th century expedition of modern day Pilgrims to sail away to that New World.

Come to think of it—on second thought—we don't think we'd go. We'll stay here just as long as a merciful Lord lets us . . . to work in our own tiny way for a better United States and a Happier World.

"My country—may she ever be right; but right or wrong—my country.

## MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, meat imports under Public Law 88–482, the Meat Import Act of 1964, have reached levels which are injuring domestic producers and jeopardizing the stability of American markets. The quantity of imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef and veal were up 30.7 percent in 1966 from 1965, and were up 50 percent in January from a year earlier.

Total meat imports, including mutton, under the meat import quota amendment were up 34 percent over 1965. These rising levels amounted to 823.5 million pounds in 1966.

To review the present situation for a moment, Mr. Speaker, Public Law 88–482 restricts the imports of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, and mutton to a level of the adjusted base quota. The law, however, provides that nothing will actually be done to check those imports unless the Secretary of Agriculture estimates in advance that the volume is likely to be more than 10 percent greater than the adjusted base quota.

The bill I am introducing today would change that arrangement in several respects. First, because there is no real reason we should suffer an additional 10

percent of import volume, this proposal would eliminate that overflow, thus limiting the imports to the quota.

Second, this bill would eliminate the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate in advance the level of imports and determine whether they will likely be greater than the allowable quantity. In this bill, the quota would be established by the law itself. Precedents for this measure come to mind in the Sugar Act and in laws governing certain imports from the Philippines.

Third, this bill would change the base period for the determination of the quota. Presently, the period is set at 1959–63. This includes a period of extremely high imports and is not representative of normal meat imports. It results in a base quota of 725,400,000 pounds. The bill I introduce today would set 1958–62 as the base period and result in an unadjusted quota of 585,500,000 pounds.

This proposal provides that quotas be imposed quarterly instead of annually so as to insure an even spread of imports to stabilize the market.

Because there could be an occasion when Congress could not act swiftly, the fifth provision would give authority to the executive branch to impose quotas on the importation of other meat products, if necessary, to prevent a damaging flood of such product. For example, this authority would be necessary in case the quotas on fresh, chilled and frozen beef were filled and there should be an effort to get around those quotas by importing beef in other forms.

Finally, the bill provides that offshore purchases of meat by the Department of Defense for the use of our troops abroad or otherwise shall be charged against the quota applicable to such meat.

The American farmer has suffered from rapidly rising imports for many months now. Last year, in spite of the astounding rise in our gross national product, per capita income on the farm was only $1,731, less than two-thirds the level of average per capita income for the entire country. The most recent figures show that the parity index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services was up 13 points in March over March 1966. The parity index for wages alone was up 61 points, and while costs rose, the prices farmers received fell and the parity ratio stood below 74, the lowest level since 1934.

Cattle prices, largely because of meat imports, have fallen far behind the rise in the general price level. The average price last month of choice slaughter steers in Chicago was $24.67 a hundred pounds, compared with $29.22 a hundred during March 1966, a decline of over $4.50 a hundred. Good feeder steers in Kansas City weighing 550 to 750 pounds averaged $26.57 a hundred in March 1966 and $23.08 a hundred in March of this year, a decline of $3.50 a hundred.

It looks now that that we will have a near record year of meat imports. American housewives, having been told by the President to shop for the cheapest cuts of meat, provide a ready market for these imports.

In addition, the American livestock producer is faced with an additional assault. The State Department is now promoting an international meat agreement patterned along the lines of the international wheat agreement which may open the doors of new markets to imports over and beyond those now permitted by law. Our shipments abroad would be limited and curtailed to meet the economic needs of Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, and Mexico and any other country that wants to start ranching.

Mr. Speaker, the experiences of the American livestock industry indicate that Public Law 88–482 needs close examination and amendment. The bill I am introducing today offers constructive change, and I urge its consideration.

---

## BARRY GOLDWATER SPEAKS OUT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the "Speaking Out" section of the February 11 Saturday Evening Post has been brought to my attention by Mr. Lyle Johnson, of Glencoe, Minn. Mr. Johnson asks that this article be brought to the attention of my colleagues here in the House, and I include "Don't Believe What the Liberals Tell You," by Barry Goldwater, at this point in my remarks:

DON'T BELIEVE WHAT THE LIBERALS TELL YOU

What do you call it when a person falsely makes the accusation that someone is associated with the enemies of democracy?

Or what do you call it when someone tries to slam the door on a political debate by the use of personal insults?

Or how do you describe the regular use of the plain old-fashioned lie as a tool of "truth"?

What do you call that kind of behavior? McCarthyism? Extremism? Birchism? Ku Klux Klanism? The Big Lie Technique?

Self-styled liberals, in particular, have a wide vocabulary of political and philosophical cuss words to describe such activities. They should. They are personally guilty of practicing every one of those techniques even as they weep, wail, moan, shriek, cry, froth and foam about how those nasty conservatives go around "smearing" people.

I'm not speaking from theory or second-hand opinion. I'm speaking from firsthand experience. And I'm not hinting anything, or suggesting, or supposing, or guessing. I am saying flatly, and on the basis of the factual record, that "liberals" in this country have piled up a record of smear and distortion that gives the lie to their every utterance of pious moral superiority.

They are two-faced.

They practice a double standard of truth and fairness.

The only part of this charge for which I am prepared to hear some contradictory evidence is the generalization. There must be some liberals who do not practice this double standard. But if any are brought to my attention, I would be prepared to bet that they are the sort of liberals whom most of their fellow liberals regard as renegades.

By liberals, of course, I mean, in a political sense, those who believe that the only solution to our political problems rests in collectivity and not in individual initiative. I hasten to add that this does not fit the classic definition of "liberal," but these people have done their own perverting of words and their meanings. For one reason or another it has always seemed somehow impolite to bring the moral credentials of liberal writers and commentators into question. Dick Nixon, for instance, was widely castigated for his criticism of the press coverage of his California gubernatorial campaign in 1962—but I have yet to hear a person who listened to him who didn't also admit, in effect, that "Of course we all know that what he said was correct. He just shouldn't have said it in public."

I, for one, am tired of this pussyfooting about a matter of crucial importance to every American. We should make our political decisions in an atmosphere of free, open and rational debate; not in a steaming sewer of half-truths, no-truths and ideological fog.

The need for some public candor on this subject is particularly painful, it seems to me and to every person with whom I have discussed the matter—persons ranging from cab drivers to ex-cabinet officers—since the fantastic coverage of the recent congressional and gubernatorial elections.

Now that is a matter that doesn't need to be documented in detail here. It is documented, indelibly, in the memory of practically every man, woman and child who watched network television on election night last November. The bias toward victory by so-called liberal, or at least nonconservative or non-Republican candidates, was obnoxious to most viewers. I think anyone would remember David Brinkley's hound-dog look as the votes piled up for Ronald Reagan, and certainly everyone will remember the doomsday look Eric Sevareid as he began to realize that many liberal bubbles were being pricked around the nation. In my judgment, the overall bias was so strong that Mr. Brinkley actually seemed to me to lose his temper when a colleague "revealed" that Brinkley himself lived in a heavily Republican suburb of Washington. Mr. Brinkley's ringing defense against this slander was to quickly reassure his audience that he hadn't even voted. No matter what Mr. Brinkley's personal political leanings, which I myself feel to be honest and responsible, the atmosphere of the evening was so heavily charged that it was bound to provoke such an incident.

Let me get something straight, however, at this exact point. No matter how lopsided this liberal double standard makes news coverage—I do not regard censorship or any kind of formal control as a solution. In fact, it is part of the problem that liberal domination of the working level of most news media exercises a sort of censorship on its own. No. Censorship is never an answer. I know that as the double standard becomes more pronounced there will be more and more cries for censorship. I even know that things some day could get so bad that, in sheer revulsion, and given localities with the political balance of power to do something about it, there might even be impositions of censorship. Recent attempts to bar some speakers from certain state campuses are just a symptom.

The impulse to such censorship is understandable. It is not, in conscience, supportable. Censorship is not the answer. The answer is open competition. And I am not so pessimistic as to believe that those most sensitive of corporate entities, the TV networks, aren't going to realize some day that true balance and a true coverage of "both sides" of political issues is a highly salable commodity.

Rather than dwell on what millions of Americans have seen with their own eyes and heard with their own ears, however, I want to take a few swats at the liberal

double standard as practiced in the public print—including the print of *The Saturday Evening Post.*

During the 1964 presidential campaign this magazine presented an editorial which—I will bet a year's subscription—will be read for years in journalism schools as an unbeatable example of editorial extremism. I will quote just one typical sentence, lest the present *Post* editors lose any sleep over an "incident" which, if they choose, they can simply slough off as having been "someone else's responsibility."

*The Saturday Evening Post,* in its epic contribution to clean campaigning, presented this thoughtful evaluation of the presidential candidate with whom I am the most closely acquainted, me:

"He is a wild man, a stray, an unprincipled and ruthless political jujitsu artist. . . ."

There is not, in the entire long repetition of such charges, a single factual statement that had real bearing on the campaign. It was hate literature, pure and simple—exactly the kind of intemperate diatribe which—I'll bet another year's subscription—the editors have editorialized against throughout the years; until it came time to practice what they preach.

Let's return, for a moment, to the points with which I began this little love letter to the illiberal liberals. Do I really mean that any lofty liberal ever really falsely accused someone being associated with subversives or totalitarians? You thought that was the sort of thing only done by anti-Communists, some of whom have used pretty skinny excuses for calling a person pink?

Well, let me first assume that you regard Fascism, as subversive, along with Communism. Wouldn't an unfounded charge linking one with Fascism, or saying he was a Fascist, be pretty much the same as an unfounded charge linking a person with a Communist group or saying he was a Communist?

Agree? Then will CBS and *The New York Times* please stand up and take their well-deserved bows for practicing precisely this sort of smear technique?

The CBS contribution came in a widely broadcast dispatch from one of the network's European correspondents, Daniel Schorr, in July, 1964, just ahead of the presidental campaign. Schorr flatly reported that I was trying to appeal to right-wing elements in Germany as "only the start of a move to link up with his opposite numbers in Germany." Referring to "right-wing elements" in Germany is the equivalent, of course, of referring to pro-Communists as the "far left." It avoids certain legal complications, but it gets the point across neatly and precisely. Schorr, however, wasn't content to risk anyone's missing the point. He then went on to report that I had accepted an invitation to speak before an evangelical academy near Munich which, he dutifully reported to his audience, was widely regarded as a breeding ground for neo-Fascism.

Mr. Schorr's report was, to put it politely, not true. But millions heard it, thanks to the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System, which has devoted major documentary time to bemoaning the fact that there is "extremism" abroad in the land—and on the airwaves, fellows, eh?

*The New York Times* not only repeated the Schorr charges regarding the evangelical academy, of which I had never even heard, but it added some new fuel to the fire, concerning the charge of neo-Fascism. In a dispatch from its correspondent, Arthur J. Olsen, the *Times* reported that I had been in "frequent and friendly" correspondence with a controversial and "militant" German politician and had given an interview to "an extreme rightist weekly."

There was no such correspondence, nor was any evidence of it ever produced. There was no such interview. As the *Times* easily could have checked, this "extreme rightist weekly" had simply quoted public statements which I had made. The *Times* piece, in short, was a full-fledged falsehood.

And what about the personal-insult technique? Is that below the belt for upstanding liberals? If so, they must wear their belts in an odd position. Again, during the campaign period, no less a liberal leader than Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, wrote a widely quoted letter saying that I was not only wrong but mentally unbalanced. Temperate, eh? High-level liberal debate!

Mr. James Farmer, a man of luminous liberal credentials, who was then head of the Congress for Racial Equality, summed up an aspect of the liberal double-think process that extends far beyond journalism. He was quoted, during the campaign, as saying that I had "no program. He is just against everything." I submit that for someone to be against everything would surely represent a remarkable feat. One of the specific suggestions I made during the campaign (and I made and published them on dozens of subjects, including the draft—which I pledged to end—and on the need to upgrade skills to end poverty) is still today caught up in the double standard. This suggestion, made early in the campaign and repeated throughout, was that we establish an equitable way in which the Federal Government could share tax revenues with the 50 states. Today that same proposal is being hailed as a triumph of "moderate" and "progressive" thinking. But even if Mr. Farmer himself agreed with those descriptions, today, I wonder if he might be moved to reexamine his former statement? Not under the liberal double standard he wouldn't.

Perhaps the most flagrant example of widespread use of The Big Lie technique came after I had been interviewed by Howard K. Smith on ABC's *Issues and Answers* program. One question was about interdicting Viet Cong supplies in the heavy jungle cover of Vietnam. Part of my reply was, from the transcript: "There have been several suggestions made. I don't think we would use any of them. But defoliation of the forests by low-yield atomic weapons could well be done."

*The San Francisco Examiner,* next day, ran this front-page headline: Goldwater's plan to use Viet A-Bomb.

The Associated Press, which originally reported, also, that I had suggested A-bombing Vietnam, took the trouble to double-check its reporter, found that the facts didn't back up his story and issued a correction. But who read the correction? Liberals always complain that corrections never do catch up with misstatements. Did they complain about this example? If I'd have held my breath waiting for them to do it, I'd be sea-blue by now.

Two of the most critical issues of the entire 1964 presidential campaign, as a matter of fact, hinged not on facts but on journalistic "extremism." During the primary campaigning in New Hampshire *The Concord Daily Monitor* ran a headline saying, flatly, Goldwater Sets Goal: Abolish Social Security. There was nothing in the story to support the headline. There was nothing in anything I had said to support the headline. It became, however, a banner for my opponents in a flurry of falsehoods from which I was never able to escape. (Ignored in this flurry was my public voting record in support of Social Security, my frequent statements that, specifically, the system cannot now be abolished, and my coincident concerns for all the voluntary forms of insurance upon which so many Americans must depend for security.)

That *The Concord Daily Monitor* should have taken the cake for misrepresenting does not mean that the rest of the press shouldn't step up to the table. Can anyone honestly say that he did not read a dozen repetitions of the Social Security distortion during the campaign? It was, in fact, commonplace. I have yet to hear many sighs of ethical concern about this in the journalism profession with its otherwise great concern for professional standards of objectivity.

Another issue that received similar treatment was control of nuclear weapons. In 1964, at Hartford, Conn., I held a press conference at which a question was asked on this subject. I answered, as I had suggested in an article for *Life* magazine, that more control over tactical nuclear weapons should be extended to the commander of NATO.

Yet the reporter for *The Washington Post* reported the answer as being a suggestion that NATO *commanders* be given nuclear authority. My views on this could easily have been checked in my published works. But hundreds of other papers also went ahead with the same casual liberal disregard for objectivity, when it concerns a conservative, to repeat the misrepresentation until it was possible for editorialists and opponents alike, across the country, glibly to say that I wanted "every second lieutenant" to have an A-bomb. (At least two major publications, *Time* and *U.S. News & World Report,* proved later on, incidentally, that *the* commander of NATO has in fact been given tactical nuclear authority. The revelation did not shake, so far as I can observe, the consciences of most of those who had earlier reported my suggestion as one of alarming folly.)

Lest you get the idea that all this double-standard business is past history, let me refer to a few current examples of two-faced liberals at work. Hate literature? You remember how, during the period of mourning following the assassination of President Kennedy, even the Chief Justice of the United States referred to the climate of "hate" that breeds such violence. Liberals everywhere began to hate hate, so to speak. What about today, when many of them also dislike the incumbent President? The double standard goes to work. There is now in wide circulation a little booklet entitled *MacBird*—a play which uses *Macbeth* as its model. It is described as a political satire. And what does it have to say? It simply sets up a situation in which the character representing President Johnson plots the assassination of the character representing President Kennedy. And what does the author, one Barbara Garson, have to say about this "funny" idea? "It doesn't worry me if people think he killed Kennedy," she is quoted as saying. Do liberals rush to heap hate labels on her and her work? Not at all. The highly regarded liberal critic Dwight Macdonald calls it "the funniest" political satire he's read in years. *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post,* the fountainheads of liberal restraint, have glowed over it, and Yale's drama school has given the authoress a $5,000 fellowship! Sic Semper Hate!

Or, take an example that I read even while writing this. In his syndicated newspaper column of December 16, Joseph Alsop says that I support Richard Nixon as a Presidential candidate for 1968 "beyond any doubt at all, because he has indicated to Goldwater that, if nominated, he will adopt the 'Southern strategy' that Goldwater invented and still favors." He goes on to make it clear this strategy is a racist strategy. (By the way, Alsop invented the "Southern strategy" slogan.)

Joseph Alsop may not have any doubts; he also hasn't any facts. It is "beyond any doubt" flat dishonesty to say that Richard Nixon has indicated to me that he will follow any particular strategy if I support him. It is a flat misrepresentation and not true to say that I favor a racist strategy of any sort, in any section, for any excuse, under any circumstance. I reject it. I abhor it. I have never accepted it, and I have never permitted it. I am not a racist, Mr. Alsop, and you do every standard of objective truth, commentary, and reportage a disservice when

you say that I am or that I favor a racist strategy, or that Mr. Nixon does.

But the double standard takes care of that. Mr. Alsop and his friends object to the smear technique only when applied to themselves or *their* friends.

In not a single one of the examples mentioned would I argue for a moment against the right of the reporter to express whatever opinion of me he might have. Nor am I even arguing that a man should not have the right to distort the truth or even reverse it in an open society where a free exchange of ideas would provide a natural and effective antidote and counterbalance. At any rate, I would not argue that we should take any form of action that would give anyone the power to compel these men to behave differently.

My argument, which may seem more like a cry in the wilderness at this late date, is simply for every American to examine his premises and his standards when it comes to so-called facts and fairness. If it is a fact for liberals, it must also be a fact for conservatives.

I know that there are those on the right who have their own double standard of fairness, and I deplore that just as heartily. But there are frequent and ample outcries against that. There are safeguards aplenty. Not so with the double standards of the left. Liberals do not even seem aware that they *are* practicing a double standard, a two-faced fairness, a spread-eagle truth.

In short, I'm not looking for retraction or apology—just simple recognition of the facts and the useful, thoughtful reflection which we might expect to follow such a recognition. But I'm still not holding my breath waiting for it to happen.

## INEQUITABLE AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining many of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to relieve the great problem of inequitable agricultural imports. New and broader machinery is needed to control foreign farm commodities displacing American markets. Certain farm imports have risen so fast and to such a great level that large numbers of domestic farmers are suffering depressed prices. This is happening in a period of rapidly rising production costs, increasing the damage from cheap foreign imports, and while parity stands at the lowest level since 1934. From 1965 to 1966, total beef and veal product imports rose 27 percent; meat imports under the meat import quota amendment, 34 percent; pork product imports, 14 percent; lamb product imports, 19 percent, and mutton product imports, 102 percent.

Last year dairy product imports in milk equivalent were up a startling 300 percent. In the same year, the number of dairy cows in America declined by 1.1 million. Much of this drop is due to dairy imports. These imports account for many of the 50,000 dairy farms that went out of existence last year. Meanwhile, farm costs of production keep going up. Last month, the parity index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services was up 13 points from the previous year. The parity index for wages and taxes alone was up about 14 percent.

We are concerned about the high level of these imports, Mr. Speaker, not only because foreign producers are usurping a greater percentage of the domestic market, but also because farm parity stood at 74 as of March 30.

I have already introduced the Dairy Import Act of 1967, and I firmly believe it is a necessary and prudent piece of legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem of price-depressing agricultural imports goes beyond just the dairy industry. The increase in imports in agricultural goods is quite general. For reasons I have cited, broader legislation is necessary. The bill I propose would amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, to include not only those goods that are covered presently under section 22, but any agricultural commodity that is threatened by increased imports.

Under the present law, only the Secretary of Agriculture can recommend that the President request an investigation by the Tariff Commission, or recommend immediate Presidential action curtailing imports. The Secretary may take this action only when he has cause to believe that programs of the Agriculture Department are endangered by imports.

Under my proposal, the President or any interested party, such as industry groups, either House of Congress, or the Committee on Agriculture of either body could request an investigation. The U.S. Tariff Commission would be required to promptly make an investigation and file its report within 90 days. It would determine whether any agricultural commodities were being imported into the country in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic producers of like agricultural products.

If this investigation uncovered evidence of serious injury, or if the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the House Committee on Agriculture so resolved, the Tariff Commission would hold hearings.

If the hearings then showed that domestic producers or farm support programs were being injured or threatened, the Commission would make a report with recommendations to the President. If he failed to act on this recommendation, the Congress could by a two-thirds vote enact the recommendations of the Commission through a concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have a recent example of why this legislation is vitally needed. Instead of requesting emergency action to govern the rate of dairy imports flooding the country, earlier this month the Secretary of Agriculture requested an investigation. If the bill I am introducing today were law, that investigation would have been held months ago. The President and the Congress would have had the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, and appropriate action would have been taken.

This bill to protect American agriculture from unwarranted imports is not aimed at protecting inefficient production, but at preventing foreign producers from throwing American markets out of balance. For example, in 1962 and 1963 imports of beef were permitted to rise to disastrous levels, driving many livestock men out of business. When imports were finally restricted, beef prices rose sharply, thus drawing farmers back into beef production. This rise in beef production came at the same time dairy imports were rising, pushing men out of the dairy industry. Beef quotas were then raised again. Because of this action, high U.S. beef output collided with increased imports. Such arbitrary import policies and reversals have helped produce the poor state of the meat and dairy market today.

In addition, we also do a disservice to foreign competitors when we do not have a stable market at home. At a given price, it is possible to figure how much of a given commodity the market will absorb. When we have an imbalanced market, importers cannot plan on how much we will buy in a given year and will tend to overproduce. This leads to dumping, at great cost not only to the foreign producers, but to the disruption of our markets and producers.

Under the legislation I am introducing today, the reaction time could well be cut so that we could have a more stable agricultural market in goods subject to import competition.

We have experienced in the past 5 years several instances where the actions taken on imports have been too little or too late. Providing other channels for initiative has become necessary, will speed action, and provide better response to the needs of the moment.

There is one final point. It should be clearly understood we cannot continue selling on the international market without purchasing. We have a favorable balance of trade in agricultural goods, and we should be able to maintain it after implementing this legislation. But the fact is, imports of all supplementary goods—those items that are in competition with domestic producers—grew from 1965 to 1966 by 17 percent, while our commercial exports for dollars grew at only 9.4 percent. Many important U.S. export categories actually showed a marked decline in 1966 from 1965. Dairy exports were down 36 percent, total animal and animal product exports were down 8 percent, and cotton exports were down 11 percent. In part, this is due to new trade barriers erected abroad.

Because I believe this bill would be effective and because it is needed now, I urge its consideration and support.

## AMENDMENT TO ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, over the past few days there has been mounted within the Johnson administration an attack of

incredible dimensions on my proposed amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to authorize block grants to the States for certain of its programs beginning July 1, 1968.

This attack has dealt in misinformation, outright misrepresentation, and fear, to such an extent that it is impossible to reply to every such allegation. Two matters, however, have seemed to me extremely important to address, and I have done so through clarifying changes in the amendment to be proposed.

First. There is the allegation that Southern and border States would "lose money" under the formula I have proposed. This is absolutely erroneous, because it is based upon a theoretical authorization for the present act which, under the committee bill (H.R. 7819), would require full appropriation of funds for title I of the act. Without such full appropriation—an unlikely event since it is more than double the President's budget request for next year—every State except three would get less money under the committee bill than under my amendment. These three are Alaska, New York, and the District of Columbia.

In order to dispel all such fears, however, my amendment will contain the following language:

SEC. 702(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall not be less than the aggregate amount of its allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, under titles I, II, III, and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The other concern was far more important—that the participation of private school pupils and teachers could in any way be imperiled by the language of my amendment. That matter has now been resolved.

My amendment from the very beginning contained the same language as the present act respecting participation of private school children in the benefits of the program, and even increased the types of assistance which could be made available. However, I have been happy to cooperate with all interested parties in writing in clarifying language to make even more explicit the intent, first, that the Federal block grants would not be commingled with State funds to be spent for general educational purposes, but would be separate funds to be spent for special programs; and second, that private school children would enjoy the same degree of participation in these programs financed under my amendment as they now do under titles I and II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The language of my amendment will speak for itself on both these points, so I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD, with the modifications agreed upon, so that every interested person may judge for himself:

H.R. 8983

A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to continue the authorized programs after June 30, 1968, through block grants to the States

*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 "Elementary and Secondary Block Grants Amendment Act of 1967".

PART A—DURATION OF AND AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. (a)(1) Section 201(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years,".

(2) Section 201(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

(b)(1) Section 301(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years,".

(2) Section 301(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

(c)(1) Section 501 of such Act is amended by striking out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years,".

(2) Section 501(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$65,000,000".

(d)(1) Section 601(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year,".

(2) Section 601(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$150,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year".

(e) Section 706(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1968," the following: "and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969,".

(f) (1) Section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968".

(2) Section 15 (15) of such Act is amended by striking out "1962–1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963–1964".

(g) Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), are each amended by striking out "1968" wherever it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "1969".

PART B—BLOCK GRANTS TO THE STATES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

SEC. 102. (a) Title VII of such Act is redesignated as title VIII, and the sections redesignated accordingly, and all references to any such section in that or any other law, or in any rule, regulation, order, or agreement of the United States are amended so as to refer to such section as so designated.

(b) Such Act is further amended by inserting a new title VII as follows:

"TITLE VII—BLOCK GRANTS TO THE STATES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

AUTHORIZATION ON CONTINUING BASIS

"SEC. 701. (a) To the end of enhancing the fundamental capability of the several States to make effective progress in meeting educational needs, and to carry forward the type of programs initiated under other Federal educational legislation without the administrative difficulties inherent in a proliferation of categorical Federal grants, the Commissioner is authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each succeeding fiscal year, to make grants to the States for the broad purposes set forth in this part, and it is the intent of Congress that these grants will replace those authorized under titles I, II, III, and V of this Act.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this part there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $3,000,000,000, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to assure continued educational progress.

"ALLOTMENTS OF FUNDS

"SEC. 702. (a)(1) From the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 3 per centum thereof, as he may determine and, first, shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs under this title, and then may use reserved funds for the purpose of making grants and contracts for special projects and educational planning as provided in section 707. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ration to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

"(A) the school-age population of the State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)), bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"(2) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 33⅓ per centum or more than 66⅔ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be computed by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him from the Department of Commerce.

"(3) For the purposes of this part—

"(A) The term 'child of school age' means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

"(B) The term 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"(C) The term 'income per child of school age' for any State or for the United States means the total personal income for the State and the United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in such State and in the United States, respectively.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reallotment, from time to time and on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for that year.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall not be less than the aggregate amount of its allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, under titles I, II, III, and V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 703. Grants under this part may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 704, for—

"(1) programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children, and which give the highest priority to school attendance areas having high concentrations of such children;

"(2) the provision of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment for use in the elementary and secondary schools of the State;

"(3) the establishment and operation of supplementary educational centers to serve broad educational needs by involving the public and private educational, cultural, and artistic resources of communities and by conducting experimental and innovative programs related to regional and national programs of educational research and development;

"(4) the strengthening of State leadership and supervision provided through the State educational agencies, and the initiation of comprehensive educational planning to identify and attack educational problems on a continuing basis;

"(5) the provision of educational testing and counseling and guidance services in elementary and secondary schools;

"(6) the improvement of in-service teacher education programs, and the encouragement of efforts to improve the recruitment of teachers, particularly for service in innercity and isolated rural schools which experience problems of recruitment;

"(7) programs designed to improve educational opportunities for children in institutions for the handicapped, or for neglected or delinquent children; and

"(8) other special programs designed to strengthen and improve elementary and secondary education in the State and to promote equal educational opportunities.

"STATE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 704. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

"(1) sets forth a program for expending funds under this part for the purposes described in section 703 and indicates the probable allocation of funds for these general purposes;

"(2) provides that (A) not less than 50 per centum of the funds allotted or reallotted under section 702 for any fiscal year shall be used to fund programs and projects to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children (as provided by section 703(1)), and (B) not less than 7 per centum of the funds allotted or reallotted under section 702 for any fiscal year shall be used for the provision of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment (as provided by section 703(2));

"(3) provides that, to the extent consistent with the number of children attending private elementary and secondary schools in school attendance areas selected for programs under section 703, provision will be made on an equitable basis for including special educational services and arrangements (such as, but not limited to, dual enrollment, educational radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment, and other special educational arrangements) in which such children can participate;

"(4) provides that arrangements (whether through the State educational agency or some other State agency or commission) for the distribution of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment and materials for the use of teachers and pupils shall include provisions for the loan of such resources, textbooks, equipment, and materials on an equitable basis for the use of teachers and pupils in nonpublic schools;

"(5) contains assurances that the highest priority in the use of funds under this title will be given to local educational agencies which are experiencing the greatest educational difficulties because of such factors as: (A) heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, (B) rapid increases in school enrollment which overwhelm the financial resources of a local educational agency, and (C) geographic isolation and economic depression in particular areas of the State;

"(6) provides that any local educational agency or other applicant for assistance under this title which is denied such assistance may have an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency;

"(7) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will not be commingled with State funds and will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private school funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and other printed and published instructional materials, and in no case supplant such State, local, and private school funds;

"(8) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency) under this title; and

"(9) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioners shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 705. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 702 the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 704(b) and in which no State agency is authorized by law to conduct educational testing or to provide library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, or other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for such testing and for the provision on an equitable basis of such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials and equipment for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year out of that State's allotment.

"PUBLIC CONTROL OF LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, LABORATORY AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT, AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL AND TYPES WHICH MAY BE AVAILABLE

"SEC. 706. (a) Title to library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, and other printed and published instructional materials furnished pursuant to this title, and control and administration of their use, shall vest only in a public agency.

"(b) The library resources, textbooks, laboratory, and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, and other printed and published instructional materials made available pursuant to this title for use of children and teachers in any school in any State shall be limited to those which have been approved by an appropriate State or local educational authority or agency for use, or are used, in a public elementary or secondary school of that State.

"SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

"SEC. 707. (a) From the funds reserved in accordance with the provisions of section 702, the Commissioner is authorized (1) to make grants to State educational agencies to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States, (2) to arrange for interchanges of personnel between the United States Office of Education and the several States (as provided by section 507 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the provisions of such section being incorporated herein by reference), and (3) after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency or agencies, to make grants to or contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for projects for the improvement or expansion of educational planning on a regional, interstate, or metropolitan area basis.

"(b) Payments under this section may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine, except that payments to a private agency, institution, or organization conducted for profit shall be in accordance with a contract for specified services.

"LEGISLATIVE INTENT

"SEC. 708. It is the intent of Congress in enacting this title that the States shall have utmost freedom, consistent with the requirements of section 704, to use the appropriated funds for the improvement and strengthening of elementary and secondary education within each State by meeting educational needs which the State determines are most urgent. Accordingly, the Commissioner is directed to administer the program in such a manner as to reduce the amount of paperwork, justifications and negotiation required of applicants and to expedite the transmission of funds to the States. To that end, questions of the intent of the legislation are to be resolved by broad, rather than narrow, interpretations and, whenever possible, in favor of the programs proposed by the State.

"ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 709. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any application submitted under section 704, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a program under an application approved under this title, finds—

"(1) that the application has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 704(a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State educational agency that the State will not be regarded as

eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of any project under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this clause, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 710. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of an application submitted under section 704(a) or with his final action under section 709(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code."

## GEORGE STAFFORD, OF KANSAS, BECOMES MEMBER OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, this is a significant day for Kansas. At 3 this afternoon, George M. Stafford, of Valley Falls, Kans., will be sworn in as the first Kansan to serve on the Interstate Commerce Commission in its 80-year history.

In taking over his new duties at this important Federal agency, George Stafford brings many years of administrative experience to this level of Government service. He has served on the staff of our senior Senator, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, for over 20 years, and this in itself is one of his highest recommendations for the post. He is devoted, loyal, effective, and dedicated to giving his very best in every situation.

George Stafford's nomination evoked considerable editorial praise from the leading papers in Kansas. The Topeka State Journal wrote:

The appointment is a good one, for Stafford has had long experience in statecraft as Frank Carlson's private secretary when Carlson was governor and as his administrative assistant for the more than 16 years he has been U.S. Senator.

The Manhattan Mercury stated:

Stafford will be a great credit to the ICC and the appointee is one of the most accomplished Kansans we know. The whole state basks in the reflected glory of the high appointment to this most-deserving native son of Valley Falls.

From the Wichita Eagle, this recommendation:

He also would bring to the position a great deal of understanding and deep personal integrity. He would serve the nation well and bring honor to Kansas.

The El Dorado Times had this to say:

It begins to look as if George Stafford, who has kept modestly behind the scenes in the Carlson entourage, is on the way up to an important place in government. Which goes to show that a man as smart, capable and obliging as is George Stafford, is seldom overlooked when jobs requiring brains and common sense are waiting to be filled.

Under an editorial entitled "A Good Appointment" in the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, George Stafford gets this kind of boost:

President Johnson has chosen well and Stafford can be expected to measure up to the responsibilities of the office . . . The Public would have more confidence in the integrity of government if we had more men of the stature and ability of Stafford in places of public trust.

Based upon what the people who know George Stafford best have to say, the Nation can be assured that the Interstate Commerce Commissioner who takes office today will measure up, will be responsible, and will serve with distinction.

I am moved to add my own endorsement to all that has been written and offer my own best wishes to George Stafford for a long and eventful career as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, knowing that each day of service in his new position will add to his record as an outstanding public servant.

## STARS AND STRIPES STRUGGLES TO STAY FREE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I submitted for the RECORD of March 16, 1967, a lengthy commentary on the Government management of news. Included in my remarks, were over 50 alleged instances of military news management involving the European edition of Stars and Stripes, a daily newspaper servicing more than a half million Americans overseas.

James M. Halbe, assistant foreign editor of Business Week, has recently written an article on the same subject, published in Dateline magazine, an annual publication of the Overseas Press Club. Mr. Halbe, a former Stars and Stripes staff member, traces the efforts of the civilian editorial staff of Stars and Stripes to find some recourse from Army censorship other than by "appealing to the officers doing the censoring."

The article attributes the Defense Department's present troubles to the fact that the role General Eisenhower filled during World War II, in preventing military interference with Stars and Stripes, "has gone unfilled for 22 years."

The complete text of the article follows:

STARS AND STRIPES STRUGGLES TO STAY FREE

(By James M. Halbe)

This year, the 25th for *Stars and Stripes* in Europe, may well be one of the most memorable years in its history. It marks the rediscovery by the *Stars and Stripes* staff of an effective recourse from arbitrary censorship that the newspaper has not enjoyed since World War II, when General Eisenhower was both the supreme Allied commander and the supreme Stars and Stripes advocate.

That recourse is the Moss Committee, the House subcommittee on government information, of which Rep. John Moss (D-Calif.) is chairman. Because of protests to this committee:

The Defense Department's scheme to create a Pentagon-controlled monopoly on the flow of all news to GIs overseas has been blocked.

The Defense Department's secret ban on the publication in *Stars and Stripes* of an Associated Press article on the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been exposed.

The Army's attempt to censor the news of the arrest in California of U.S. Ambassador to Germany George McGhee's son has backfired badly, creating a flurry of publicity that the original news item would never have received.

A list of more than 50 examples of Army and Air Force attempts to manage the news in Stars and Stripes during the last six years has been placed in the Congressional Record by Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.), a member of the Moss Committee.

The only tragedy in the *Stars and Stripes* affair has been wrought by the Defense Department. It not only tolerated the summary dismissal of Colonel George E. Moranda from his post as chief information officer of the Army in Europe, but it publicly denounced him as "unsuitable" for the job. Colonel Moranda's offense: trying to protect the Army from certain embarrassment by counselling against censoring the McGhee story out of *Stars and Stripes*, then, having lost the battle, immediately complying with an order to do so.

Obviously something has gone wrong somewhere. Certainly neither the Army nor the Defense Department expected this kind of trouble. What happened?

The simplest explanation is that the role Eisenhower played in protecting the integrity of *Stars and Stripes* has gone unfilled for 22 years. Eisenhower understood the natural tendency of the military to ordain righteousness by fiat, and the danger it posed for both the credibility and the integrity of *Stars and Stripes*. He simply forbade any military meddling with the paper.

When *Stars and Stripes* was recreated in London on April 18, 1942, General George C. Marshall, the Army chief of staff issued a statement noting that its World War I predecessor had been a major factor in sustaining the morale of the American Expeditionary Forces.

"We have Pershing's authority for the statement that no official control ever was

exercised over the matter which went into the Stars and Stripes," wrote Marshall in the first issue in World War II. "It always was entirely for and by the soldier. This policy is to govern the conduct of the new publication."

Eisenhower made Marshall's order stick. So did the staff. Bob Moora, managing editor of the wartime London edition (and now an executive with RCA in Camden, N.J.), remembers that "the staff had to fight to withstand the pressures of well-meaning but ill-advised officers to use the paper for propaganda purposes, for personal publicity, or as a headquarters directive."

The staff's standard brushoff to would-be abusers of *Stars and Stripes* was to refer them to Eisenhower for "authorization" to publish their pet news item. The staff also maintained a private "out-of-channels" pipeline to Ike—a Syracuse bookie named Bill, who was a back-slapping pal of Captain Harry Butcher, Eisenhower's naval aide.

When Lieutenant General George Patton made his now-famous threat to ban *Stars and Stripes* from the Third Army because of a Bill Mauldin cartoon he didn't like, Bill the Bookie called Harry. Eisenhower immediately wrote a letter to his deputy, stating, "A great deal of pressure has been brought upon me in the past to abolish such things as Mauldin's cartoons, the B-Bag, etc. You will make sure that the responsible officer knows he is not to interfere in matters of this kind. If he believes a specific violation of good sense or good judgment has occurred, he may bring it to my personal attention."

General Mark Clark provided the same kind of protection for *Stars and Stripes'* Mediterranean edition.

Eisenhower, Clark, Marshall, and Pershing wanted *Stars and Stripes* to be just one thing—a newspaper. All of the generals who have commanded U.S. forces in Germany since Eisenhower have wanted the newspaper to be a house organ as well.

The most notable example of overplay in *Stars and Stripes* in recent years was the retirement in 1962 of General Bruce Clarke as Army commander in Europe. Fourteen times between March 30 and April 30 Clarke made Page 1 of Stars and Stripes—almost entirely by paying farewell visits to military units. His retirement ceremony and the change of command on April 30, of course, became the most important news event in the world in the issue of May 1.

The Army also has traditionally served as self-appointed public relations agent for the American Express Company in Europe. When Amexco changes the interest rates or terms of deposits in the banking facilities it operates on U.S. military posts, the Army makes the announcement not Amexco.

And consider this lead from a Page 1 story in this issue of January 31, 1963:

"Heidelberg (Special)—The following press release was received Wednesday from the (West German) Federal Ministry of Economics for transmittal to U.S. Army Europe."

From the U.S. military's standpoint, the AP, UPI, and *Stars and Stripes'* own reporters are merely loopholes in the iron curtain it has thrown up around its bailiwick in Europe. And it intervenes to plug the loopholes whenever it chooses.

This compulsion to interpose itself between the GI and reader and the source of the news also suggests that U.S. military leaders believe news lacks a certain validity until it has been "ratified" by the Army or Air Force.

When the President announces the assignment of any general to Europe, for example, *Stars and Stripes* is forbidden to publish the story until Army or Air Force headquarters has found a specific job for him. This means that newspaper readers in the U.S. can sometimes know about the assignment several days before *Stars and Stripes* readers.

When the reassignment of a general already in Europe is announced by the President, *Stars and Stripes* cannot publish the story until the general has been notified. In one instance, *Stars and Stripes* "notified" him personally; he said he already knew about it. But the Army information division still refused to "release" the story until the general had been "officially" notified.

In another instance, an Army information officer in Heidelberg refused to approve a change in a reassignment story because he did not want to disturb a general on the badminton court to read it to him.

Generals are not entirely to blame for the news distortion in *Stars and Stripes*. The military command system itself creates problems. The channel of communications between *Stars and Stripes* and most U.S. generals in Europe is a bobsled run of embellishment.

If a colonel thinks a one-column picture of a general in *Stars and Stripes* would make the general happy, then obviously a two-column picture would make him twice as happy. Conversely, if a general tells an aide, "The news from Timbuktu doesn't look good this morning," *Stars and Stripes* hears it as, "No more unfavorable news from Timbuktu; the general doesn't like it." Or, worse still, "What's the matter with you guys up there? Can't you see you're damaging Timbuktu-American relations?"

In the publishing of *Stars and Stripes*, the military command system produces a series of conditioned responses up and down the chain of command. Generals begin to feel that they and their VIP visitors are always Page 1 news, regardless of what else is going on in the world that day. After that, the mere arrival of an Army courier with a picture of the general at *Stars and Stripes* amounts to an order to publish it—on Page 1.

The picture of General Paul Freeman, commander of the Army in Europe in 1962–65 (and now head of the Continental Army Command in Chicago), posed with frequent VIP visitors, was treated as Page 1 "news" during his tenure probably more often than that of any other individual in the world.

The cumulative effect of all the "must" stories, including verbatim handouts, is to reduce *Stars and Stripes* to exactly what the Defense Department, the Army, and the Air Force, claim it is not—an official U.S. government publication.

The detachment from official U.S. policy that Stars and Stripes might have had by remaining what Eisenhower intended it to be has been lost almost entirely because the U.S. military establishment behaves toward *Stars and Stripes* approximately the ways the Soviet government behaves toward *Izvestia*.

For the recent exposure of the Army's malpractices as a newspaper publisher in Europe, the Defense Department has only itself to blame. Much of what has come to light this year was known by the Defense Department in 1963. With studied care, it chose to ignore all of it.

There had been repeated efforts by individual members of the *Stars and Stripes'* staff before 1963 to protest both arbitrary censorship and phony "must" stories. But the system of protesting censorship to the officers doing the censoring was so obviously ineffective that it became, as it is today, an exercise in futility. Its only value lay in creating a written record of the protests.

The staff's search for some recourse from the military's abuse of *Stars and Stripes* thus led away from the whole military establishment. The most obvious recourse for most Americans is to write their Congressman. Several staff members tried this avenue in 1960–63—without success.

In June 1963, on my first and only try, I found a recourse that produced complete and almost immediate success. On June 8, while I was acting assignments editor, the Army killed a story I had assigned about President Kennedy's impending visit to Germany, giving as the reason "a protest from the embassy." I checked out the alleged "protest" with the embassy and elicited a categorical denial that anyone in the embassy had made any.

I then hit hard where I thought it would do the most good, since the President was involved: I wrote a carefully documented letter about the circumstances to Pierre Salinger.

Three weeks later, I learned that the officer who had ordered the story killed had been "transferred to other duties." No one ever interfered with *Stars and Stripes'* coverage of President Kennedy again.

In August, 1963, Heidelberg's temptation to meddle in the news became irresistible again, and this time it had more sinister implications. The Birmingham race riots were taking place, and *Stars and Stripes* gave them the Page 1 prominence they were getting in most American newspapers.

Major General William C. Baker, the Army chief of staff in Heidelberg, became indignant about the *Stars and Stripes* coverage. Colonel Ben Legare, the army chief of information, came up to Darmstadt and told both Colonel Ridgeway Smith, the editor, and Arnold Burnett, the managing editor, that all news pictures of racial incidents in the United States must henceforth be "screened" in order to eliminate any that might "inflame" General Baker. Legare quoted Baker as saying publication of such pictures was "treason."

Later, Baker told Smith and Burnett in Heidelberg that he was dissatisfied with *Stars and Stripes'* coverage of racial disorders in the U.S. because it was not objective and did not give the white Southerners' point of view. He also expressed the opinion that AP and UPI were not objective because they had "sold out."

The immediate result of these two meetings was an order that all pictures of racial incidents had to be cleared either by Burnett or Bernard Kirchhoff, the assistant managing editor. A few days later, the order was strengthened to require approval by Colonel William W. Coleman, Jr., the deputy editor.

On the first day of the new order, three pictures and one story were killed. The kills continued, and a week later two more staff members wrote Salinger. On September 16, the dam broke. Burnett informed me and two other members of the staff that the inspector general of the Army, Major General Edward H. McDavid, and two aides had arrived from Washington and wanted to talk to us the next day.

None of us who were thus summoned knew exactly why, and I was curious; so that night I telephoned Salinger at the White House. He called Arthur Sylvester at the Pentagon while I waited, then came back with, "That's my investigation. You're free to tell them anything you want. I'll get a complete report on the whole matter."

For the next three days, we did a great deal of telling, but that was the last we ever heard of the Great IG Investigation of 1963. Two months later, President Kennedy was assassinated. No one felt like inquiring further of Salinger after that. When Salinger was a senator in 1964, however, I called him in Washington and asked if he had ever gotten the IG report. He said no. He also called Sylvester at the Pentagon. Sylvester said the report was "classified" and would never be made public. The Moss Committee is now trying to get a copy from Major General Keith Ware, the Army chief of information.

Salinger was an ideal solution to the recourse problem that had plagued *Stars and Stripes* for so long. He did for *Stars and Stripes* what Eisenhower did in World War II and what the Moss Committee is doing to-

day: He used muscle, the one language the Army seems to understand.

But Salinger and we made two mistakes. Salinger's was that he called on the Army to investigate the Army. In truth, the services are so committed to preserving their command structures that they are almost completely incapable of perceiving any truths that might appear to weaken it.

Colonel James W. Campbell, the present editor-in-chief of *Stars and Stripes*, made the point quite well when he admitted in a Frankfurt press conference in January that he had allowed a kill order by his deputy to stand, even though he disagreed with it, because he "didn't want to undermine the authority of a subordinate." To his credit, Campbell later admitted he felt he had made a mistake in not reversing the decision. (The story killed was an A feature by William L. Ryan on the new Soviet leadership.)

Our mistake at *Stars and Stripes* was in not making public the 1963 investigation at the time it took place. We were surprised that the "investigating" was to be done by the Army, but we were caught up in a heady enthusiasm generated by Salinger's quick response. We felt committed to the propriety of silence, both because the White House was involved and because we were civil servants and unwilling to give our own story to the competition. We were convinced we were on the right track.

Had we tipped off AP, UPI, and *Overseas Weekly* to what was happening, we might have created the pressure that only public attention can exert. The IG report might at least have reached Salinger.

For the Army, *Stars and Stripes* remains what it has always been, a dilemma. The Army cannot publish it with an entirely military staff it can control; there is not enough professional talent in the entire Armed Forces to produce it. The Army, therefore, must rely on "outsiders"—trained professional newsmen. But it cannot make professional newsmen accept what it has been doing to *Stars and Stripes* for the last 22 years. Fortunately, the staff will no longer shut up—and the Moss Committee won't let go.

## A FEW KIND WORDS FOR THE CIA

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Hon. William Atwood, editor in chief of Look magazine and former Ambassador to Kenya, presents a sobering view of the recent controversy and publicity concerning the Central Intelligence Agency and its role in countering the Communist offensive. Mr. Atwood knows at first-hand something of the CIA operations, and his comments merit close attention. The article, which appeared in the April 18, 1967, issue of Look magazine, follows:

### A FORMER AMBASSADOR SAYS A FEW KIND WORDS FOR THE CIA

It's open season on the Central Intelligence Agency. Just about everybody, from the California New Left to the Arizona Old Right, has been taking potshots at one agency of our Government that can't talk back. The revelation that it has helped finance through foundations some cultural and student groups seems to have aroused even more indignation than the Bay of Pigs fiasco 6 years ago. Editorial-page cartoonists are again caricaturing the foxy-faced little men in trench coats with CIA on their hatbands, and any mention of the Agency is good for a snicker on the cocktail-party circuit. CIA is once more a dirty initial.

And as usual, the CIA has had to keep quiet. It's the silent service that is never able to brag about its frequent successes nor confess its occasional failures. Even its friends on the outside have to be careful about what they say for fear of violating security. And yet, having seen quite a bit of CIA operations during my 5 years as a U.S. Ambassador, from 1961 to 1966, I feel like saying that I'm sorry about the recent furor and sorrier still about its possible consequences. For the exposé in *Ramparts* magazine has succeeded in doing what Communist propagandists have tried for years, in vain, to accomplish: the slandering of American students and scholars abroad and the discrediting of much of the good work done by our private foundations.

Carl Rowan, who was, like me, a Kennedy-appointed ambassador, recently asked in his newspaper column: ". . . [are] the benefits to 'freedom' accruing from these exposés of the CIA . . . great enough to balance out the damage done to our security"?

I don't believe that anybody should answer "yes" to this question without first taking the following insufficiently appreciated facts into consideration:

1. The CIA is primarily concerned with the collection and evaluation of intelligence from a variety of sources. Its 15,000 employees are neither spooks, jackasses nor supermen, as they are so often and so variously depicted in fiction; they are for the most part calm, studious, deskbound professionals who never do the kind of things James Bond does. Nor is the Agency by any stretch of the imagination "an invisible government." Abroad, CIA people assigned to our overseas missions are under the jurisdiction of our ambassadors. In Washington, CIA activities are cleared, approved and supervised by the interdepartmental National Security Council, which meets in the White House.

2. The CIA is also in the business of watching and countering the actions of the Soviet KGB and other Communist intelligence services. Unhappily, the cold war is by no means over. I have seen at first hand and close range in Africa how much effort and money is spent by our adversaries to bribe, deceive, subvert and undermine the potential leaders of these new young nations. And I have been gratified, as an American, that we have been able to alert our friends and help protect African independence and nonalignment—thanks in part to the CIA. The information we have been able to furnish free governments about the identity and activities of KGB agents among others has been invaluable. For the latter's activities are both far-flung and intensive. Between 60 and 70 percent of all Soviet-bloc diplomatic personnel in Asia and Africa are intelligence agents in disguise. And among Communist newsmen, the proportion is even higher. Compared to the opposition, we are quite thin on the ground; but then, our mission in these countries is not to subvert but to help prevent subversion.

3. Indirect CIA financing of student and cultural activity has been negligible compared to what the other side has been doing. The Russians alone are estimated to be spending $10 million a year in recruiting and proselytizing youth groups. Total CIA subsidies to counter this campaign since the early 1950's have been less than a third of this sum. The beneficiaries of funding have not—as implied in the recent exposés—been bought, badgered or corrupted by the CIA. In fact, most of them didn't even know where the money was coming from. Unlike their fellow students from the East, they were not expected to take orders, perform espionage functions or even promote official U.S. views on foreign policy.

Then why all the fuss? I think part of the reason is that the CIA has both an undeservedly sinister reputation and the wrong kind of name to be in the business of supporting activities that are peripheral to its intelligence-gathering mission. The British perform this function more discreetly. Student, youth and cultural affairs are handled by the British Council, a privately run but government-supported institution. The French work through their Ministry of Education and the *Alliance Francaise*. Their CIA counterparts manage to keep far away and out of sight—which is where they belong. This is not to say that Britain or France are "closed" societies. It's just that, being more experienced and sophisticated, they appreciate the importance of self-imposed restraint on publicizing intelligence operations.

We Americans don't—perhaps because we feel guilty about the CIA. I don't think we have any reason to, but then I've had more chance than most of my fellow citizens to see how the Agency works.

So what do we do now? Admitting that the CIA and our top Government officials were naive in thinking that these indirect subsidies could be indefinitely hushed up, we still should not jettison the activities they made possible—not if we care about enlarging worldwide understanding of America and what we stand for.

I believe that it's up to the Congress, which holds the purse strings, to repair the damage. You can hear plenty of patriotic cold-war oratory on Capitol Hill, but when it comes to appropriating funds needed to wage the cold war, our representatives don't always suit their actions to their words, except where military expenditures are concerned. Let's hope the recent furor will impel our elected representatives to realize that Vietnam is only one front in this war—and by no means the most important—and that being niggardly about foreign economic assistance, about USIA operations and about the kind of activities that should be handled by the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs is the most shortsighted kind of economy at this time in history.

The job the CIA has been doing covertly needs to be done overtly, perhaps by an agency with a less cloak-and-dagger-sounding title. Otherwise, we will only make it easier for our determined and unscrupulous opponents to convert and subvert a new generation of leadership in this revolutionary world.

And while we ponder how to do it, let's also hope the muckrakers get on a new tack. We've done ourselves enough damage already.

WILLIAM ATTWOOD,
*Editor in Chief.*

## HOMEOWNERSHIP FOR LOW-INCOME GROUPS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a new approach in providing homeownership for low-income groups, originated by Senator CHARLES PERCY, of Illinois, and cosponsored by every Republican in the

Senate and supported by over 100 Republican Members of the House of Representatives, is attracting national public comment and support.

I offer for the RECORD three editorials from nationally recognized newspapers which discuss the Percy housing bill:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Apr. 22, 1967]

PERCY'S PULLING POWER

The decision of all the Republicans in the U.S. Senate to join in sponsoring Sen. Charles Percy's housing bill is a bright omen not only for the bill but for the very junior senator from Illinois. We cannot recall when a bill proposed by a senator of less than three months' seniority has drawn this kind of unanimous support.

The variegated list of co-sponsors is an impressive display of Percy's salesmanship and his party's unity. It is a remarkable feat for a freshman senator, even for a remarkable freshman senator. It is no wonder that anybody who can talk John Tower, Jacob Javits, Strom Thurmond and Clifford Case into sponsoring the same bill should find himself being talked about as a presidential possibility.

The wide attraction of Percy's bill can also be explained by its combination of appeals. It uses government financing to meet an urgent social problem, but it relies primarily on individual initiative. And by encouraging private ownership of housing, it promises to save public money.

The mechanics of the bill are inventive and involved ("not perfect"), says Percy, who hopes the details will be worked out in committee. A National Home Ownershp Foundation would be financed by the sale of government bonds, to attract investors who otherwise might not put their money into slum housing. The foundation in turn would lend money to local, nonprofit associations that would renovate slum properties and sell them to poor families at low-interest, long-term rates with small down payments.

The federal government would make up the difference between the rates at which the foundation lends the money and the rates charged by the local associations.

Those unable to afford even modest payments could contribute their labor—a "sweat equity"—as apprentices in construction work. It is hoped they would learn job skills while working for their homes.

Under another part of the Percy bill, home buyers would be eligible to receive not only job training but counseling in the problems and responsibilities of maintaining their property.

The Percy approach is based on the observation that those with an interest in society—a home, in this case—can best be trusted to build and preserve it. Percy calls his bill an urban homestead act. It is not just another federal subsidy tacked on to the old ones but a new approach, which is another reason why his bill has attracted more attention than is usually given legislative requests from the White House.

The bill may also be an omen for the Republican Party's prospects in 1968. All 36 GOP senators now have aligned themselves behind an imaginative attack on a pressing problem of American cities. By backing the Percy bill, the senators have demonstrated that their party has more than opposition to offer the country's great urban centers.

Everett Dirksen, Illinois' senior senator and the leader of his party in the upper house, says the Percy bill will probably be "the major Republic housing measure in this session." It is also a major demonstration of the party's capacity for responsibility as an election year approaches.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 21, 1967]

THE PERCY PLAN

There is something universal in the desire to own one's home. Millions of immigrants went to the United States with the hope of achieving this goal, often denied them in their native lands. Countless poor American families have wished for the security of an owned dwelling. But low incomes and the building costs in American cities have frustrated the hopes of many. The choice offered the poor is usually a rented slum flat or public housing which the family must leave when its income rises.

Many of the ills of the cities have roots in the misery and insecurity of the rented slum homes in which families below the poverty line are living.

In presenting to Congress a carefully thought-out and opinion-tested plan for low-cost ownership of houses or apartments for the poor, Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois is providing a needed stimulus to action.

It is not the whole answer to the slum housing problem, as Senator Percy himself points out. He sees, as we do, the need for many approaches. An important one is that of the new federal commission appointed by President Johnson to go into recommended improvements in housing codes, zoning, taxation and other factors affecting building costs.)

But Senator Percy's proposal for establishment of a National Home Ownership Foundation moves down a largely untraveled road. He calls it "an attempt to mobilize the private sector, with government reinforcement at crucial spots." The program would be financed by the sale in the private market of up to $2 billion in bonds. The federal government would then provide subsidy to bring down the interest rate on mortgages to an amount the low-income families could afford. A further aid to the poor would be to accept the prospective homeowner's own labor on the dwelling as a part of the payment.

The program has a ring of practicality. It has already so recommended itself to both conservative and liberal Republicans that the party may well adopt it as a campaign issue. We hope it might win bipartisan support.

Lack of adequate housing has already emerged as one of the country's worst problems. It is part and parcel of continuing racial tensions and the preservation of the so-called "poverty cycle." The Percy plan is an imaginative effort to do something additional about this problem.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Apr. 23, 1967]

PERCY'S HOUSING PLAN

Sen. Charles H. Percy's bill for low income housing is one of the most ingenious plans yet proposed for fighting the slums. It is too bad the bill doesn't have bipartisan support; Percy reportedly tried to obtain it but could not.

The freshman senator does have Washington marveling, however, at the way he lined up support for the bill from 35 of his 36 Republican colleagues in the Senate, including such disparate G. O. P. spirits as New York's liberal Jacob Javits and Texas' conservative John Tower. This feat of persuasion has heightened speculation about Percy's chances for his party's Presidential nomination next year—anyone who can unify the strife-torn G. O. P. this way evidently has something the party needs. The speculation, in fact, has all but submerged the bill. Yet the proposal has merits that should make it acceptable to both parties.

Under Percy's plan, a national home ownership foundation would be set up to help nonprofit community organizations work out plans for low income housing. Financing of the local groups would be backed up by the federal government. The foundation would buy bonds that the local groups issued to finance their projects, selling them to the public as tax-exempt, government-guaranteed bonds.

The foundation would also help pay the interest on mortgages of low income families buying homes, or cooperative or condominium apartments.

One advantage of this approach is that it would give slum dwellers a real stake in the community—something they don't get by seeing their rents siphoned off by a landlord who often does not live among them. Tenants jointly owning cooperative or condominium apartments would have a common investment to protect in seeing that the project did not slip into disrepair. If a person's income increased enough, he would be obliged to repay the government for its assistance. The new jobs created by such increased building and rehabilitation of dwellings would be a beneficial byproduct of the plan.

There is some question how much an impact this approach would have in Chicago or New York City, with their large inventories of big, multiple-apartment dwellings. Rehabilitation of such structures would require extensive financing, and community groups might be wary of tackling such large-scale projects. In cooperatives and condominiums, moreover, money has to be set aside to pay for repairs as a part of the building payments. If something required extensive repairs, the individual payments of tenants would have to be raised to make up for a depleted maintenance fund. Experience has shown that poor people cannot stand such strains on their severely limited incomes.

Still, Sen. Percy should take a bow for developing what could become another highly workable tool to put to use fighting slums. If we are to salvage our cities, we need as many of these tools as we can find.

## THE REAL HEROES

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in continuing its fine publicity of the coming support-our-boys-in-Vietnam parade to be held May 13 along Fifth Avenue in New York City, the New York Daily News today carried an account of the coming parade with this headline: "Heroes Will Lead Viet Parade."

The heroes referred to are Congressional Medal of Honor winners who will head the mammoth salute to other American heroes—our servicemen in Vietnam.

Contrast these heroes with those heroes championed by the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee in one of its circulars headlined: "Free Three American Heroes."

The Fort Hood Three Defense Committee are formed to agitate in behalf of three Army enlisted men who were court-martialed, given dishonorable discharges, and sentenced to prison for refusing to go to Vietnam. The Communist Party, DuBois Clubs, and other Communist organizations have conducted a tremendous amount of agitation and distributed extensive propaganda material

on behalf of the "Fort Hood Three." This committee is supported by a mixed group of professed and identified Communists, fellow travelers, and pacifists.

The Fort Hood Three Defense Committee supported the Vietnam Week demonstration in New York in which the American flag was burned on April 15.

New Yorkers, past masters when it comes to parades, will have an opportunity to show who their real heroes are on May 13 when the support-our-boys-in-Vietnam parade goes swinging down Fifth Avenue. According to Mr. Ray Gimmler, parade chairman, the commemoration for our servicemen in Vietnam promises to be quite an affair. He said:

From all indications this parade promises to be one of the biggest New York has ever seen.

Here is a unique opportunity for those in the New York City area to render respect to the American flag in contrast to the sickening extremism of the flag burners.

Here is an excellent means of showing Moscow and Hanoi that the majority of Americans are undivided and resolute in helping free men defend themselves against Communist treachery and terror.

And finally and most importantly, here is a wonderful chance to tell our servicemen in Vietnam that—like their forefathers fighting in a righteous and moral cause—they are our real heroes.

I have permission to insert in the RECORD at this point the article from the New York Daily News of April 26, 1967, by Henry Machirella, entitled "Heroes Will Lead Viet Parade":

HEROES WILL LEAD VIET PARADE

(By Henry Machirella)

A number of Medal of Honor winners, from World War I through Vietnam, will head the Support Our Boys in Vietnam Parade to be held May 13 along Fifth Ave., it was announced yesterday.

Ray Gimmler, parade chairman, said: "From all indications this parade promises to be one of the biggest New York has ever seen."

Representing the recipients of the nation's highest military award will be Michael Valente of Long Beach, L.I.: Thomas Kelly of Manhattan; Charles Shea of Plainview, L.I.; John Meagher of Jersey City, Stephen Gregg of Bayonne; Maynard H. Smith of Nassau, N.Y. and recent Vietnam hero Robert E. O'Malley of Long Island City, Queens.

DARED ENEMY FIRE

During World War I, Valente charged through withering enemy machine-gun fire east of Ronssoy, France, that was holding down an entire company. He and another soldier finally silenced the fire by killing four and capturing 21 of the enemy.

Kelly, a medic in Germany during World War II, made 10 separate trips through murderous enemy fire to bring critically wounded men out of a battlefield death trap.

Shea, serving with the 88th Infantry Division in Italy, singlehandedly attacked three enemy machine-gun nests, killing the crews of the first two and three more Germans in the last nest.

Meagher, in the battle of Okinawa, charged an enemy pillbox and killed six Japanese after bayonetting one who charged his tank.

ONE-MAN ASSAULT

Gregg, a second lieutenant in France, staged a one-man machine-gun assault to permit a medic to recover seven wounded comrades from behind enemy lines.

Smith, a bomber gunner over Europe, saved his burning aircraft by throwing exploding ammunition overboard and manning all working guns until enemy fighters were driven off.

O'Malley is the former marine sergeant personally decorated by President Johnson at the White House for his heroism against the Viet Cong.

Because of the overwhelming response from persons and groups wishing to join the parade several new phones have been manned to accept calls. They are: in the Bronx, 669-7363; in Brooklyn, TR 5-9140; in Queens, BO 3-2279; Nassau, FL 4-2323 and 593-4790; Suffolk, RA 8-6337 and LT 9-1265, and Westchester, WH 9-1300.

---

## CONGRESSMAN NELSEN'S VERSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that would, I believe, provide an equitable and satisfactory approach for helping to solve the District of Columbia's acute revenue problems.

The bill offers something close to a middle course between the measure sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the House District Committee, on the one hand, and the administration-backed legislation, on the other.

To refresh the memories of the Members, the administration's proposal calls for a new method of computing both the annual Federal payment authorization and for determining the District's debt ceiling.

Under these provisions, the Federal payment would equal 25 percent of the general fund income from local taxes. The companion revenue proposal would limit the amount available each year for debt retirement to 6 percent of the general fund tax yield and the Federal payment.

Chairman MCMILLAN, however, has introduced legislation that would raise the District's fixed-dollar authorization ceiling for the Federal payment by $10,000,000, for a total of $70,000,000, and increase the fixed-dollar borrowing maximum by $25,000,000, for a total of $315,000,000.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, combines some key features of both approaches. It would set the annual Federal payment authorization at $70 million—the amount provided in Chairman MCMILLAN's measure. My bill, however, adopts the administration's computation proposal for determining the debt ceiling authorization, but with a major stipulation. Under this provision, the debt ceiling amount would be frozen at the end of the 3 fiscal years for a thorough review by Congress.

Until and unless Congress acted, this authorization level for debt would be held at the amount set under these provisions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970—the final year of the 3-year trial period. With this control feature, Congress would have the option of turning to either the fixed-dollar or the computation mechanism for determining the authorization levels.

The Federal payment authorization would, of course, remain at the $70 million level until revised by Congress.

The provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker, would provide the Appropriations Committees with sorely needed additional revenue leeway in their deliberations on the District's budget programs.

With this debt ceiling approach, District of Columbia officials would be better able to look ahead and thus develop orderly and sound financing for capital improvement spending programs and projects.

It might be well to emphasize that the proposed approach relates only to revenue authorization, and not to actual appropriations. Congress would, of course, maintain its annual control over the city's budgets through the appropriations review process.

For the purposes of clarity, here is a comparison of the authorization levels that would be established under the three revenue proposals:

Chairman MCMILLAN's bill: The Federal payment would be raised from $60 million to $70 million; the debt ceiling authorization would be raised from $290 million to $315 million; both would remain at these levels until changed by Congress.

The administration-backed bill: The Federal payment for fiscal 1968 would be $70.6 million; $74.4 million for 1969; $78.3 million for 1970; $82.4 million for 1971; $86.7 million for 1972, and $91.1 million for fiscal 1973. The loan ceiling would be set at $335.0 million for fiscal 1968; $353.3 million for 1969; $371.6 million for 1970; $391.1 million for 1971; $411.5 million for 1972, and $432.6 million for fiscal 1973.

The Nelsen bill: The proposal by Chairman MCMILLAN for a $70 million Federal payment authorization is combined with the administration's computation method of arriving at the loan limitation. The loan ceiling for fiscal 1968 would be $335 million; $349.6 million for 1969; and $363.9 million for 1970 and, at that point, would freeze for congressional review.

My approach to the District's revenue and budgetary problems should in no way be interpreted as being the only answer to these problems. The proposal of our distinguished chairman, Mr. MCMILLAN, has great merit and is a step in the right direction.

I have consulted with the minority members of the House District Committee and the consensus appears to support my proposal.

With the introduction of my bill the committee will have before it all the possible solutions to the District's revenue problems so that the committee can engage—as quickly as possible—in a meaningful and fruitful dialog looking to the best interests of the District of Columbia and the Nation.

*Comparative statement of revenues provided under various legislative proposals*

[In millions of dollars]

| | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Administration proposals: | | | | | | |
| Payment | 70.6 | 74.4 | 78.3 | 82.4 | 86.7 | 91.1 |
| Loan | 335.0 | 353.3 | 371.6 | 391.1 | 411.5 | 432.6 |
| Representative Nelsen: | | | | | | |
| Fixed amount for Federal payment with no escalation: Payment | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 |
| 3-year projection under computation method for Federal loan with no further increase without legislation: Loan | 335.0 | 349.6 | 363.9 | [1] 363.9 | [1] 363.9 | [1] 363.9 |
| Representative McMillan: Fixed amount for Federal payment and fixed limitation on loan amount; no escalation without further legislation: | | | | | | |
| Payment | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 |
| Loan | 315.0 | 315.0 | 315.0 | 315.0 | 315.0 | 315.0 |

[1] Prior to July 1, 1970, a review will be made to determine future method for establishing Federal payment and loan.

## MINK MARKET MENACE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, unless we stop the rising flood of price-depressing mink imports, American mink farmers may be forced to abandon their industry. Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill to place a yearly quota on mink imports that are in competition with domestic producers. Simultaneously, I have written the President urging the Chief Executive to use his authority under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to institute a Tariff Commission investigation into the problem of mink imports.

Imports of mink pelts are entering our country at an alarming rate, driving down the market price American mink farmers receive for their product. Last year the United States accepted 5.7 million foreign mink pelts with an import value of over $73 million. But it is even more disturbing to note that mink imports for January–February 1967 hit an average monthly rate nearly twice the average monthly rate last year.

Mink raisers in the State of Minnesota are feeling the adverse effects of the unfair competition caused by the swelling tide of cheaper foreign mink imports which is washing away needed markets for them. Minnesota ranks second among States in the production of mink pelts.

My bill to restrict mink imports would insure American mink raisers that their vital domestic markets would not be usurped by foreign mink. When foreign mink imports are dumped into this country at an average price of less than $13, every effort should be made to protect the interests of domestic producers whom it costs an average of $18 per animal to produce one pelt. That is why I earnestly hope the House Committee on Ways and Means will schedule hearings on my bill at the earliest possible time.

Under the provisions of the Langen mink import control bill, a quota based on domestic consumption would be placed on imports of whole skins, whether or not dressed, with a duty of 50 percent ad valorem on mink imports in excess of the quota allotment.

## FARMER STILL GETTING SHORTCHANGED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, with farm debt and production costs hitting recordbreaking highs, and farm prices continuing to go down, no wonder the American farmer is up in arms over low farm prices and concerned about what the future will bring. We on the House Republican task force on agriculture have found that the dire situation of American agriculture leaves little assurance of improvement in the future, except that the demands of the war might result in improved farm prices.

Feeling his pocketbook become lighter by the month, the farmer knows full well that he is being shortchanged—as the farm parity ratio continues its plunge now to a dismally low 74—the lowest since 1934.

If the present deplorable conditions of inadequate farm prices and increased agricultural imports to compete with commodities produced domestically continue, then we can certainly expect to see a continued decline in the number of farms in this country. Indeed, the future of the family farm in America has never been more endangered than it is today. That is why the task force will continue to analyze the farm scene in order that the many antiagriculture maneuvers which have repeatedly hurt the farmer can be corrected.

Total farm debt last year went up 10 percent—an average of over $1,200 increased indebtedness per farm. Prices farmers now receive for their commodities are substantially below those received last fall. The number of farms operating in the United States in 1966 dropped 4 percent from the previous year, and the Department of Agriculture now predicts 82,000 more farms will be wiped out in 1967. Obviously, the farmer is alarmed, with good reason.

There has not been a farm message sent to the Congress this year, nor is there any indication that the many anti-agriculture maneuvers will be halted. In fact, agriculture rated but one short sentence in the President's state of the Union message.

Lack of income equity between farmer and nonfarmer is a glaring, undeniable fact. While estimated annual personal income from nonagricultural sources rose 8 percent from the March 1966 rate to the March 1967 rate, estimated annual personal income from farming dropped 16 percent, as reported in the April 1967 issue of Economic Indicators, prepared by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Thus, if any group has legitimate cause to go on strike for a fair financial return, it would be the farmers.

If there is no objection, I hereby insert the task force statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ODIN LANGEN, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE, APRIL 26, 1967

The American farmer has his back against the barn wall. He is struggling under the burdens of record-breaking production costs, record-breaking farm debt, and record-breaking agricultural imports which compete with the commodities he produces. He has little assurance that present inadequate farm prices will show improvement, except perhaps as a result of the demands of the war. Indeed, the farmer's pocketbook tells him by its lightness that he is getting shortchanged for his efforts. And he knows full well that his plight is reflected in the farm parity ratio—now at a dismally low 74 (the lowest point since 1934).

Take a close look at the dire situation of American agriculture. Note the 122,000 farms which were wiped out last year and the fact that the Department of Agriculture predicts that another 82,000 farms will no longer be operating units at the end of this year. Is it any wonder that the American farmer is up in arms over low farm prices and concerned about what the future will bring? Unequivocally, the future of the family farm in America has never been more endangered than it is today.

It is in response to this deplorable situation that the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture will persist in its efforts in behalf of American agriculture, with the purpose of analyzing the farm scene, both national and international, in order to correct the many anti-agriculture maneuvers which have repeatedly and abrasively worked against the best interests of the American farmer. For if the farmer is not given the full and proper recognition he so richly deserves, the ability of this nation to produce its own food and fiber will soon be permanently impaired.

Without question, then, the economic condition of American agriculture is growing steadily worse. We find that the total farm debt in 1966 increased 10% over 1965—an average of over $1,200 increased indebtedness per farm. The increase was from $41.6-billion to $45.8-billion, or an increase in the national farm debt of $4.2 billion in just one year, according to page 305 of the *1967 Economic Report of the President*. And with increased production expenses, it is so very difficult to obtain a market return adequate enough to cover the production effort. That is why present low farm prices are all the more difficult for the farmer to endure. Price farmers now receive for their commodities are substantially below those received last fall.

The farm income picture is completely out of line with the rest of the economy. While estimated annual personal income from non-

agricultural sources rose 8% from the March, 1966, rate to the March, 1967, rate, estimated annual personal income from farming dropped 16%—as reported in the April, 1967, issue of *Economic Indicators* prepared by the President's Council of Economic Advisers:

*Estimated annual personal income from selected sources (change from March 1966 rate to March 1967 rate)*

| | Percent change | Change (billions) | Scope of change (billions) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Personal income from nonagricultural sources | +8 | +$46.5 | $547.0 to $593.5 |
| Business and professional | +2 | +1.0 | 41.5 to 42.5 |
| Rental income of persons | +4 | +.7 | 18.7 to 19.4 |
| Dividends | +4 | +.8 | 20.9 to 21.7 |
| Personal interest income | +12 | +4.9 | 41.4 to 46.3 |
| Wage and salary disbursements | +8 | +30.5 | 382.9 to 413.4 |
| Farm | −16 | −2.8 | 17.3 to 14.5 |

Take a look at the dairy situation, in particular. With 2.7-billion pounds of dairy imports (whole milk equivalent) entering our country in 1966, no wonder markets for domestic producers are being usurped and prices they receive held down. In fact, last year's dairy imports equaled the milk which could have been produced by over 300,000 American cows, or the milk production of more than 6,000 dairy farms with 50 cows each.

Remember: it was only last spring that the President followed the Secretary of Agriculture's advice in raising the Cheddar cheese import quota for fiscal year 1966 from 2.8-million pounds to 3.7-million pounds. We only hope that the President will see fit not to boost the Cheddar cheese import quota even further to 9.6-million pounds, a possibility he asked the Tariff Commission to investigate last spring.

Other agricultural imports adversely affect large numbers of livestock raisers: total beef and veal imports were up 27% in 1966 over the previous year; meat under the Meat Import Quota Amendment (Public Law 88-482) up 34%; pork imports up 14%; lamb imports up 19%; mutton imports up 102%; and present indications are that meat imports will continue to increase in 1967.

Or take a look at the dilemma confronting the grain farmers, who are asked to expand their production but are not given assurance by the Administration that their cooperative efforts will bring an adequate financial return.

ANTIAGRICULTURE MANEUVERS

Last year our domestic producers of food and fiber felt the economic impact of many developments, including the decision to dump huge quantities of grain upon the domestic market in order to break and depress grain and livestock market prices; a sharp curtailment of purchases of pork and dairy products by the military; repeated decisions to increase imports of raw sugar into the United States, designed to lower market prices for domestic sugar producers; decisions on the 1967 wheat program which will lower the blend price per bushel farmers will receive for their wheat; permitting or condoning price and wage increases for other segments of the national economy in excess of the 3.2% Administration guideline, while denying farmers the opportunity to receive fair prices for their products; the departmental action imposing restrictions on the export of cattle hides, calf and kip skins, such action causing lower domestic livestock prices, notwithstanding subsequent increases in shoe and other footwear prices; etc.

If the Administration would have avoided implementing the foregoing decisions, the American farmer would today be in far better economic condition. Indeed, these Administration policies and practices have repeatedly worked against the farmer's best interests—just as the Task Force on Agriculture predicted they would.

There is no indication that these antiagriculture maneuvers will be called to a halt, so the Task Force will be ever alert to further developments in the same vein in order to respond to them with full force in behalf of American agriculture. We note that there has not been a Farm Message sent to Congress this year. Moreover, agriculture rated but one short sentence in the President's State of the Union Message. Therefore, every effort must be expended to alleviate the worsening economic position of American agriculture before it is really too late.

If there is any doubt in the public's mind about the alarming extent to which Administration officials have welcomed indications that their efforts to depress farm prices have met with success, the public should take a look at the following substantiating evidence—just a few of the abundant examples:

"Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman expressed pleasure today with the fact that prices of farm products had dropped recently. It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices." (Article in the *New York Times*, 4/1/66)

"Mr. Ackley (Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers) cited as 'welcome' evidence of a slowdown in economic growth the recent turndown of pork prices." (article in *Wall Street Journal*, 5/16/66)

"You should take immediate action to increase the Cheddar cheese (import) quota for the current quota year ending June 30, 1966, by 926,700 pounds without awaiting the formal review and recommendations of the Tariff Commission . . ." (letter from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to President Johnson, 3/31/66)

"For example, I mentioned the fact that increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government's acquired large stocks of corn in its past price support operation, now we're releasing them into the market." (Interview with Mr. Gardner Ackley, Today Show, 3/10/66)

"Mr. LANGEN. Does this imply then because of production increases you think the present parity prices as established are too high?

"Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think parity income is the standard. I think parity price today is largely meaningless. It is just one of a number of factors.

"Mr. LANGEN. That doesn't answer my question. Do you think present parity is too high?

"Secretary FREEMAN. Yes."

(House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee Hearings, Part I, p. 77, 2/3/66)

Accordingly, we on the Task Force will persevere in our efforts to rectify this situation whereby the farmer is being shortchanged by administrative tactics and inadequate farm prices.

## OUR WAYWARD EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. BUCHANAN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I sent a letter to Eximbank President Harold Linder asking him to comment on allegations made against the Bank; to wit, that it had made a loan to the Government of Iran for a petrochemical plant which is to supply Russia and the Soviet bloc with petroleum products pursuant to Iran-Soviet agreement under which Iran is getting a steel mill—and also armaments—and that it had made some 80 loans in competition with commercial banks, which loans totaled $856,000,000, mostly in connection with the export of jet aircraft engines and related equipment.

I hope to have Mr. Linder's answer shortly, but my letter may be of interest to the Members of this House. The United States-Persian-Russian oil situation will perhaps be made clearer to those who find it interesting if they read my insertion in yesterday's RECORD at page 10744 entitled "Johnson's Oil Diplomacy Builds Slick but Dangerous Bridges to the East."

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., April 20, 1967.*

Mr. HAROLD LINDER,
*President, Export-Import Bank,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. LINDER: In the brief interval since you spoke to our Committee, several situations have been brought to my attention with respect to which I feel our Committee ought to have your views. I hope that it will be possible for you to answer these serious allegations prior to the reconvening of our Committee hearings.

(1) On April 12th, Eximbank announced a $60 million loan to the Government of Iran to help finance U.S. purchases of equipment and services for the construction of a petrochemical plant to be built by Shahpur Chemical Company (jointly owned by the National Iranian Oil Company and the Allied Chemical Company of New York) on the Persian Gulf. As you know, the State Department is concurring in or encouraging (depending on the source) United States oil and chemical company participation in Iranian oil consortiums which are exporting petroleum products to the Soviet Union. Assistant Secretary of State Macomber admitted to me in a letter of March 14, 1967, that U.S. companies in Iran were free to sell to the Soviet bloc because the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe do not fall within the prohibition of the Foreign Assets Control Act, which prohibits U.S. companies from selling even foreign-produced products to China, North Korea and North Vietnam. A *Northern Virginia Sun* article of February 22, 1967 states bluntly that back in January, the State Department pressured U.S. oil companies in the Middle East to sell to the Soviets, although the sales were arranged under the "greatest secrecy". Secretary Macomber has admitted that U.S. oil companies are participating in sales to the Soviet bloc, any of which deliveries could be transshipped to North Vietnam.

According to the *London Economist* of April 2nd, Iran and Russia are developing a new economic and political closeness. Russia is building a pipeline across Iran to the southern Soviet Republics and United States oil and chemical companies are entering into joint ventures with the Iranian government to develop the oil and gas products which are going to be piped to Russia. One such joint venture which will supply Russia with petroleum products is the Shahpur petrochemical plant, to which you have just granted a $60 million loan. Were

you aware, in granting the loan to Shahpur, that the facilities to be constructed were to be used in part to provide petrochemical products for the Soviet Union, as part of the Iran-Soviet agreement whereby Iran is slipping out of the United States sphere of influence and Russia is gaining her long sought toehold on the Persian Gulf?

(2) Apropos the present campaign of the Soviet Union to better its foreign exchange position and gather in hard currencies, for example, by opening up the White Sea shipping route and selling antiques in London, have you made a study of the benefits of the Fiat plant, with its 600,000 annual capacity, alleged by the February 10, 1967 *Wall Street Journal* to be intended primarily for export, to the foreign exchange position of the Soviet Union? If you have not made such a study, has the State Department, to your knowledge?

(3) I am appending to this letter a table showing nearly eighty loans made by your bank between January 1, 1964 and March, 1967, which reliable and highly placed sources in New York allege to have been made in unfair competition with commercial banks active in the field of export trade financing. In several of the situations mentioned, I am informed that your bank deliberately ignored information indicating that commercial banks had already obtained a commitment from a foreign buyer to borrow at a set amount. Instead of helping the commercial banks, your bank underbid them by offering foreign borrowers a lower rate of interest, thanks to your public resources, than the privately-owned commercial banks could match. I am informed that your loan to Iberian Airlines in 1966 was a particularly reprehensible example of business stealing. You will note that over a period of slightly more than three years, you are accused of having made $856,000,000 worth of loans "suitable in whole or in part for commercial banks." I think you owe it to the export financial community, yourself, and the House Banking Committee to address yourself very carefully to the situation regarding *each* of these loans—did you offer a below-market rate, did you underbid a private group which had received a commitment, and what were your reasons for making the loan?

(4) As you know, plans are afoot among leading banks to establish a corporation, perhaps an Edge Act or Agreement Corporation, to finance United States jet aircraft and related equipment exports. Among the eighty-odd loans regarding which questions have been raised, a good number—$449,000,000 worth—represent loans your bank made to finance jet aircraft and related equipment exports. Some persons interested in trade financing feel strongly that you have been guilty of gross "empire building" with respect to loan financing of jet aircraft and equipment exports, and that you are trying to block, with behind-the-scenes efforts, the formation of an Edge Act or Agreement Corporation through which commercial banks may finance jet aircraft exports. As you will note, the loans you are alleged to have made in unfair competition with the commercial banks, are all prime loans to solid, established countries, so that there is no question of "risk". I hope that you will address yourself in detail to the jet aircraft loan situation, and I hope that you will go on record with an emphatic approval of the efforts of commercial banks to form an Edge Act or Agreement Corporation to finance United States jet aircraft and related equipment exports, as per the hopes of the Treasury and State Department.

(5) With respect to the loans allegedly made by your Bank in competition with commercial banks, is it not true to say that our balance of payments is suffering by the fact that whereas commercial banks could be collecting market interest rate returns from foreign borrowers, some of whom had already agreed to market interest rates before your intervention, your Bank is collecting lower rates of interest offered for empire building reasons? Is it not true that the Department of the Treasury has sought to influence you to desist in your loan making competition?

(6) Also with respect to your competing with commercial banks by making loans at less than market interest rates, do you feel that it is proper for you to make less-than-market interest rate loans when the borrower is willing to pay market? In my bill, H.R. 8288, there is a provision which would amend your Act to prohibit you from making loans when market interest rate loans are available to the would-be borrowers in the United States. Would you object to having such a provision in your Act to amplify the present "policy of Congress" expressed in the statute that you not compete with private lenders?

I hope that you will be able to answer these questions in some detail before our Committee meets again on the subject of the Eximbank. Copies of this letter are being sent to all Members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency; to the Secretary of State and to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. FINO,
*Member of Congress.*

Enclosure.

*Export-Import Bank loans committed during 1964, 1965, 1966 and January–March 1967 which might have been made in whole or in part by commercial banks*

| Date | Country | Loan | | Portions suitable for commercial banks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Amount (millions) | Purpose | |
| Jan. 22, 1964 | Venezuela | $10.5 | Steel mill equipment | Maturities to 5 years. |
| Apr. 13, 1964 | Mexico | 1.6 | Cement plant | Do. |
| May 18, 1964 | Venezuela | 2.3 | Equipment for paper plant | Do. |
| June 1, 1964 | Mexico | 4.0 | Equipment for auto parts plant | Early maturities. |
| June 3, 1964 | Colombia | 2.5 | Agricultural machinery | Maturities to 5 years. |
| June 22, 1964 | Italy | 20.0 | Equipment for automobile plant | All. |
| June 23, 1964 | India | 25.0 | Equipment | Early maturities. |
| July 6, 1964 | Tunisia | 2.6 | Railways | Early maturities under political guaranty. |
| July 15, 1964 | Iran | 4.2 | do | Early maturities. |
| Aug. 10, 1964 | Philippines | 11.6 | Telephone cable | Do. |
| Aug. 27, 1964 | Austria | 2.0 | Cotton | All. |
| Aug. 31, 1964 | Italy | 1.65 | Equipment for steel plant | Do. |
| Sept. 2, 1964 | India | 6.8 | Pulpmill | Early maturities. |
| Sept. 10, 1964 | Japan | 60.4 | Jet aircraft | All. |
| Oct. 15, 1964 | Peru | 13.8 | Equipment for iron ore processing plant | Do. |
| Oct. 23, 1964 | Israel | 4.0 | Refinery | Early maturities. |
| Dec. 28, 1964 | Greece | 5.0 | Power | Do. |
| Jan. 7, 1965 | India | 3.34 | Chemical plant | Do. |
| Jan. 11, 1965 | Italy | 20.0 | Industrial equipment | All. |
| Jan. 15, 1965 | India | 17.0 | Locomotives | Early maturities. |
| Jan. 31, 1965 | Colombia | 2.5 | Agricultural plant equipment | Do. |
| Feb. 24, 1965 | Taiwan | 2.75 | Nylon plant | Do. |
| Mar. 3, 1965 | Nigeria | 3.36 | Power | Do. |
| Mar. 30, 1965 | Japan | 11.0 | Auto plant | All. |
| Apr. 12, 1965 | Argentina | 1.8 | Equipment for tire plant | Early maturities. |
| Apr. 15, 1965 | Greece | 2.5 | Equipment for cement plant | Maturities to 5 years. |
| June 30, 1965 | Japan | 6.4 | Chemical plant | All. |
| July 14, 1965 | Argentina | 2.5 | Equipment for synthetic fiber plant | Early maturities. |
| July 22, 1965 | Venezuela | 12.5 | Equipment for aluminum plant | Do. |
| July 30, 1965 | Mexico | 1.5 | Equipment for auto parts plant | Maturities to 5 years. |
| Aug. 4, 1965 | Germany | 2.5 | Steelmill equipment | All. |
| Aug. 12, 1965 | Mexico | 1.8 | Equipment for aluminum plant | Maturities to 5 years. |
| Do | Israel | 5.0 | Jet aircraft | All. |
| Sept. 16, 1965 | Austria | 1.5 | Cotton | Do. |
| Oct. 7, 1965 | Japan | 5.0 | Auto plant | Do. |
| Nov. 9, 1965 | Greece | 10.0 | Industrial Development Bank | Maturities to 5 years. |
| Nov. 17, 1965 | Italy | .9 | Computer system | All. |
| Do | Japan | 14.5 | Jet aircraft | Do. |
| Dec. 1, 1965 | do | 3.3 | Auto plant | Do. |
| Do | Ecuador | 0.8 | Equipment for paper plant | Early maturities. |
| Jan. 7, 1966 | Ivory Coast (Senegal) | 6.05 | Jet aircraft | All. |
| Jan. 13, 1966 | Ethiopia | 4.3 | Equipment for papermill | Early maturities. |
| Do | Taiwan | 31.2 | Power | Do. |
| Jan. 25, 1966 | Finland | .8 | Airplane engines | All. |
| Feb. 23, 1966 | Iran | 9.8 | Jet aircraft | Early maturities. |
| Mar. 2, 1966 | Mexico | 5.0 | Mining equipment | Maturities to 5 years. |
| Mar. 3, 1966 | do | 1.4 | Textile equipment | Early maturities. |
| Mar. 15, 1966 | Japan | 2.35 | Equipment for chemical plant | All. |
| Mar. 24, 1966 | Iceland | 0.3 | Dredge | Do. |
| Mar. 28, 1966 | Zambia | 4.9 | Aircraft | Do. |
| Mar. 31, 1966 | Mexico | 21.2 | Equipment for lubricating | Maturities to 5 years. |

*Export-Import Bank loans committed during 1964, 1965, 1966 and January–March 1967 which might have been made in whole or in part by commercial banks*—Continued

| Date | Country | Loan | | Portions suitable for commercial banks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Amount (millions) | Purpose | |
| Apr. 27, 1966 | Brazil | $1.5 | Equipment for auto plant | All with parent co npany guaranty. |
| Do | New Zealand | 6.5 | Jet aircraft | All. |
| May 13, 1966 | Peru | 2.0 | Various equipment | Do. |
| May 16, 1966 | Morocco | 1.6 | Equipment for gas turbine plant | Early maturities with political guaranty. |
| May 23, 1966 | Costa Rica | 3.2 | Equipment for tire plant | All with parent company guaranty. |
| May 25, 1966 | Belgium | 17.5 | Jet aircraft | All. |
| June 2, 1966 | Jamaica | 3.0 | Equipment for tire plant | All with parent company guaranty. |
| June 7, 1966 | Mexico | 1.75 | Communications link | Early maturities. |
| June 8, 1966 | China | 4.7 | Jet aircraft | All. |
| June 10, 1966 | do | 5.4 | Petroleum equipment | Do. |
| June 15, 1966 | France | 11.0 | Jet aircraft | Do. |
| Do | Iceland | 5.2 | do | Do. |
| June 30, 1966 | Spain | 2.1 | Power equipment | Early maturities. |
| July 1, 1966 | Japan | 2.0 | Equipment for chemical plant | All. |
| July 14, 1966 | Norway | 1.2 | Helicopters | Do. |
| July 18, 1966 | Mexico | .8 | Television glass tube manufacturing equipment | Do. |
| July 19, 1966 | Italy | 1.0 | Manufacturing equipment | Do. |
| Aug. 3, 1966 | Venezeula | 6.4 | Jet aircraft | Do. |
| Do | Mexico | 6.8 | Equipment for auto plant | Do. |
| Aug. 4, 1966 | Italy | 110.4 | Jet aircraft | Do. |
| Aug. 16, 1966 | Israel | 1.3 | Papermaking equipment | Do. |
| Aug. 22, 1966 | Pakistan | 2.5 | Various equipment | Do. |
| Aug. 23, 1966 | Iran | 9.0 | Power equipment | Early maturities. |
| Sept. 6, 1966 | Korea | 3.3 | Jet aircraft and related equipment | All. |
| Sept. 9, 1966 | Taiwan | 7.65 | Power equipment | Maturities to 5 years. |
| Sept. 26, 1966 | Iran | 13.1 | Equipment for petrochemical plant | Early maturities. |
| Oct. 4, 1966 | Iceland | 0.85 | Equipment for diatomite plant | Do. |
| Oct. 6, 1966 | Israel | 5.6 | Jet aircraft | All. |
| Oct. 10, 1966 | Venezuela | 2.0 | Equipment for steel plant | Early maturities. |
| Oct. 20, 1966 | Mexico | 1.28 | Equipment for synthetic rubber plant | All. |
| Oct. 27, 1966 | do | 10.0 | Railway equipment | Early maturities. |
| Nov. 11, 1966 | Japan | 2.5 | Equipment for polyethylene plant | All. |
| Nov. 21, 1966 | Tunisia | 0.7 | Equipment for tire plant | Early maturities. |
| Nov. 23, 1966 | Mexico | 1.8 | Dredge | All. |
| Do | do | 3.0 | Air navigation equipment | Early maturities. |
| Nov. 28, 1966 | Australia | 11.7 | Jet aircraft and related equipment | All. |
| Dec. 1, 1966 | United Kingdom | 4.6 | do | Do. |
| Dec. 9, 1966 | Portugal | 5.8 | do | Do. |
| Jan. 5, 1967 | Finland | 17.55 | do | Do. |
| Do | Japan | 22.5 | do | Do. |
| Jan. 9, 1967 | Taiwan | 5.0 | Relending credit to commercial banks | Do. |
| Jan. 11, 1967 | Ireland | 20.0 | Jet aircraft and related equipment | Do. |
| Feb. 2, 1967 | France | 6.5 | Jet aircraft | Do. |
| Feb. 24, 1967 | Spain | 5.9 | Communications equipment | Do. |
| Mar. 3, 1967 | Colombia | 20.4 | Jet aircraft and related equipment | Do. |
| Mar. 6, 1967 | Mexico | 4.0 | do | Do. |
| Mar. 9, 1967 | Sweden | 7.2 | do | Do. |
| Mar. 28, 1967 | Japan | 3.0 | Printing equipment | Do. |
| Mar. 30, 1967 | Australia | 65.5 | Jet aircraft and related equipment | Do. |

SUMMARY

| | |
|---|---|
| Total loans suitable in whole or in part for commercial banks | $856,000,000 |
| Loans wholly suitable for commercial banks | 589,000,000 |
| Loans to finance aircraft for prime borrowers | 449,000,000 |

## COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING REGULATIONS

Mr. BUCHANAN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing my 1967 commodity futures trading regulatory bill. I feel strongly that Congress must pay more attention to this increasingly important segment of American commerce. I include material as follows:

First. My press release, briefly describing my legislation.

Second. Explanation of changes which would be made in existing law—Commodity Exchange Act—by the Fino bill.

Third. Brief statement with respect to need to give the CEA carefully safeguarded margin-setting power with respect to futures trading. The need for margin-setting power because contract markets like Chicago Board of Trade, Nation's biggest, refuse to take the necessary steps themselves.

Commodity Exchange Authority is holding off a decision as to whether to seek margin-setting power pending completion of an Agriculture Department commissioned study—Wall Street Journal article of March 20, 1967, included. Probable CEA request will be for margin-setting power only where likelihood of excessive speculation instead of last year's sweeping power.

Fourth. Importance of commodity trading is growing, witness article "A Booming Bedlam in Commodity Trading" from Business Week of March 4, 1967, and New York Times article of March 19, 1967, on volume in commodities keeping up a record pace.

Fifth. The need for additional Federal regulatory power over the commodity markets is great. Included are New York Times article of February 13, 1965, showing how CEA's resources are inadequate to police commodity markets, according to U.S. General Accounting Office, and how trading practices and lack of competition go uninvestigated and uncorrected, as witness De Angelis and the salad oil swindle: New York Times article of March 10, 1966, describing how CEA failed last year in its regulatory power increase bid; Wall Street Journal article of April 6, 1966, on same subject; New York Times editorial of April 8, 1966, discussing how proposed CEA bill last year went too far vesting power in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sixth. There is fair sentiment for putting the growing futures trade in livestock and livestock products under the act, as per my bill. Two New York Times articles describe the growing livestock futures markets.

Seventh. It would be foolish to put sugar and coffee futures trading, to say nothing of cocoa, under CEA authority because such regulation would impose enough new administrative and financial burden upon such trading that the markets would shift to London, where there is no Government regulation and practically no margin requirements. Any price-influencing speculation would continue unabated, and the United States would lose trading profits and related benefits. Subheading 7 includes numerous enclosures and letters in support at this position. As a general policy, we should not seek to regulate futures trading in commodities produced outside the United States, and in which trading markets exist abroad free of controls. We should also rethink our participation in international commodity agreements like the International

Coffee Agreement, which are so disadvantageous to the American consumer and to dependent American businessmen.

[A release of Congressman Paul A. Fino, Apr. 26, 1967]

FINO INTRODUCES COMMODITY CONTROL BILL

Congressman Paul A. Fino, Dean of the New York Republican House delegation, and a senior member of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee, today introduced his 1967 commodity regulatory legislation. Mr. Fino also introduced commodity regulatory legislation in the 89th Congress.

In introducing this legislation, Mr. Fino said:

"Today, more than ever before, United States agricultural surpluses are disappearing and commodity trading is booming. Last year, the volume of commodity futures trading exceeded the volume of the New York Stock Exchange by several billions of dollars, yet this trading in commodities—which is extremely important in determining the prices for many food products—is not adequately regulated by the federal government. The only federal agency regulating trading in agricultural commodities is the Commodity Exchange Authority, a small agency within the Agriculture Department which operates on a meager and inadequate budget.

"For one thing, the Commodity Exchange Authority needs more money to do a good job. My bill would require the CEA to undertake a certain regular commodity trading investigations and would raise the CEA budget accordingly. Secondly, it would toughen the present Commodity Exchange Act to give the CEA greater powers over America's commodity exchanges. My bill would give the Commodity Exchange Commission margin-setting power with respect to commodity futures trading, albeit only in clear circumstances of excessive speculation, but my bill would not give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to put new commodities under regulation without Congress' approval.

"My proposal would also exclude from regulation under the CEA agricultural commodities produced abroad—for example; coffee, sugar, rubber, cocoa and so forth. The way to make sure that American housewives pay reasonable prices for these commodities is to get the United States out of international cartels like the International Coffee Agreement, by which United States consumers are made to pay high prices as a kind of indirect foreign aid to coffee growing nations. My bill calls for a study of these international commodity agreements.

"My bill would add trading in livestock and livestock products to the trading regulated by the CEA. Our American consumers need this kind of protection against speculation in beef and pork."

EXPLANATION OF PRINCIPAL CHANGES IN COMMODITY EXCHANGE WHICH WOULD BE MADE BY FINO BILL

The Commodity Exchange Commission would be given authority to set margin requirements whenever there is a clear danger of excessive speculation likely to cause unwarranted commodity price changes.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be given the following powers:

(*e*) To issue cease-and-desist orders against individuals for violations of the act.

(*f*) To establish minimum financial requirements which must be met by futures commission merchant registrants.

(*g*) To deny registration, after opportunity for hearing, to any applicant who does not demonstrate his meeting of the financial requirements or any applicant who it is found is unfit for registration, by reason of having engaged in practices of the kind prohibited by the act, conviction of felony, suspension by a board of trade, debarment from Government contracting, or having made false statements in the application, or for other good cause shown.

The bill would provide authority for injunctions to restrain or prevent violations.

It would make applicable to all persons the provisions of the act prohibiting fraud, cheating, deceit, bucketing, and false records in connection with the orders for or transactions in interstate commerce or for future delivery on or subject to rules of a contract market. The present provision is applicable only to members of contract markets or their correspondents, agents, or employees. Administrative action would be authorized with respect to any action intended to have or having the effect of restraining trade, as well as any unfair or deceptive act or practice.

Presently futures commission merchants are required to segregate customers' funds in separate accounts. The depository of such funds would be prohibited from treating them as belonging to the futures commission merchant or any person other than the customers. This is to prevent their being used to offset liabilities of the commission merchant, and so forth.

Recordkeeping requirements would be expanded to include a requirement with respect to records pertaining to spot or cash transactions and inventories.

The bill would make it a violation of the act for anyone against whom an order denying trading privileges has been issued to in any manner exercise such privileges during the effective period of such order. Heretofore the restraint was on persons extending the privileges without any affirmative restraint on the person against whom the order was issued.

The bill would affirmatively require contract markets to make effective trading rules prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and make failure to do so grounds for disciplinary action against the contract market.

It would make any person who aids, abets, or acts in combination or concert with any other person in any violation of the act responsible as a principal.

Manipulation and cornering, or attempts thereat, and transmitting false, misleading or knowingly inaccurate crop or market information would be made felonies instead of misdemeanors, as is presently the case.

The term "manipulate" would be defined so as to require that manipulation involve an action intended to raise, peg, fix, depress or stabilize prices, albeit there would not have to have an intent to go beyond this.

The bill would require the Administrator to undertake periodic investigations of commodity markets based on their contract volume, and the Authority would be given increased funds amounting to $250,000 per year for the purpose.

The bill would make contract markets liable in damages for violation of the act, or negligence in connection therewith, to aggrieved persons.

The bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of international commodity agreements, their viability in balancing world supply and demand, their impact on U.S. supply and demand and price structures, and other facets of the problem, by April 1, 1968.

The CEA should have power to set margins with respect to commodities over which they presently have jurisdiction. Clearly, the markets themselves are not always able to meet reasonable opportunities to police themselves. A March 4 Business Week article, included in the next section, describes how the Chicago Board of Trade is so loath to police itself that even its top officials feel that they may be inviting regulation—to this end, they are seeking political influence rather than taking corrective steps:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 20, 1967]

COMMODITIES: FARM AGENCY, SEEKING CONTROL OF MARGINS IN FUTURES TRADING, PINS HOPES ON STUDY

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—The Agriculture Department is far from burying its hopes for stronger controls over commodity trading.

With the help of a Washington research organization, it is seeking evidence to support its theory that higher margin requirements (partial payments on contracts calling for future delivery of certain commodities) can curb price manipulation or "excessive" speculation. The research study is expected to be given to Agriculture officials about mid-April.

Last year, the department supported a bill in Congress that would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to set minimum margins in commodity trading. It got no further than House Agriculture Committee hearings. And though it was only one of 14 major amendments suggested for the Commodity Exchange Act, this proposal drew the most vehement protests from industry witnesses.

The margin issue is no less controversial today. Commodity traders already are suspicious of plans announced by the department to regulate supplies of such basic commodities as wheat and corn with the aim of assuring farmers a "fair" income and keeping down Government costs for storing surpluses. Supplementing existing Federal supervision of crop production with commodity-price powers would complete Government dominance of once-free markets, they fear.

Not so, counters Alex C. Caldwell, administrator of the department's Commodity Exchange Authority. "It's 30 years since any major change in the Commodity Exchange Act," he says. "Meantime, the markets have changed and the situations have changed. If we're going to do any real policing, we're going to have to get authority to deal with market conditions as they exist."

The CEA supervises trading in domestically produced commodities. These include grains, soybeans and soybean products, wool, fats and oils, butter, eggs and potatoes. It isn't involved in trading of metals, hides, rubber, coffee, cocoa, or sugar, which to a large extent are produced by foreign nations but traded on U.S. exchanges.

DIFFERENT FROM SECURITIES MARGIN

The commodities-margin issue is probably confused by some with credit margins permitted in securities trading. These are set by the Federal Reserve Board as part of its general credit-control machinery. A security may be owned "on margin" for unlimited periods, but a futures contract is an agreement to take delivery of a specified quantity of a commodity by a particular date.

However, in many cases delivery is averted by a sale of the contract before delivery date.

The securities margin is in effect a down payment, currently set at 70% of the total purchase price. Commodity margins, on the other hand, are intended only to protect dealers from price drops and are consequently pegged by commodity exchanges at levels equivalent to far lower percentages. For example, futures contracts for March wheat, currently quoted at about $1.85 a bushel in Chicago, may be purchased on the Chicago Board of Trade with a cash margin payment of only 15 cents a bushel. If the price should drop 15 cents, the buyer need put up only another 10 cents to meet lower margin-maintenance requirements. The buyer pays the balance of the contract's value upon delivery.

CEA officials continue to follow the market action with the aim of developing a dossier of suspicious commodity-price movements. Such a compilation would help bolster any future department testimony before Congress. But beyond that, it might well foretell the precise circumstances under which the Agriculture Secretary would act to change margins should Congress ever give him the authority.

Consider a memo circulated in the department last June, describing "most irregular" movements of soybean futures prices.

On June 27, the memo noted, all soybean futures prices had advanced the 10-cent limit permitted in one day by Chicago Board of Trade regulations. The following day, "the July soybean futures price opened about 2 cents higher than the previous close," the memo continued, "dropped 6 cents in the next half hour, rose 10 cents in the next hour, fell 5 cents in the following half hour, closing about 1 cent down from the previous day." On the day after that, "the July soybean future advanced the 10-cent limit again to $3.75½ a bushel, the high for the season."

The scuttled 1966 margin amendment would have permitted the Secretary to act "whenever (he) has reason to believe there is danger of manipulation, sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in the price of any commodity, or excessive speculation in any commodity."

As might be expected, this sweeping authorization stirred a storm of grain-trade objections. Foremost was the argument that it would provide the Secretary with price-control powers enabling him to destroy commodity trading entirely. There was also criticism of its "blunderbuss" terminology, which was said to threaten a confusing collision with trading-practice definitions evolved from years of court decisions. Asserted Robert B. Parrott, director of the Grain and Feed Dealers Association: "The proposed amendment defines 'manipulation' so loosely and arbitrarily as to enhance the prospect that ethical participants in the markets would be falsely accused and convicted."

MAJOR OBJECTIONS LISTED

Evidence developed by Robert Nathan & Associates Inc., the research concern hired by the department, will help overcome such objections, Agriculture officials hope. Heading the effort is Harlan Bramble, a scholarly former State Department economist with long experience in international grain negotiations, who lists the major questions the study seeks to answer:

—Assuming "excessive" speculation can't be defined, can it at least be shown that substantial trading activity sometimes is associated with substantial price fluctuations, and which is the result of the other?

—Is control over margins a feasible tool for influencing price fluctuations?

—If the answer to both questions is yes, what administrative difficulties would be expected (such as timing Government action to assure the prices decline rather than rise after controls are imposed)?

In their study, Mr. Bramble and about five colleagues chiefly are mining daily reports of certain grain-futures contracts filed by brokers, traders and exchange clearing house members. The CEA has been receiving this trading information since 1924, but Mr. Bramble's work is complicated by the fact that the agency has discarded all the raw forms filed prior to 1958. Moreover, because of its limited budget and manpower, the CEA has tabulated the data for only two days of each month—the 15th and 30th, or the closest trading days to those dates.

The study will employ other data as well, including trading-volume statistics, compiled by the exchanges and clearing houses, and past Government reports on crops, weather and other topics "having a bearing on market conditions." All this is being "tempered by conversations with knowledgeable persons" in commodity trading.

Mr. Bramble will acknowledge only "some interesting findings so far." But he adds, "We'll contribute some light, I suppose, and probably raise a lot more questions."

Thus the Agriculture Department continues to press for extensive power to control commodity margins. On several past occasions, though, the Government has successfully "persuaded" commodity exchanges to increase margins to combat sharp price fluctuations. Most notable, perhaps, is the period in the spring of 1947 when, by the department's account, "a sharp rise in speculation activity indicated the need for substantially higher margins to prevent price distortions."

---

[From Business Week, Mar. 4, 1967]

A BOOMING BEDLAM IN COMMODITY TRADING

Volume is rising at the Chicago Board of Trade, the world's largest commodity exchange. And the public is joining in the action, with closer government control a likely result.

At precisely 9:30 a.m. every Monday through Friday, a bell rings in a huge room at the Chicago Board of Trade, and something akin to a 1,000-man karate match erupts.

The board's members, who have been waiting calmly in groups of five to 10 on the steps of seven wooden trading pits, suddenly start yelling, shoving, and waving their hands wildly in an effort to work out trades. Some bull their way through the thick crowd to get to other brokers. Some simply yell as loudly as they can—often in the face of another broker—and use frantic hand signals to try to make it clear that they have commodity contracts to buy or sell.

As faces grow redder, tempers shorter, the jostling more aggressive, and the roar louder, another day of trading is under way at the 119-year-old board—the world's largest commodity exchange.

*Lean days*

The board hasn't always been such a boisterous place. In the late 1950s, speculative trading of commodity contracts dwindled because prices were pretty much controlled by the government's agricultural price supports. As trading volume slackened, the board bought up 20 of its 1,422 memberships at $5,000 each in a vain attempt to keep up the value of a membership. Even then, the price sagged to $3,650 in October, 1960.

These days, however, it is hard to imagine how the board's trading floor, occupying a quarter of a city block, could be much more tumultuous—or its management more interested in setting up new programs to protect the board's new-found prosperity. Trading volume soared 25% last year, to a record $81.4-billion—only moderately below the $98.5-billion volume on the New York Stock Exchange, the giant of the nation's financial markets. Membership prices rose in response to $29,950. (The amount of money actually changing hands at the Board of Trade was much less than on the Stock Exchange, however, because traders don't have to put up as much cash margin in commodities.)

*Regulations*

But beneath the rosy glow is concern. The government is trying to tighten its regulatory grip on the commodity market, the last of the great U.S. arenas for free-wheeling speculation, just as it did on the stock market in the 1930s.

The government already has tried several times and lost. Last year, for instance, the Agriculture Dept. asked Congress to give it new powers over commodity trading, including the authority to set margin rates (the amount of cash a trader must put up when buying commodity contracts) and increased leeway for investigating price manipulations and for disciplining errant commodity brokers. Margins currently are set by the exchanges themselves, under the time-honored tradition of minimum government interference in the exchanges' operations. The bill was defeated, largely because of vigorous opposition from the exchanges.

This week, the government was at it again. The Commodity Exchange Authority, an Agriculture Dept. agency, was working on a plan to strengthen its regulatory activities by requiring brokers to supply more information on transactions. As before, there is strong industry opposition.

I. ROLE OF THE PUBLIC

The exchanges may be getting into a bind, however. They need increased trading by the public to help support their increased volume. But widespread public participation in the market is likely to bring stronger cries for tougher government regulation—especially if there is a major price decline in which the public gets hurt.

The public already is getting into commodity speculation in a big way. Donald J. Powers, a vice-president of E. F. Hutton & Co., estimates that the number of Hutton customers who trade commodity contracts has risen 40% to 50% the last two years. Another big brokerage house—Francis I. duPont & Co.—says its commodity brokerage business was the most active ever last year. Gardiner B. Van Ness, Jr., of Thomson & McKinnon adds that public trading of commodities has been on the rise since late 1965.

Many investors were attracted to commodities last year because prices rose sharply just at the time the stock market was falling apart. Some traders, according to Van Ness, also saw commodities as a good way to hedge against last year's price inflation. And as the investing public has become more sophisticated and speculative, it has gotten deeper and deeper into commodity trading, where the action is much more lively than in stocks or bonds.

*Sales training*

Brokerage houses, for their part, have been working hard to whet the public's appetite for commodity speculation. Some firms have started advertising that they deal in commodity contracts. Some have set up special programs to educate their salesmen on the big profits that commodity trading can produce for sophisticated customers—and on the pitfalls of big losses.

Board of Trade officials acknowledge that this heavier public trading is bound to increase pressure for stiffer government regulation. "Any time the public gets hurt the public is going to scream, and the government uses it as an excuse to step in," says Warren W. Lebeck, executive vice-president. "It happens in automobiles, it happens in cosmetics, and it happens in the stock market."

The board insists it would be willing to accept a "reasonable" increase in government regulation, but that too much regulation would hurt rather than help. That's because commodity trading, unlike stock or bond trading, thrives on unfettered speculation.

II. KIND WORDS FOR SPECULATION

While speculation has become something of a dirty word in the stock market, it still is as American as Girl Scout cookies at the nation's commodity exchanges. Visitors to the Board of Trade are proudly shown a film titled "The Speculators," and board officials righteously extol the "economic function" of speculation. The idea is that it allows farmers and grain processors, by buying and selling commodity contracts, to transfer the speculative risk for price fluctuations in their products to the professional speculators with whom they trade.

William J. Walton, a floor trader for General Mills, says that the company's reasons for trading at the board are simple. "Look at the price of wheat over the last year. It has fluctuated nearly 50¢ a bushel. Without a place to hedge our inventory, we would have no control over our profit and loss."

Robert B. Parrott, executive vice-president of Central Soya Co., adds that his company buys about half its annual soybean requirements during September, October and November when the crop is marketed. "This is a substantial commitment in dollars and cents," he says. "Obviously, we can't sell our products at the time of purchase, so we must hedge. This permits us to shift the price risk and protect ourselves against price exposure and hazard."

*Price supports*

Until a few years ago, government price supports were so high on wheat, corn, and certain other commodities, that farmers and processors weren't hedging. The government guaranteed them a better price than they would get on the open market. But last year, as prices of many commodities rose well above the support levels, hedgers flocked to the Board of Trade—and the speculators followed.

Another factor in the sudden surge of speculation was that the government's once-mighty grain stockpiles were getting smaller and smaller because of the world food shortage and reduced farm production in the U.S. Trading became so hectic that it had to be delayed several times in June to allow harried brokers to catch up with their paperwork.

*A wild ride on March wheat*

If investing on the New York Stock Exchange is too tame for you, consider trading on the Chicago Board of Trade.

When you buy a common stock, you own a piece of the company. But when you buy or sell a commodity "futures" contract, you merely agree to deliver some commodity at a future date at a set price, or to accept delivery of the commodity from someone else at that price. Thus, you are speculating on whether the price of the commodity will rise or fall before the delivery date and are taking the risk of price fluctuation away from the farmer or processor who owns the commodity.

*Risky*

And the prices do soar and sink. Among the factors that drive prices up and down are weather, government agricultural policies, the size of farmers' plantings, purchases of commodities by foreign countries, and international political developments.

Witness March wheat—that is, wheat for delivery this month. Late last September, the March contract was trading as high as $1.90 a bushel, or $9,500 per contract of 5,000 bushels. Any speculator who bought or sold a contract was required by the Board of Trade to put up 15c a bushel—or $750 per contract—in cash margin as a sort of performance bond in case of default. This low margin gives a speculator great leverage.

By early last October, the price of the March wheat contract had fallen to $1.74 a bushel—more than enough to wipe out the 15c margin of anyone who had bought a contract at $1.90, and more than enough to double the money of anyone who had sold a contract at $1.90.

The price of the March contract then rallied as high as $1.86 a bushel in late November, producing big profits for speculators who had bought at the October low. By the end of January, however, it was down to $1.61 a bushel—a penny shy of tripling the money of anyone who had sold the contract for $1.90 at the September high and again wiping out many buyers. At the end of last week the price was back up to $1.77, more than doubling the money of those who bought at $1.61 and wiping out those who had sold at that price.

*How it works*

When delivery date on a contract arrives, you don't necessarily have to clear your backyard and get ready to stack 5,000 bushels of wheat there. If your contract obligates you to deliver the wheat to someone else, you can simply cancel it by buying another contract that obligates you to accept delivery in the same month. Similarly, you can offset a position that obligates you to accept delivery.

Besides wheat, the Board of Trade has trading in corn, soybeans, oats, live cattle, and other commodities. If you are looking for more exotic speculation, you can trade everything from frozen orange juice to mercury to frozen pork bellies on other exchanges. The Board of Trade once even kicked around the idea of trading in Scotch whisky futures contracts. The only problem, as some members tell it, was that everyone wanted to be a taster.

III. UPDATING THE EXCHANGE

Now, spurred by the trading boom and by the threat of stiffer government regulation, the Board of Trade's management has taken on a new, more progressive look. Last fall, for instance, the board started requiring new brokers to take a three-hour test on the commodity market before being allowed to handle customers' orders for contracts.

The board also is stepping up its public relations program to polish its image and to stress the economic need for speculation in the commodity market. It has scheduled a three-day conference on international agriculture for May—the first major conference of its kind by the board. And it is installing new electronic equipment to speed the dissemination of price information.

*Other moves*

Some smaller commodities exchanges also are changing. The Chicago Mercantile Exchange, where trading volume last year was nearly four times as large as in 1963 is enlarging its trading floor. The New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange has embarked on an aggressive public relations program under its new executive director, Edwin B. Dexter.

The Board of Trade's new vigor is particularly impressive when you consider that it has been operating without a president since late 1965. The board has been searching for a new president since Robert C. Liebenow resigned a year and a half ago to become president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation in Washington. Robert L. Martin, the chairman, says the board has considered numerous candidates, but hasn't been able to find the right man so far. "You go with a lot of girls before you get engaged," he quips.

Of the board's new programs, the electronic dissemination of prices is probably the most overdue. But, as officials explain it, they spent most of their time in the late 1950s and early 1960s fighting government price supports, and didn't have much time left for other matters.

IV. SPREADING THE WORD

The price dissemination that's still in use couldn't be much more archaic. When two brokers complete a trade in one of the seven pits—octagonal wooden structures with several outside steps leading up to a flat rim and then several inside steps down into the "pit"—they flash the price by hand signal to a clerk standing in the "pulpit" overlooking the pit. The clerk then transmits the information to shirt-sleeved workers in a small, grimy back room.

From the back room, the information is transmitted over the board's ticker service, leased from Western Union Telegraph Co.

Then the really tricky part begins. Instead of using its own original information for posting grain prices on the trading floor, the Board of Trade takes the data off the Western Union tape. After that, the prices are transmitted by Morse code to a balcony around the trading floor, where clerks chalk the prices onto huge boards that can be seen by traders on the floor.

*Factor of error*

The entire roundabout process sometimes takes two or three minutes. In addition, it results in wrong prices being posted about 5% of the time and allows traders in Minneapolis, Kansas City, or any other location away from the trading floor to read the latest prices on the ticker before they are posted at the Board of Trade.

The new electronic system, scheduled to be installed this spring, will permit prices to be posted directly from the "pulpits" onto electronic boards on the walls of the trading floor. It is expected to reduce errors and be far quicker.

In pushing through its new programs, the board's management has encountered some opposition from members. In 1964, for instance, a special committee of the exchange wanted to stiffen numerous rules in the wake of the "salad oil scandal" at Bayonne, N.J. In that scandal, Anthony "Tino" De Angelis and his Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp. bought up about 30% of the soybean oil futures contracts on the Board of Trade and about 90% of the cottonseed oil futures contracts on the New York Produce Exchange, only to become overextended and go into bankruptcy when prices began to fall. As it turned out, De Angelis was also using forged warehouse receipts for collateral for borrowing.

*Rejection*

The Board of Trade's special committee urged that a "positions surveillance committee" be formed to protect against future price manipulations and attempted corners of the market, but the membership rejected the plan by a vote of 431 to 311. It also rejected a proposal for stricter margin rules.

Lebeck insists that although the proposals were turned down in 1964, "I think that things like this are gradually going to come along." Adds Chairman Martin: "We don't want to be like the guy in the buggy whip business who wondered what happened to him."

---

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1967]

VOLUME IN COMMODITIES KEEPING UP WITH RECORD PACE OF 1966

(By Elizabeth M. Fowler)

Last year proved to be a record one for commodity futures trading, with 10.4 million contracts traded. Brokers noted that a shift out of the stock market into commodity futures had helped.

Then along came January and some disillusionment. Many commodities had lost their speculative appeal. Furthermore, the stock market looked interesting.

January's volume of commodity futures fell to 801,500 contracts down 5 per cent from the 847,900 in the month a year earlier. Most of the decline could be traced to sharply lower speculative interest in soybeans and soybean oil, linked to lower export demand and a larger crop.

The trend changed in February. Figures just released by the Association of Commodity Exchange Firms, Inc., showed 741,385 contracts traded in February, 8 per cent ahead of the 686,379 in the month a year ago.

By a scant margin of less than 1 per cent, trading for the first two months exceeded last year's record pace.

On the bright side for trading activity, wheat and corn have been moving at a faster pace this year than last.

Meanwhile, speculative interest continues to remain quite heavy in Maine potatoes, pork bellies, live cattle and world sugar. And in recent weeks there has been a spurt in silver futures trading.

Volume and speculative interest in potatoes continue strong in the face of sharply declining prices. Apparently some traders have clung to the belief that the market has been oversold.

In the case of pork bellies and live cattle, much of the attraction has centered on Government talk of helping farmers to get higher cash prices for live hogs and cattle. There has been a report, too, that farmers have been moving more live animals than usual to market now in the hope of forcing higher prices later. The picture remains confused.

Speculative interest in world sugar increased sharply on news some weeks ago of sales of low-priced sugar for industrial use. For example, Publicker Industries, a chemical and liquor company, bought sugar to be processed into alcohol.

Japan was also reported to be a substantial buyer of sugar for similar use. Since that news, prices have tended to drift lower in quiet trading.

The most recent switch of speculative interest has been into silver futures. Many brokerage firms have deliberately avoided suggesting speculation in silver because the prospect of the Treasury's permitting a price rise remains a year off.

Nonetheless, trading in this relatively inactive contract has been on the increase. Only 10,013 silver contracts were traded in all 1966. In January this year, volume totaled 2,520 contracts.

In February trading amounted to 1,806 contracts.

Recently, the Government announced plans to sell a large amount of its silver reserves, indicating that it hoped to keep the price at the current $1.29 an ounce at least through 1967.

---

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1965]

SUPERVISION LAGS FOR COMMODITIES—FEDERAL AGENCY IS SEEKING BROAD POWERS TO CURB TRADING MALPRACTICES—ENFORCEMENT ASSAILED—OLD ASSOCIATES OF DEANGELIS APPARENTLY STILL CAST A SHADOW OVER MARKETS

(By Richard Phalon)

Anthony DeAngelis is walloping pots in the kitchen at the Lewisburg, Pa., penitentiary for his part on the $150-million-salad-oil swindle, but there was an indication last week that some of his old buddies still cast a long shadow over the commodities markets he once dominated.

That became apparent when a Federal grand jury charged A. James Comenzo, who used to handle much of the floor brokerage for DeAngelis on the New York Produce Exchange, with fraud and violations of the Commodity Exchange Act.

Mr. Comenzo insists he will prove his innocence in court. He said: "There's nothing to" the four indictments, which among other things, contend that Mr. Comenzo and an associate filed false financial statements with the Government after setting up a commodities brokerage concern called Harney, Burns, Inc., late in 1963.

PROMISE OF PROFITS

The grand jury also charged, on evidence first dug up by the Commodity Exchange Authority, the Government agency responsible for policing the securities markets, that customers had been lured into the concern with roseate promises of big profits. The profits somehow turned into losses, the grand jury said.

The indictments further allege that Harney, Burns "churned" customers' accounts in an effort to beef up commissions and that customers' cash accounts were not segregated, as the Commodity Exchange Act demands.

Criminal actions against futures brokers, according to Alex C. Caldwell, C. E. A. administrator, are few and far between. And for all the muscle the C. E. A. has put behind it, the Comenzo case illustrates that regulation in the commodities markets is considerably more porous than in the securities markets.

* * * * *

FOOD PROCESSORS AFFECTED

Enforcement of the rules that govern the game on the futures markets—and some of the shortcomings in those rules—are questions of more than casual interest to food processors, who use the commodities exchanges to "hedge" their soybean-oil and wheat inventories, for instance, against price fluctuations.

They are also questions of more than casual moment for members of the public who speculate in commodities.

And they are questions of importance for every housewife who has ever loaded a supermarket basket with bread, butter, cereals, bacon or beef. As Mr. Caldwell told a Senate Committee last year, what happens in the commodity markets can affect consumer prices.

The C. E. A.'s budget for this year is $1.19-million, roughly 7 per cent of what was earmarked for the Securities and Exchange Commission's oversight of the stock markets, or about $800,000 less than what was allocated to the S. E. C.'s New York regional office alone.

There are time lags in most S. E. C. prosecutions, too, but the Comenzo case suggests that the short-staffed C. E. A. has a certain amount of difficulty in penetrating behind the documentation commission brokers are required to file.

Thus, the C. E. A. approved the Harney, Burns registration as a futures commission merchant in December, 1963, and again in December, 1964. It was not until April of last year that the C. E. A. filed an administrative complaint against the concern. The grand jury charged Harney, Burns with fraud that dated to November, 1963.

The grand jury also charged that when Harney, Burns went out of business last spring, possibly because of the interest the C. E. A. had begun to show in its activities, a "successor" company called the Dunbeath, Hagen Corporation, theoretically under completely different management, sprang up at the same 50 Broad Street address.

The C. E. A., because the law is so permissive as to entrance requirements into the commodities brokerage business, approved Dunbeath, Hagen's registration in July of last year.

It was not until the end of December that the Government agency complained that Dunbeath, Hagen had filed "a false financial statement . . . which misrepresented and concealed the true financial condition" of the concern.

Neither Harney, Burns nor Dunbeath, Hagen was a member of any of the regulated exchanges. Under the terms of the Commodity Exchange Act, and unlike the broker-dealer requirements in the securities business, the two concerns did not have to show even a minimum amount of capital to qualify for registration as futures commission merchants.

The Commodity Exchange Act is so elastic that even a felony conviction does not bar entry into the business, investment advisers do not have to register, and neither do brokerage firm salesmen.

The Comenzo case in fact, provided a counterpoint on how far removed the commodities business is from regulatory practices that have long been standard in Wall Street.

Two of the salesmen named as defendants along with Mr. Comenzo in one of the four indictments drifted into Harney, Burns after having been forced out of the securities business.

Their registrations were lifted last year as the result of an S. E. C. investigation into high-pressure sales tactics at the New York brokerage concern of Fabrikant Securities, Inc.

Still a third Harney, Burns salesman was among the 14 individuals cited last year in an S. E. C. complaint of stock manipulation.

Many New York Stock Exchange member firms, of course, do a brisk business in commodities. Their salesmen are subject to Big Board discipline.

Commodity-exchange member firms are also choosy about the kind of sales help they take on, but both Mr. Caldwell and Louis J. Lefkowitz, New York State Attorney General, are convinced that some refugees from the boiler rooms have infiltrated the booming commodities trade.

WHERE THE ACTION IS

"The dynamiters," says Assistant Attorney General Fred D'Ambrosi, "are taking the path of least resistance. They go where the action is."

At the moment, the C. E. A. has no plans to bring brokerage-firm salesmen under its direct control. The government agency did, however, propose a bill in the last session of Congress, and again this session, that would set minimum capital standards for brokers who want to get into the business.

The bill would also empower the C. E. A. to slam the door on any prospective broker who has been suspended by a commodity exchange, convicted of a felony, barred from doing business with the Government, or who makes a "false statement" on his application.

The bill stirred no noticeable enthusiasm in Congress last year and, though the House Agriculture Committee is expected soon to schedule hearings on it, some observers believe the outlook for passage is not good.

Industry opposition is likely to center less on the minimum-capital and "pedigree" provisions of the bill than on the power the C. E. A. wants to set margin requirements on the exchanges whenever it believes there is danger of excessive speculation, unwarranted price moves, or manipulation.

The agency also wants injunctive and "cease and desist" powers. It would also like to see written into the Commodity Exchange Act of 1936 a definition of manipulation. The statute, though originally framed to outlaw manipulation, unaccountably does not spell out what the term means.

Mr. Caldwell thinks the proposed legislative package would make for much more effective policing. There has "been no general revision of the Act for 30 years," he says. "The markets have changed and the times have changed."

Though some of the proposed amendments would give the C.E.A. the kind of injunctive leverage the S.E.C. has always had at its command, that precedent cuts no ice in the trade.

Robert Martin, chairman of the Chicago Board of Trade, thinks that giving the C.E.A. injunctive powers is a bad idea.

"They wouldn't have to prove anything," he says, "they'd just have to suspect it. They could force people to divest themselves of a position—then apologize if they were wrong."

Mr. Martin is also dead-set against giving the C.E.A. control over margins, the "earnest money" traders have to put up on futures contracts. So is Everette B. Harris, president of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

Washington, Mr. Martin contends, is a long way removed from the realities of the jostling and shouting traders in the wheat and

soybean pits, and would be inclined "to play things safe," perhaps to the detriment of the exchanges' function as a hedging place.

The Board of Trade chairman is also convinced that the definition of manipulation the C.E.A. is seeking is much too vague. What is needed, he says, "is a rifle, not a shotgun."

"We're always on the watch for manipulation," Mr. Martin adds, "but it's not that much of a problem."

That statement is seconded by Mr. Caldwell. "I don't think there's been any increase in manipulation," the C.E.A. head says.

The box score would seem to support both men. Since 1936, the C.E.A. has logged only 28 administrative complaints against manipulation, about 22 of which, Mr. Caldwell says, resulted in "effective sanctions."

Yet the General Accounting Office, which rides herd on the regulatory agencies, is convinced that the C.E.A. has not found more violations because it has not been looking hard enough.

QUESTIONABLE PRACTICES CITED

Last July the Accounting Office said the C.E.A. had not been running enough trade-practice investigations "to disclose and discourage abusive trading practices . . . on certain commodity futures markets."

In the five years ended June 30, 1964, the G.A.O. said, the agency had not once checked the trading pattern on 21 "regulated" markets, with a combined volume of $33.7-billion, that accounted for 76 per cent "of the average annual value of all futures contracts."

In addition, the G.A.O. reported that three of the fastest-growing markets on the board accounting for a combined average annual volume of $26.5-billion—soybeans, soybean oil and soybean meal "had never been subjected to a trade-practice investigation since their establishment," a period that ranged from 13 years to almost a quarter-century.

In the course of investigating the investigators, the G.A.O. pieced together buy and sell orders on an exchange the C.E.A. had not checked out for seven years. Over a single three-month period, it found 47 instances "where questionable trading practices appeared to exist."

The C.E.A. followed up on the evidence and ultimately slapped a suspension order on two brokers. They admitted to having dealt at the expense of their customers and to having run a series of "wash," or fictitious, sales.

The G.A.O., in addition to finding that the "number of trade-practice investigations made by C.E.A. was . . . insufficient to provide the necessary deterrent to abusive trading practices," also rapped the agency's knuckles for not having made regular examinations of exchange records.

A periodic review of "inside" documents such as the minutes of business-conduct-committee and directors meetings, the G.A.O. said, would put the C.E.A. in the "possession" of information needed "to effectively administer and enforce the provisions of the Act."

Mr. Caldwell, more than three months before the report came to the surface, told the G.A.O. that he agreed his agency should be making more trade-practice investigations but that, unfortunately, there was the budget problem. The C.E.A. had neither the money nor the staff needed to keep a more aggressive tab on the exchanges.

But the Accounting Office said C.E.A. could not "limit its responsibility to properly police trade practices . . . merely because additional manpower and funds may have to be requested."

On April 1, two weeks after having told the G.A.O. about his agency's money problems, Mr. Caldwell appeared before a House Appropriations subcommittee. Presumably in accordance with policy laid down by the Agriculture Secretary, he made no request for an increase over the $1.16-million the C.E.A. got in fiscal 1965.

TRADITION OF FRUGALITY

According to the transcript, Representative Thomas G. Morris, a New Mexico Democrat, asked: "Isn't it rather unusual not to ask for any increase in funds over a previous fiscal year in your agency?"

"No, sir," Mr. Caldwell replied. "We have been rather conservative in our budget requests in the past—as I believe the chairman will agree."

Jamie L. Whitten, Democrat of Mississippi, made it clear that he did indeed agree. "Yesterday," he said, "I reminded everyone that Mr. Mehl [a former C.E.A. administrator] some years ago turned some money back that he couldn't use and he got written up all over the United States, competing with two or three movie stars for newspaper space."

Mr. Caldwell carried on his agency's tradition of frugality when he appeared before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee two months later—a month before the G.A.O. published its report.

"You are satisfied with the amount of money?" asked Senator Milton R. Young, Republican of North Dakota.

"Yes, sir," Mr. Caldwell replied.

The C.E.A. has put in a budget request of $1,398,000 for fiscal 1967, an increase of about $200,000. It is not clear at this point whether the increase would be earmarked for more trade-practice investigations or whether the request is pegged to the additional money the C.E.A. will need if the Commodity Exchange Act is amended.

The agency apparently intends to buttress its case for the amendments with atrocity stories raked from the debris of Anthony "Tino" DeAngelis's wild foray into the commodities markets.

The C.E.A. did not come out of that episode with distinction. It had position reports on DeAngelis and knew beyond question that he had accumulated about 80 per cent of the cottonseed-oil contracts on the New York Produce Exchange and about 30 per cent of the open soybean oil contracts on the Chicago Board of Trade.

CLOSED BOOKS ON DE ANGELIS

Exactly why the C.E.A. did not act—or felt it could not act before the DeAngelis collapse—has been kept a closed book. Two Congressional committees that attempted to get at the agency's files and question some of its personnel pulled up short when C.E.A. said public disclosures might jeopardize the case against DeAngelis.

Now that DeAngelis has been jailed, the receiver for Ira Haupt & Co., an old-line brokerage firm that lost $20-million and was liquidated as a result of the swindle, has started a court action in the hope of getting access to some C.E.A. records.

Two attorneys for the receiver—Ira Millstein and Carl Lobell—are trying to determine whether Haupt can justifiably file suit against the exchanges for failure to regulate and have argued that the C.E.A. files are important to that determination.

The attorneys have also been questioning officials and directors of the exchanges. Harry E. Anderson of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith has testified that he was concerned that DeAngelis had actually cornered the cottonseed-oil market.

"I was afraid," he told Mr. Millstein, that the New York Produce Exchange was "going to be in violation of the Commodity Exchange Action that a corner was being allowed to develop."

Mr. Anderson also testified that directors of the New York Produce Exchange Clearing House in August, 1963—some three months before DeAngelis's roof caved in—ordered their chairman "to communicate to the manager of the exchange their concern over the manner in which trading was being conducted and their apprehension over the concentration of interest." DeAngelis's position continued to build.

Similarly, Robert Rachlin, a partner of Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, recently testified that he, in the spring of 1963, warned the Chicago Board of Trade's soybean oil committee that DeAngelis was "attempting to run a corner," and that he "would eventually go bankrupt," because of the murderous premiums he was paying to keep prices high."

Mr. Rachlin says he voted to expel DeAngelis from the Board of Trade when the then-president of the Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corporation was brought up on charges of wash sales several months before the collapse.

"I felt," Mr. Rachlin testified, that "we had Mr. DeAngelis in the position the Treasury Department had Mr. Capone. We could hang him for the wrong reasons, perhaps, but keep him out of there."

The board voted to suspend DeAngelis for 30 days. "I didn't feel I was too persuasive in convincing a lot of people who were economically interested in Mr. DeAngelis," Mr. Rachlin said. "Nobody wanted to kill the golden goose."

---

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1966]

COMMODITY AGENCY FAILS IN BID FOR BROAD REGULATORY POWERS

(By Richard Phalon)

A cortege of more than 20 witnesses appeared before a House Agriculture subcommittee last week. By the time the last attaché case snapped shut on the last prepared statement and the hearings ended, it was clear that the Commodity Exchange Authority's hopes for broader regulatory power over the nation's commodity markets had been left for dead.

The last flicker of life in those hopes was snuffed out when Representative Spark M. Matsunaga, a Hawaii Democrat and chairman of the subcommittee on domestic marketing and consumer relations, said, "there has been no real need shown for the bill."

That statement was a blunt summary of the stand taken by almost all of the commodity market officials who attended the obsequies, and it was seconded by several other subcommittee members.

Representative Charles M. Teague, Republican of California, said he thought Robert L. Martin, chairman of the Chicago Board of Trade, had made a much "more convincing case against the bill" than Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George Mehren had made for it.

"No case has been made for the bill," said Representative Bob Dole, a Kansas Republican.

The bill, among other things, would have amended the Commodity Exchange Act to include a definition of manipulation. The act was drawn to outlaw manipulation, but unaccountably does not spell out what the term means.

The C.E.A. also hoped to get injunctive and "cease and desist" powers, one of the primary weapons the Securities and Exchange Commission relies on in regulating the stock markets.

Further, the C.E.A. was asking for margin requirements on the commodity exchanges—the so-called "earnest money" traders have to put up—whenever it believed there was a danger of excessive speculation, unwarranted price moves, or manipulation.

The exchanges, apparently to the satisfaction of the subcommittee, argued that the amendments would amount to writing the C.E.A. a blank check.

"If passed," said Everette B. Harris, president of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, "this resolution will give the Secretary of Agriculture unprecedented power."

"If used mistakenly by the present or any future Secretary," Mr. Harris continued,

"it could disrupt completely and ultimately destroy our entire system of futures trading in agricultural commodities."

The industry's position has been clear for more than 2 years now. The Department of Agriculture sent a similar bill to Capitol Hill last session only to see it disappear into a morass of Congressional inaction.

The industry had plenty of time to mend its political fences. The C.E.A. based its brief for tighter regulation on the $150,-million salad-oil swindle and Anthony DeAngelis's wild foray in the cottonseed oil and soybean oil futures markets.

ACTION INEFFECTIVE

The C.E.A. proved itself to be a watchdog with rubber teeth in that episode, a chastening fact of regulatory life the General Accounting Office underscored last July, when it reported that the Government agency had not been running enough trade practice investigations "to disclose and discourage abusive trading practices . . . on certain commodity futures markets."

Testimony coming out of the continuing investigation into the case suggests that the Chicago Board of Trade and the New York Produce Exchange were no better at flagging down DeAngelis than the C.E.A.

Curiously enough, the G.A.O. report was generally ignored during the subcommittee hearings last week. When it did sneak into the record at one point, a Congressman confessed complete surprise to the existence of the survey.

It was no surprise to the industry that the C.E.A. planned to buck for legislation after the collapse of the DeAngelis empire. The industry began to muster its lobbying forces at least as early as January, 1964—two months after the swindle surfaced.

On Jan. 20, 1964, for instance, one Chicago Board of Trade official told another that a study of the swindle "could be presented to members of Congress in support of our position that certain proposed legislation is not necessary.

Vice President Humphrey, then a Senator from Minnesota, the official wrote, "made a strong suggestion that such a study would be well received by members of Congress and may perhaps forestall legislation."

AN EAR TO THE GROUND

Still another Board of Trade official, at about the same time, asked a Congressman from South Dakota to "keep his ear to the ground" and drop him a line "if there appears to be any ground swell for new legislation."

Not all of the testimony the subcommittee heard last week was hostile. Harry L. Graham, legislative representative for the National Grange, a farm organization, said the bill was necessary "not only to correct the abuses we have seen, but to prohibit similar abuses in the future."

Mr. Graham also suggested that the recently opened futures contracts in frozen pork bellies and beef sides "had something to do with the increase in the price of bacon this last year, an increase not consistent with the price of pork."

The C.E.A. recently checked into the possibility of manipulation in pork-belly trading and gave the Chicago Mercantile Exchange a clean bill of health.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 6, 1966]

FARM AGENCY'S PUSH FOR BROADER AUTHORITY OVER COMMODITY EXCHANGES SEEMS STIFLED

WASHINGTON.—Commodity-trading groups appear to have stifled an Agriculture Department push for broader Federal authority to regulate commodity exchanges.

More than 20 trade spokesmen, representing food processors, farm groups and grain dealers as well as the exchanges, have blasted the proposed new regulatory legislation at hearings before a House Agriculture subcommittee. Provisions empowering the Secretary of Agriculture to set credit and down-payment requirements for commodity-futures trading and broadening the terms of a ban on market "manipulation" have drawn the sternest opposition. Commodity-exchange spokesmen also complain that the bill would let the Secretary set exchange procedures and prescribe the terms of futures contracts.

With only the Agriculture Department promoting the bill, the present disposition of most subcommittee members is to shelve the measure. Some of the bill's minor features appear constructive, "but the cloudburst over the main ones has deluged all the rest," says a subcommittee Democrat.

The Agriculture Department based its campaign on a need for guarding against "another salad-oil scandal" and for curbing "unreasonable price fluctuations." Under critical questioning from House panelists, however, department officials acknowledged that they already have tools for dealing with fraud and attempted market-rigging in the existing Federal Commodity Exchange Act. The act requires the licensing of most commodity exchanges, provides for imposition of dollar ceilings on the futures-trading activity of a single firm or individual, and enables the department to ban further exchange dealings by anyone it finds guilty of attempted market-cornering or manipulation.

The one section of the bill that might survive the industry onslaught would extend these policing powers to certain commodity markets currently exempt. The Agriculture Department wants authority to cover trading in any "agricultural or forest commodity." Such a blanket grant is highly unlikely, but there is considerable sentiment in the House Agriculture unit for covering cattle and hog futures markets and the New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange.

---

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1966]

COMMODITY REGULATION

The abuses in commodities trading exposed by the soybean scandal have led the Department of Agriculture to request sweeping powers over the nation's commodity exchanges. It is seeking amendments to the Commodity Exchange Act that will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to set margin requirements, regulate trading and take legal action against anyone suspected of manipulation.

Stricter regulation of commodity trading is necessary. The soybean affair was only the latest and most notorious example of the freewheeling practices that pervade the commodity exchanges. They have shown little desire to curb manipulation and other abuses largely because those who are charged with self-regulation represent those doing the manipulating. And the Commodity Exchange Authority—an arm of the Agriculture Department—has been too small and too weak to take effective policing action.

But measures to eliminate the abuses that now prevail should not make for potential new abuses, and that is what the proposed amendments vesting absolute power in the Secretary would do. For the nature of the Secretary's office ties him too closely to the special interests of farmers to make it wise to put him in sole control of regulating the commodity markets.

The solution may lie in giving regulatory powers to the Securities and Exchange Commission or to some wholly new commodities trading agency. It is also conceivable that the job might be done by an expanded and strengthened Commodity Exchange Authority. But it is clear that power over regulation must not be placed in the hands of a czar representing a special interest any more than it can remain in the hands of speculators representing their own self-interest.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1967]

BEEF PRICES UP, BUT FUTURES ARE DOWN

(By Elizabeth M. Fowler)

Many housewives now know that beef prices will be heading up this year.

But no one would think a beef price rise is on the way by looking at the recent action of livestock futures. The futures have been registering more declines than increases on heavy volume.

In fact, since a month ago the nearby April contract has dropped about 2 cents a pound to 25.85 cents a pound.

Last year's drought conditions in the Southwest probably contributed to the drop in futures prices. The drought encouraged more farmers to ship cattle to feeders earlier than usual. At last report, the Government estimated cattle and calves being fed for slaughter at 11.3 million head as of Jan. 1, about 7 per cent more than a year earlier. This caught some futures traders by surprise and led to enough selling to cut back prices.

PRODUCTION CYCLES

Cattle, like some other basic commodities, tend to go through production cycles. An oversupply, as in 1963–64, brings lower prices for a while. Then farmers cut back their herds for higher prices. Once higher prices make themselve felt, farmers increase their output and so it goes.

"Cattlemen reduced herds in 1965 and 1966 in response to depressed cattle prices," according to Arthur Raitano, head of commodity research at Walston & Co. "Now they are more optimistic and are taking steps to halt a decline in inventory." The outlook for later this year is fewer animals coming to slaughter as farmers build up herds. A decline in beef output means higher prices.

How will it affect families? Each person in this country spends about $450 on food, and a large percentage goes for meat, possibly a third or more.

Mr. Raitano commented, "Some cattlemen expect prices to be around $30 a hundredweight, 30 cents a pound, compared with $24 in Chicago in recent weeks."

This indicates housewives will have to allot more of their food money to meat or switch to cheaper protein alternatives.

With the prospect for higher prices, trading in live cattle futures has become active. Trading in the contract was started a little more than two years ago by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. Last year the Chicago and Kansas City Board of Trades also added trading in cattle.

The Chicago Mercantile Exchange contract has become one of the most successful new futures contracts in history, with a trading volume in 1966 of 168,574 contracts covering 25,000 pounds of live beef on the hoof. What makes it significant is that it proves a live commodity can be traded effectively. Few deliveries are actually made, as is the case of most futures contracts.

The fact that they can be made is the basis of trading. The contract gives the farmer or feeder a chance to sell his herd ahead by means of selling a future. Then when he takes his cattle to market he can buy back the future. His price protection is a matter of importance since banks that make agricultural loans want collateral.

AIDS RETAILERS

On the other side of the fence, a meat packer or retailer of meat can buy thousands of head of cattle by means of futures, thus assuring his supply. Then, as the packer's or retailer's buyers purchase the herds from ranchers or farmers an equivalent number of futures can be sold, lifting the hedge as the supplies come in. Thus, price and supplies are assured.

Futures prices take their cue from conditions in the cattle market, plus the prospects such as size of herds, numbers coming to

market, weather conditions etc. As each delivery month draws to its end the price will rise, or fall, to the level of the spot market for cattle.

Since cattle reach the consumer from a variety of directions, the question arises as to where the spot prices are set. Ranchers and feeders can sell directly to packers of supermarkets under contract. They can consign their animals to a trucker who carries them to different markets. These markets may be in country areas, or they can be large terminal markets in cities. There, the cattle will be handled by selling agents or sold at auction.

HELPS SET PRICES

"We're the price-setting mechanism," explained Raymond French, president of the Canal-Randolph Corporation. He was talking last week of the nation's major public stockyards, which act as "hotels" providing quarters, feed and water for about 16 per cent of the nation's live cattle.

Union Stock Yards of Omaha ranks as the nation's largest single stockyard, but Canal-Randolph, which is also in the real estate business, operates 10 active yards including the nation's second and third largest yards, in South St. Paul, Minn., and Sioux City, Iowa.

"We're essentially a public utility. Our rates are set by the Department of Agriculture," Mr. French added.

He noted a "big change" in the livestock picture from the days when the poet, Carl Sandburg, wrote about Chicago's once bustling stockyards. Today there are more than 1,500 packers compared with the so-called Big Four of some years ago. With decentralization, Mr. French believes the producer has been hurt because there are too many markets now, which means higher unit costs for handling cattle.

---

[From the New York Times, November 1966]

CATTLE FUTURES SPURRING BATTLE—CHICAGO EXCHANGES VYING FOR LEAD IN TRADING

(By Elizabeth M. Fowler)

A battle is under way between two large Chicago commodity exchanges—the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade. Both trade in live cattle futures contracts, but the Mercantile Exchange has chalked up two successful years, while the Board of Trade cattle contract was started only in October.

While no one knows how the contest will be resolved, both exchanges may be lucky in the next six months or so because the cattle production cycle indicates fewer animals will come to market next year, with resulting higher prices for beef. Such a situation generally tantalizes speculators, who tend to like the long, or bullish, side of a market.

Last week the Chicago Board of Trade was in the midst of a vigorous publicity campaign to promote its new cattle contract. Its officials were visiting major cities such as Omaha, Denver, Dallas, Los Angeles and San Francisco, with a message for brokers and a movie about trading.

Warren W. Lebeck, executive vice president of the Board of Trade, the nation's largest commodity trading center, was in New York to answer questions and tell why the exchange added live cattle to its roster of soybeans, wheat, corn and other agricultural commodities.

In starting its new contract, the Board of Trade has obviously come up against some formidable competition from its smaller, but aggressive and evergrowing rival, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, which pioneered in a live cattle contract about two years ago. In so doing the Mercantile Exchange was following the suggestion of a bank officer. Bankers have long liked futures trading because it gives farmers, other producers, wholesalers, exporters, etc., a place to hedge their positions. Since many large commodity positions are carried partly on bank loans, a hedged position makes the loan secure.

In addition, the Kansas City Board of Trade, also envious of the success of the Mercantile Exchange, began its own live feeder cattle contract earlier this year.

The Mercantile Exchange made a notable success with its pork-belly contract, which attracted some frenzied speculation only a year ago when pigs were in short supply and bacon prices were high. With this taste of victory, it may not be cowed by its much bigger rival.

SUPPORT GROWING

Although at first the Chicago Mercantile Exchange did not arouse the interest and participation of the meat packers, it has slowly attracted support for its new cattle contract. The recalcitrant meat packers apparently use it now. For the first nine months of this year, the Mercantile Exchange volume in this commodity totaled 115,828 contracts, compared with 37,987 in the 1965 period. It also has a so-called Western-delivery contract, in which trading totaled an additional 2,080 contracts in the period.

Competing in the same field is not new to commodity exchanges, which are always eager for new trading vehicles to increase their volume and give their members alternate markets. Since many commodities move through cycles when interest in them is high, a variety of contracts gives members a kind of "hedge."

Although brokers usually think it is confusing for two exchanges to trade in similar contracts, the desire for greater volume is a big factor. For example, the New York Produce Exchange recently started trading in a new soybean contract, hoping to lure some business that might otherwise go to the Board of Trade, which has a surprisingly successful soybean contract. In fact, the board's soybeans have become in recent years the most actively traded commodity future in the world. In the first nine months of this year, more than 2,561,000 contracts changed hands, although this was somewhat less than in the 1965 period.

SIZE DESCRIBED

The size of soybean trading can best be judged by this fact: It represents almost a third of the 7,876,000 nine-months' trading in all commodity futures on this nation's exchanges.

Both the Board and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange have futures contracts in dressed beef, but neither has been particularly successful. However, the Board has done better in this instance than the Mercantile.

Can the Board of Trade be successful with its new contract? Brokers don't know, but they are watching with interest. Some say they don't think it is fair for the Board of Trade to try to break into the Mercantile Exchange's field.

Mr. Lebeck said last week, "We think it has a tremendous potential. We're encouraged." He stressed some of the differences between the board's contract and its competitor's. These include the board's permission for delivery during a contract month while trading is still going on and its single delivery point—Chicago.

One aspect is that the cattle cycle may soon help trading volume in the two competing contracts. Speculators by nature tend to be bullish and like the up side of a market. Cattle production, which is now completing one of its long cycles, is expected to decline because of recent lower prices and cutbacks in cattle on hand after a long rise in the total. This comes at a time when consumers' incomes are high and their taste for beef well developed, along with the population increase.

The outlook is for higher beef prices, with the effect being felt especially early next year.

EXCLUSION OF COFFEE, SUGAR, COCOA, RUBBER, HIDES, AND FISHMEAL FUTURES TRADING

In preparation for introducing my 1967 commodity regulation legislation, I wrote a letter on March 10 to Commodity Exchange Administrator Caldwell, asking his views on certain aspects of trading in sugar and coffee futures, two commodities the Authority is anxious to bring within the regulatory scope of the Commodity Exchange Act. Because the Authority is most anxious to regulate these commodities so that it may set margin requirements on contract purchases in order to curb alleged speculation, which allegedly raises prices, I asked Mr. Caldwell to comment on the part that was played or was not played by effective margin requirements during the great sugar speculation of spring 1963. I also asked Mr. Caldwell to comment on arguments raised by the coffee and sugar exchange that sugar and coffee futures trading would shift to the unregulated London exchanges if put under CEA regulation in the United States. I also contacted the New York Cocoa Exchange, which submitted a memorandum opposing inclusion of cocoa under the Commodity Exchange Act for quite similar reasons. The New York Produce Exchange likewise opposes the inclusion of its new fishmeal contract within the Commodity Exchange Act's scope. I contacted Ambassador Bruce in London for information regarding the rules and regulations of the several London commodity markets, and he advised me that these margin requirements "are left largely to the discretion of the individual trading member dealing with his client," confirming exchange arguments that many large sugar traders—most coffee trading has already moved to London—would shift their orders to London if the CEA were to be given margin-setting power over sugar futures purchases. Information is also available linking the 1963 price rises in sugar more to U.S. Government actions like reallocation of the Cuban sugar quota, misspeculation as to available sugar and untimely sugar purchase announcements than to sugar futures speculation. I include all of this material, together with my analysis of the inadvisability of giving the Department of Agriculture regulatory power over futures trading in agricultural commodities produced abroad and readily traded on foreign exchanges, particularly London.

My letter of March 10 to Commodity Exchange Administrator Alex Caldwell.

Caldwell reply of March 15 to that part of my letter asking for comments on 1963 and 1964 margin rates on sugar.

Caldwell letter of March 28 in further elaboration on steps the CEA would have taken to curb sugar futures speculation in 1963 by higher margins, denying that such steps would have interfered with hedging.

New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange letter of March 31 debating Caldwell attack on sugar margins set in 1963 and correcting erroneous statistics.

Caldwell reply of March 28 to that part of my March 10 letter requesting comments on exchange allegations that

CEA regulation would drive coffee and sugar trading to London.

New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange letter of March 27 setting forth in greater detail reasons why CEA regulation of coffee and sugar futures trading would drive trading to London.

April 3 letter to me of U.S. Ambassador Bruce in London describing freedom under which British commodity markets operate.

March 14 letter of New York Produce Exchange opposing inclusion of fishmeal contracts under Commodity Exchange Act.

Memorandum of New York Cocoa Exchange opposing regulation of cocoa futures trading under the act—that is, shift to London as per coffee and sugar.

With reference to the CEA's desire to pull sugar under the act because they deem this power necessary to set—25 percent—margins in sugar trading so as to curb speculation leading, they feel, to price escalation, I oppose this for reasons as follows:

First. The 1963 sugar price escalation was principally a function of misconceptions of supply and demand, aided and abetted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in their: reallocation of the Cuban sugar quota, pushing up the price of world sugars; erroneous and misleading forecasts; and their May 1963 announcement of sugar needs which the August 1963 Fortune article on sugar describes as having pushed sugar prices 1½ cents higher in its own right.

Second. Even if speculation did abet sugar price climbing in 1963, as is possible, the Coffee and Sugar Exchange imposed four margin increases taking the fullest steps short of inhibiting legitimate hedging.

Third. Even if sugar margins can curb sugar speculation in the United States, that speculation can just as easily shift to London, with the same effects on sugar prices to users and consumers, but with a business loss to the United States.

Fourth. There is no good reason to put international commodities under CEA regulation.

MARCH 10, 1967.

Mr. ALEX CALDWELL,
*Administrator, Commodity Exchange Authority, Department of Agriculture, Washington D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. CALDWELL: I am writing to ask you to put together a short memorandum of the futures markets for agricultural commodities, specifically sugar, coffee and cocoa in European centers like London, Paris, and Antwerp, describing for each what types of futures are traded and how that trading is regulated. I have also written to our several embassies.

As you may know, I am working on new commodity regulatory legislation this year, which I expect will be somewhat different than my bill of last year. I have been in touch with some of the Commodity Exchanges, and some of them have raised arguments which have given me pause. I am particularly concerned with the possible effects of CEA regulations on New York futures trading in commodities like sugar, coffee and cocoa, which trade might easily be shifted abroad, particularly to London, were the United States regulatory burden to be increased. The British government, as you know, does not regulate the British exchanges, and there are no margin requirements, just bank guarantee arrangements. Representatives of the Coffee and Sugar Exchange have expressed particular fears that their trade might move to London. They suggest that in that event, commodity futures speculation and price changes would presumably persist as before, but the United States would have lost the benefits of having trade in these commodity futures headquartered in New York. I would appreciate having your thinking on these questions as I have not yet decided whether or not to include coffee and sugar in the list of commodities which I will propose, by legislation, to add to those presently under CEA jurisdiction. My Administrative Assistant, Mr. Phillips, has already raised these points with your Deputy Administrator, Mr. Grosstephan.

I believe that your Agency studied the change in sugar prices during 1963–64 and made a report on those changes to the House Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, of which I am a member. The executive committee of the Coffee and Sugar Exchange argues that the margin requirements they promulgated at the time were more than adequate to curb excessive speculation. As you will remember, the Exchange raised its margin requirements (for No. 8 contracts in quantities one thousand or less) from $500 to $1200, albeit they did so in several stages. I would appreciate having your views on the adequacy or inadequacy of these actions with respect to the situation in sugar as it existed at the time.

You may be sure that I recognize that it will take you some time to prepare this information.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. FINO,
*Member of Congress.*

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY,
*Washington, D.C., March 15, 1967.*

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FINO: This is in response to that part of your March 10 request for comments on 1963 and 1964 margin rates on sugar. We will answer you on the foreign commodity exchange dealing in coffee, sugar and cocoa as soon as we can.

The attached table sets forth the margin rates for the No. 8 world sugar contract and prices during 1963 and 1964. Prices for the No. 8 contract climbed rapidly in the first four months of 1963, and spurted upward during May, reaching a high of 12.95 cents a pound on May 23, before reacting sharply.

From January 1 to May 31, the exchange raised margin rates from $400 per contract of 112,000 pounds to $1,200. The $1,200 rate became effective on May 6, 1963, only after prices had almost doubled from the level at the beginning of the year. The most important gauge in the application of margins, in our opinion, however, is the percent of the margin rate to price or value of the contract. This is the way margins are assessed in stocks.

With the broad upward movement in sugar prices occurring in the first five months of 1963, margins rose from 7.1 percent on January 2, 1963, to 8.3 percent on May 23, 1963, when the peak price was reached. Thus, at best, applicable margins were less than 10 percent during this period of high prices. After the spurt when prices fell, margin percents rose, reaching 15.8 percent on August 30, 1963, with the futures price at 8.12 cents a pound. Higher margin percentage rates were attained in 1964, but by this time prices had receded below 5 cents a pound and margin rates had been reduced and were at $500 by the end of 1964.

In assessing the adequacy of sugar margins in the 1963–64 period, it is my view that higher margins were put into force too late in light of the rising price movement which was accompanied by extremely heavy trading of a predominantly speculative nature. Moreover, the margin levels that were in force were too low to effectively restrain the speculative fever that gripped the market. To quote John Maynard Keynes: "Speculators may do no harm as bubbles on a steady stream of enterprise. But the position is serious when enterprise becomes the bubble on a whirlpool of speculation."

In short, I consider the action of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange with regard to margins as too little and too late.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX C. CALDWELL,
*Administrator.*

*Sugar: Margin rates, No. 8 contract, New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, monthly, 1963 and Mar. 31, June 30, and Dec. 31, 1964*

| Date | Future | Closing price per pound (cents) | Minimum margin per contract | Value per contract | Margin as percent of price |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *1963* | | | | | |
| Jan. 2 | March | 5.00 | $400 | $5,600 | 7.1 |
| Jan. 31 | do | 5.88 | 600 | 6,586 | 9.1 |
| Feb. 28 | May | 6.22 | 600 | 6,966 | 8.6 |
| Mar. 29 | do | 6.42 | 800 | 7,190 | 11.1 |
| Apr. 30 | July | 8.58 | 800 | 9,610 | 8.3 |
| May 23 | do | 12.95 | 1,200 | 14,504 | 8.3 |
| May 31 | do | 10.95 | 1,200 | 12,264 | 9.8 |
| June 28 | September | 8.35 | 1,200 | 9,352 | 12.8 |
| July 31 | do | 7.08 | 1,200 | 7,930 | 15.1 |
| Aug. 30 | October | 6.80 | 1,200 | 7,616 | 15.8 |
| Sept. 30 | March | 8.12 | 1,200 | 9,094 | 13.2 |
| Oct. 31 | do | 11.47 | 1,200 | 12,846 | 9.3 |
| Nov. 29 | do | 10.36 | 1,200 | 11,603 | 10.3 |
| Dec. 31 | do | 10.40 | 1,200 | 11,648 | 10.3 |
| *1964* | | | | | |
| Mar. 31 | May | 7.90 | 1,200 | 8,848 | 13.6 |
| June 30 [1] | September | 4.96 | 900 | 5,555 | 16.2 |
| Dec. 31 | March | 2.50 | 500 | 2,800 | 17.9 |

[1] Margin of $1,200 in effect from May 6, 1963, through June 28, 1964. Effective on June 29, 1964, margin lowered to $900.

MARCH 28, 1967.

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FINO: As you asked in your March 23 letter, these are our views concerning the level of margins that might have been set on sugar in 1963–64 and whether higher margins would have disturbed hedging during this period.

As you are aware, we have no authority under the Commodity Exchange Act to fix margins. From time to time, however, we have expressed our concern that excessive speculation is a major factor causing erratic fluctuations in futures prices and should be curbed. And we have indicated that minimum initial margins on speculative transactions should be at least 25 percent of the contract value. On this basis, therefore,

margins on the No. 8 sugar contract in 1963 would have been about $3,600 per contract on May 23, 1963, three times higher than the $1,200, the top margin fixed by the exchange in 1963.

This 25 percent rate should have been fixed in January 1963, when volume and open contracts spurted along with prices. Of course we now have the benefit of hindsight, but the three factors mentioned, the amount of trading activity, the trend in open contracts, and the course of prices, along with knowledge of market conditions, would have been essential ingredients in determining the level of margins. We should also state that a fixed percentage under certain conditions might be totally inadequate under other conditions.

Whether higher margins on speculative transactions in 1963 would have restricted hedging in the No. 8 sugar contract is problematical. We don't think so, for in the first place, the amount of hedging was relatively small in the No. 8 contract during 1963.

Secondly, and more important, however, is that the erratic price movements that prevailed in the sugar markets must have been highly disturbing to hedgers in view of the relatively small amount of hedging in the No. 8 contract. We also say this based on our experience with other markets which shows that hedgers facing a gyrating market pricewise have a much greater price risk in placing their hedges than in a market of less price fluctuation. Thus, this risk to hedgers adds more to the cost of marketing than would be the case under more stabilized conditions.

We consider that large numbers of speculators add to rather than reduce price fluctuations. The very presence in the markets of large numbers of speculators brings capricious shifts in market balance as all flock one way and then the other.

Although in theory it might be demonstrated that speculation tends to stabilize prices, in practice, however, speculation lives on price fluctuations and the weight of such trading more often accelerates and accentuates price movements.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX C. CALDWELL,
*Administrator.*

---

NEW YORK COFFEE AND SUGAR EXCHANGE, INC.,
*New York, N.Y., March 31, 1967.*

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FINO: Thank you for your letter of March 23, 1967, with which you enclosed a copy of Mr. Alex Caldwell's letter to you, dated March 15, 1967, concerning minimum original margins for No. 8 Raw Sugar Contracts during the first half of 1963.

First, we would like to invite your attention on the appended page to certain errors in the tabulation of price quotations and minimum margin rates attached to Mr. Caldwell's letter.

We are concerned with these errors because they may have been the basis for your inquiry as to "why you did not impose higher margins on No. 8 Sugar Contracts during the period between March 30 and May 23, 1963."

When sugar prices were rising spectacularly during the first half of 1963, the Board of Managers of the Exchange and the Board of Directors of the Clearing Association kept in daily touch with every phase of the sugar situation. All necessary actions were taken to maintain the integrity of the Raw Sugar Future Contracts and to keep sugar futures prices in line with values of raw sugar in the actuals market.

Mr. Caldwell's letter seems to imply that the extent of the fluctuations in sugar prices during that time would have been less if original minimum margins for sugar futures contracts had been higher. We heartily disagree with this view.

Minimum original margins were increased by the Clearing Association and required by the Exchange four times during this period of rising sugar prices as shown on the appended page and affirmed by the attached copies of actual directives which implemented each margin increase. The aim was to maintain such margins at about ten percent (10%) of the value of the contract. Even though prices were rising rapidly, margins as percentage of price rarely fell under ten percent.

There is one point of great importance which we would like to stress and which is so often overlooked in discussions of minimum margins. These original margins are minimums and are rarely available to general trading customers. The Managers of the Exchange and the Directors of the Clearing Association knew that margin deposits required from customers by clearing members of the Exchange were considerably higher than the minimums. The general public trader normally clears through large commission houses. This Exchange checked the margin requirements of major commission firms at the time when the minimum margin was $1,200.00 per contract; these firms reported that they required $4,000.00 per contract from their customers. This, in practice, puts a substantially different light on the relationship between original margin and the value of the contract. It is, however, what actually happens in a volatile market. We believe the businessmen of commission firms did an excellent job of screening customers on the basis of the credit risks involved.

Price changes result from the interaction of supply and demand. The sugar price rise in 1963 resulted from a sudden supply deficiency. After the U.S. Department of Agriculture report was published on August 5, 1963, representatives of the Exchange called on Congresswoman Sullivan and all members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and requested that a public hearing be held promptly in connection with the sugar price situation. For reasons which were not divulged to the representatives of the Exchange, no public hearing was scheduled.

We contend, as we did in the statement made by my predecessor, Mr. James M. Clark, before the House Agriculture Subcommittee on April 5, 1966, that "we are sure that an impartial examination of the operation of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange will support our contention that the Exchange is managed responsibly in the best interest of buyers, sellers, and the public."

Further, we appreciate this opportunity to review the data provided to you, and to answer questions. We shall be pleased to provide additional information if needed.

Sincerely,

REED CLARK,
*President.*

---

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FINO: This is in further answer to your March 10 letter concerning futures markets abroad that deal in sugar, coffee and cocoa. The markets discussed are the only ones dealing in futures in the commodities with which you are concerned. As discussed with your Administrative Assistant, Mr. Phillips, there are some problems in trading in futures markets abroad.

In the first place, prices of the commodities are in the currency of the country in which the market is located. It means that such prices have to be converted to U.S. prices based on fluctuating exchange rates in order to follow the course of prices. Trading abroad also creates the added risk from changing exchange rates and the cost of covering this risk by the purchase or sale of foreign exchange. This is an impediment which the rank and file of traders, other than those dealing in the actual commodity, generally wish to avoid.

Secondly, there is very little public information on trading activity in markets abroad available. The lack of such information would handicap traders in this country where exchanges release trading data and traders are accustomed to having this information.

We have no way of telling whether trading in sugar, coffee and cocoa would be shifted abroad with the advent of Government regulation. It is our opinion that such would not be the case, and we are basing this on our experience with wool. This is an international commodity which was placed under the Commodity Exchange Act in 1954, and in which there is futures trading in England, Australia and France. Our records show that there was no shift of trading from New York to these countries at the expense of New York. In fact, there are many traders located in England and France who regularly trade and hold positions on the New York wool exchange.

We do not have adequate information available on which to comment concerning the extent of regulation abroad in sugar, coffee and cocoa. We can only obtain this information by writing to our attachés. Since you have already written on this aspect, we will not do so.

As you asked, we are listing the various markets by commodity, briefly describing the distinguishing features of each market.

SUGAR

*United Terminal Sugar Market Association, Contract No. 2, London.* This market trades in only raw cane sugar produced in a country signatory to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. Thus, sugar from other countries than Commonwealth countries is not deliverable, as is the case with the No. 8 contract in the New York sugar market.

*International White Sugar Market of the Bourse de Commerce de Paris.* This market trades only in white sugar. It is not intended as a replacement to the London or New York raw sugar markets, but is complementary to these markets.

COFFEE

*Coffee Terminal Market Association of London.* Trading in this market is based on African coffees although coffees from India, Trinidad and Indonesia are deliverable. No Brazilian or Colombian coffees are deliverable as on the New York market.

COCOA BEANS

*London Cocoa Terminal Market Association.* Cocoa beans from all important producing countries are traded on this market just as on the New York market.

*Stichting Cacaotermijnmarkt of Amsterdam.* We are informed that this market is inactive at the present time.

More detailed information on the specific contracts covering each commodity discussed in the above markets is given in the briefs attached.

If we can be of further assistance to you in obtaining additional details concerning these markets, please let us hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX C. CALDWELL,
*Administrator.*

---

NEW YORK COFFEE AND SUGAR EXCHANGE, INC.,
*New York, N.Y., March 27, 1967.*

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FINO: It is a pleasure to give you more detailed information concerning our belief about the effect of regulation by the Commodity Exchange Authority on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange.

In our opinion government regulation of coffee and sugar trading would jeopardize the life of the Exchange. Moreover, government regulation of coffee and sugar futures trading would have no effect on the price

levels for coffee and sugar. Coffee prices are largely influenced by the International Coffee Agreement. Prices for sugar in the United States are stablized through the operation of the Sugar Act of 1948. World sugar prices are a result of the inter-action of supply and demand in the world sugar market.

With respect to coffee futures trading, there is enclosed a chart showing coffee futures trading in recent years in the New York and London markets. Trading has declined drastically in New York, and increased dramatically in London. There are many reasons for this development, including lack of margin requirements in London, terms of contracts in the two markets, operation of the International Coffee Agreement and structure of the coffee industry in the United States. The fact is that the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange could not operate if dependent alone on the volume of trading in coffee futures at the present time.

Two raw sugar contracts are traded on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. The No. 10 contract involves raw sugar eligible for consumption in the United States under the Sugar Act. Because of the nature of the administration of the Sugar Act by the United States Department of Agriculture, there is almost no trading in Contract No. 10. At the present time, only Sugar Contract No. 8 is traded in substantial volume.

Trading in raw Sugar Contract No. 8 is the activity that supports operation of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. The contract provides for delivery of free world market raw sugar at free world market prices. The raw sugar is not eligible for food consumption in the United States. Delivery of raw sugar under Contract No. 8 is f.o.b. and stowed in an ocean-going vessel at a foreign port of shipment. Many of the buy and sell orders originate in foreign countries.

The Exchange currently requires an original margin deposit of $500 per contract which now represents approximately one quarter of the full value of the contract. In the past the Exchange has acted promptly during radical price changes to change margin requirements to protect investors.

In the London Terminal Market, the raw sugar futures contract provides for delivery of British Commonwealth raw sugar at free world prices. Delivery is c.i.f. (cost-insurance-freight) destination port in the United Kingdom.

Unlike New York no cash margins are required. This differs from New York in two important aspects. First, the clearing member may lodge with the London Terminal a simple bank guarantee rather than cash. Second, the clearing member can allow his trading client to buy and sell without depositing any margin at all. The credit standing of the trader will obviously be of some interest to the clearing member, but this is left solely to the judgment of the clearing member, whereas in New York Exchange rules require margins from any and all traders. Lower margin requirements obviously cheapen the cost of trading.

World sugar marketers and traders use the New York #8 contract and the London raw sugar contract inter-changeably. Delivery provisions of the New York contract offer somewhat more flexibility than the London contract to traders who envisage the possibility of effecting delivery. However, in practice physical deliveries are negligible. In 1966 deliveries amounted to one percent (1%) of total value of world futures sugar contracts. As a trading medium London is on a par with the New York contract. In actuality advantages in margin costs, commission rates and a favorable governmental climate has, and in our opinion will continue to attract increasing trading in coffee and sugar futures to London.

It is our judgment that further restrictions or impositions placed on our Exchange will invite the foreign interests to hedge their contracts in London in preference to New York. This again will tend to drive capital out of the New York market, to London. To cite an example we invite your attention to study the attached Coffee chart, which is self-evident.

We are proud of the service of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange has rendered to coffee and sugar producers and consumers for eighty-five years. We want to continue to perform that function, but if trading in coffee and sugar futures is subject to regulation by Commodity Exchange Authority, we shall in all likelihood be forced to suspend operations.

Sincerely,

REED CLARK,
*President.*

---

APRIL 3, 1967.

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FINO: I refer to your letter of March 9 and Minister Kaiser's interim reply of March 17, 1967, concerning the commodity exchanges in London.

Enclosed herewith are copies of the complete rules and regulations of the following commodity markets operating in London:

London Metal Exchange.

Coffee Terminal Market Association of London.

London Cocoa Terminal Market Association.

United Terminal Sugar Market Association.

Rubber Trade Association of London.

London Wool Terminal Market Association.

I believe that these authoritative booklets will give you a more accurate picture of the manner in which the several market groups police their members and operations than we could offer you by attempting to summarize or extract from them.

As for margin requirements, you will note that they vary somewhat among the several markets but are, in great measure, left very largely to the discretion of the individual trading member in his relationship with his client. For example, a member of the London Metal Exchange buying copper bars for a client may require an unknown client to put up the full 10% margin provided for in the standard contract or, if his client is a well known and established firm, he might not require any margin at all. According to knowledgeable persons engaged in commodity trade here, this system functions very satisfactorily.

A booklet describing the operations of the London Metal Exchange is in the process of being published and I shall send you a copy as soon as it is available. I believe it might provide an interesting supplement to the formal rules and regulations.

This subject of commodity exchanges and their operations is, of course, a rather complicated one and I know that this material may not answer all of your needs. If, after looking over this material, there are any further detailed or specific questions which you feel the Embassy might help to answer, please do not hesitate to write to me again.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID BRUCE,
*American Ambassador.*

---

NEW YORK PRODUCE EXCHANGE,
*New York, N.Y., March 14, 1967.*

Hon. PAUL A. FINO,
*Congress of the United States,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINO: This is in response to your letter of March 10, 1967, in which you state that you expect to offer amendments to the Community Exchange Act again this year.

As to the Fish Meal Futures Contract which was inaugurated on this Exchange the first of this month, it would appear that it would be entirely inappropriate for the Commodity Exchange Authority to be required to regulate trading in this futures contract should Fish Meal be added as a regulated commodity.

Our future contract provides for delivery of the Fish Meal, which must originate from Peru or Chile, at Hamburg, Germany, on a cost, insurance and freight basis. Under the terms of the contract, therefore, any deliveries made in satisfaction of the contract could not be made either from the United States or to the United States.

The two other active futures contracts being traded on this Exchange are soybeans with a delivery basis of St. Louis, Missouri and East St. Louis, Illinois and cottonseed oil, delivered from licensed warehouses located in the cotton producing areas of the United States, basis F.O.B. New York City. These commodities are presently numbered among those named in the Commodity Exchange Act.

Accordingly we can see no correlation whatsoever between trading in cottonseed oil and/or soybeans or any other regulated commodity and trading in our Fish Meal Futures Contracts.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to your letter and to give you our views as you have requested.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO F. REHDERS,
*President,*

---

MEMORANDUM—EFFORTS TO PUT THE NEW YORK COCOA EXCHANGE UNDER THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

1. The New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc., a membership organization, was formed in 1925 to provide a hedge market for cocoa beans. The chaotic market conditions in the early 1920's caused serious difficulties to merchants and traders in cocoa when wide variations in price occurred against which no protection was available. To guard against such risks, a small group of merchants banded together forming a commodity exchange to trade in cocoa.

2. The New York Cocoa Exchange operates as a futures contract market for the purchase and sale of contracts for delivery of cocoa at a later date. Contracts (each for 30,000 lbs. of cocoa beans) can be made for the current and 17 months forward, a total of 18 months. Orders for purchase and sale emanate from the cocoa trading activities of cocoa importers, merchants, producers, manufacturers and public traders. The trading floor is the hub of a vast communications network spreading throughout the world and transmitting orders to buy or sell from Ghana, London, Paris, as well as the entire United States. More detailed explanations of the market machinery are available and are freely distributed.

3. The Exchange is governed by a Board of Managers (12 in number) representing all segments of the cocoa trade and industry elected annually by the membership. The Board has jurisdiction over the operations of the Exchange and constantly reviews the trading procedures, the level at which margins are required, and generally sets the policy of the Exchange. The Exchange does not make prices nor does the Exchange profit from any price changes. At the present time the New York Cocoa Exchange is not under the jurisdiction of the Commodity Exchange Act and is termed (quite erroneously) as an unregulated Exchange. Even a cursory study of the By-Laws and Rules of the New York Cocoa Exchange shows it to be one of the most strictly regulated in this country or anywhere else.

4. For 41 years the New York Cocoa Exchange has provided the facilities for trading in cocoa bean futures for importers, merchants, producers, manufacturers and public traders. Futures contracts representing over

4,500,000 tons of cocoa beans have already been transacted in 1966. The New York Cocoa Exchange has therefore provided a fluid market which has thus far traded tonnages 3 times the size of the world crop permitting "price insurance" operations by those who market and process the world's cocoa crops.

5. The Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Representative Harold Cooley, introduced a bill, H.R. 11788, on October 22, 1965, at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture. This bill, if passed, would have had the effect of transferring the authority for placing certain commodity exchanges under the Commodity Exchange Authority from the Congress to the Agriculture Department, and would allow the Secretary of Agriculture at the same time to determine when agricultural or forest commodities or products or by-products are to be placed under the operation of the Commodity Exchange Authority. Hearings were held on this bill April 4, 5, and 6, 1966, and no further action has been taken by the Sub-Committee since that time.

6. On May 3, 1966, Representative Paul A. Fino introduced a bill, H.R. 14854, which was a somewhat watered-down version of H.R. 11788. However, this bill still places in the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to determine when any agricultural or forest commodity or product or by-product is to be placed under the Commodity Exchange Authority. No further action has been taken on this piece of legislation.

7. It seems doubtful that action will be undertaken in the House of Representatives on either of these bills during the current session of Congress; however, in all probability, one or the other will be reintroduced during the early part of the next session of Congress, probably in amended form.

8. At no time in the past has there been an investigation of the Cocoa Exchange, its activities, or its officers by any Federal regulatory body. Routine checks by state authorities have never resulted in any criticism of the operations of this Exchange.

9. There has never been a default, fraud scandal, or failure involving the Exchange or its related organization, the New York Cocoa Clearing Association, the purpose of which is to guaranty the fulfillment of every contract executed on the Cocoa Exchange.

10. It is noteworthy that the New York Cocoa Exchange provides the world's only universal commodity futures contract—a contract under which any of the more than 25 growths of cocoa now grown, as well as any growths which may be produced in the future, can and are freely deliverable at fixed differentials. Hence, the Cocoa Exchange becomes the most perfect hedge market available to a commodity trader.

11. Prior to the formation of the Exchange in 1925, the world cocoa market place was in London and Liverpool. Although Western Europe including the United Kingdom still consumes more cocoa than the United States, the remarkable hedge opportunities of the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. has brought the center of trade to the United States.

12. It is interesting to note that the Exchange facilities provided the Trade the means of carrying stocks in such quantities prior to the outbreak of World War II, that the chocolate industry was able to operate for more than a year without requiring much-needed shipping space for further importations—even though cocoa and chocolate held high priority ratings. By the same token, today, the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc., has provided the means for stocking the United States with an estimated 400,000 tons of raw cocoa beans—a stockpile of a strategic raw material well in excess of a year's useage, carried at no cost to the United States Government.

13. With such a distinguished record of performance to a great industry and to the United States Government, it is difficult to rationalize the need for the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. to be placed under the Commodity Exchange Act. Evidence would tend to support the opposite conclusion that the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. is best regulated by those most intimately concerned with its success.

14. In any discussion of the difficulties of bringing the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. under the authority of the Commodity Exchange Authority, it must be borne in mind that not one single cocoa bean is grown commercially within the territorial limits of the U.S.A. The U.S.A. is the largest individual consumer nation of cocoa and its confectionery business is the largest in the world. To adequately maintain a supply of a raw commodity for the use of the largest consumer nation when none is grown here, requires special techniques both contractual and operational which appear far beyond the scope of the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Exchange Authority, who have directed their regulatory attention since the 1930's almost entirely in the domestic field. The New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. is constantly aware of changing patterns in world cocoa trading whether caused by political upheaval (West Africa provides ⅔ of world cocoa), changes in cocoa quality, or international monetary changes. The Commodity Exchange Authority could not be expected to react to international changes adequately.

15. Commodity Exchange Authority control would be rendered difficult with respect to the large foreign interest in our market, and the delicate problem of a United States regulatory body policing the business activities of foreign nationals has never been faced. This problem becomes even more delicate when regulation might even infringe on the activities of foreign governments—whose state marketing companies control the sale of all cocoa within their countries.

16. Although New York and the U.S.A. are now the center of the cocoa trade, there is fear that if the Commodity Exchange Authority regulations were imposed upon the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. this dominance would cease. There are three other cocoa exchanges now in existence and competition is keen among them. London, Paris, and Amsterdam could easily provide better hedging opportunities if the trading on the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. either became more expensive or more restrictive.

17. As an example of how Commodity Exchange Authority rule would make trading both more expensive and restrictive on the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. the subject of initial margin comes to mind. Generally, Commodity Exchange Authority has suggested to its regulated exchanges a higher initial margin rate than imposed by the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. London requires even less.

18. Unregulated exchanges do not require members to place margin payments in segregated bank accounts as does the Commodity Exchange Authority. By allowing customer's funds to be comingled with company funds greater credit availability for the cocoa trade is generated and is invaluable in maintaining the flow of supply. The London Terminal does not require segregeation of funds.

19. The Commodity Exchange Authority sets maximum limits for the number of contracts an individual may hold, and, although this appears to be a regulation with merit, it would further alter the competitive position of the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. The London Terminal again has no limits.

20. Any business lost to foreign cocoa exchanges further alters the balance of payments pattern which the United States now has in cocoa trading. Obviously, since all cocoa is imported into the U.S.A., the basic pattern of payment balance is a dollar outflow. However, the heavy volume of trading done from abroad on the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc. creates an inflow. By restricting the competitive position of the New York Cocoa Exchange, Inc., even this inflow would be reduced, and if United States traders found London Terminal more attractive, an outflow would be established.

21. Finally, both H.R. 11788 and H.R. 14854 give to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority of deciding what commodities are to come under his regulation. To give an administrative department such open-end regulatory power is neither required nor justified. The Congress should retain its traditional power to decide which commodities are to be placed under the Commodity Exchange Authority. In so doing, this assures those interested in a given commodity such as cocoa the traditional right to be heard before a proper forum of this Government where they can state their case and argue the issues such as those mentioned in this memorandum.

---

## BILL TO PROHIBIT DESECRATION OF THE FLAG

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to prohibit desecration of the flag and urging that Congress take swift action on the passage of this important legislation.

Across the Potomac River, adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery, stands a monument. It depicts the actual account of six U.S. marines raising the American flag atop Mount Suribachi on the island of Iwo Jima during World War II. This memorial is solemnly dedicated to those brave men who have fallen in combat so that the American flag, which symbolizes our proud heritage and our beloved country, might fly forever.

Several times in recent years in this country, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed this same flag spit upon, trampled, and burned in the streets by misguided mobs and collegiate reactionaries. These protestors and demonstrators, in their twisted and confused way, have made it a vogue to desecrate the very symbol of that which permits them to protest and demonstrate. In so doing, they have made a mockery of those who have given their lives so that others might have the privilege of saying: "I pledge allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands."

The vast majority of our citizens have watched and listened to these professional demonstrators with great patience and tolerance, Mr. Speaker. Recently, however, many have drawn the line over desecration of the American flag. News accounts of recent Vietnam protest demonstrations in New York and San Francisco reflect more resentment, more fights and more arrests than in the past. This strongly suggests, Mr. Speaker, that patience is growing thin.

So long as misfits and malcontents in this country are permitted to exploit loopholes in the law, they will continue to seek them out. The burning of draft cards and the flag are prime examples. This distinguished body has seen fit to make it a Federal offense to burn a draft card. We must, in my judgment,

render the same respect to the American flag. As the Nation's lawmakers, we have thus been challenged.

Failure of the 90th Congress to act on this vital bill would provide a partial answer to those who are asking: "What has happened to patriotism in this country?" Passage of this bill would remove considerable doubt and, in so doing, we will have acted in the best interests of those millions of Americans who are appalled at these shameful displays of defiance and disloyalty.

## CONGRESSMAN HORTON SUBMITS BILL MAKING DESECRATION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG A FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of regret, I am today submitting for the consideration of the Congress a bill making it a Federal crime to publicly desecrate the American flag.

My regret stems from the sad fact that such a bill is necessary in this great and free democracy. Until very recently, it was inconceivable that a person who enjoys the benefits and privileges of American citizenship would stoop to the public desecration of the flag which is the symbol of the American Nation, its people, and its free government. To illustrate the newness of this problem, I would cite a law passed in 1917 which prohibits aliens from destroying the American flag. Obviously, our counterparts never dreamed during World War I that American citizens would so mock their homeland.

Of course, one of the bastions of the American system is the right of all citizens to express themselves freely. But we, as legislators, must decide what shall be the dividing line between lawful and unlawful expressions. If we will not permit the destruction of military or Government property as a mode of protected expression, nor the public burning of one's selective service registration card, how can we in conscience permit the willful destruction of the star-spangled symbol of our people which is displayed at every scene of worthy national endeavor—from Iwo Jima to the flagpoles of thousands of schools and courthouses across our land.

Mr. Speaker, I need not pursue the deep meaning that our flag has for the great majority of Americans. As the Congressman from Rochester, N.Y., once the home of Francis Bellamy, author of our Pledge of Allegiance, I feel shame for those who make necessary the introduction and consideration of this bill.

## NATIONAL HOME IMPROVEMENT MONTH

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week, I introduced House Joint Resolution 522, authorizing the President to proclaim the month of May 1967, as National Home Improvement Month. Similar resolutions have been introduced by my distinguished colleagues, the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, and the chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Housing, Representative WILLIAM BARRETT. In the other body, similar resolutions have been sponsored by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Housing Subcommittee.

As detailed in the resolution which I shall include at the close of my remarks, we believe that a focus on home improvement can be a positive factor in arresting the decline of neighborhoods and in shoring up a vital area of our economy, the homebuilding and construction industry. Home improvement loans are available through regular commercial financing channels, with FA guarantees, and, in special cases involving urban renewal or areas of concentrated code enforcement, directly from the Federal Government.

I have a particularly strong interest in seeing home improvement and rehabilitation encouraged. For the past several years, as ranking minority member of the House Special Housing Subcommittee, I have been stressing the need to preserve and improve one of our Nation's most precious resources, the existing housing supply. The housing needs of our citizens are such that we have to run just to stand still as far as new construction is concerned. To improve both the quality and the quantity of decent housing we will have to make use of existing rehabilitation techniques and generate an interest in new approaches. One of these is the low-interest rehabilitation loan for urban renewal and code enforcement areas I authored in the 1964 Housing Act.

The housing industry as a whole, while improving from its performance in 1966, is still far from being out of the woods. An effort by Congress and the President, such as this resolution declaring May to be National Home Improvement Month, will give a psychological and economic lift to the industry. In contrast to last year, money does seem to be available for mortgages and home-improvement loans, but the demand has not sufficiently developed. This is certainly one way to encourage that demand. I would hope that action could be taken promptly on this resolution by the appropriate congressional committees.

The text of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 522

Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of May 1967 as National Home Improvement Month

Whereas the repair, rehabilitation, modernization, and improvement of the housing inventory of the United States is a matter of national interest and concern; and

Whereas this Nation has undertaken a major effort to improve the physical and social environment of America through the rebuilding of entire blighted neighborhoods in cities, large and small; and

Whereas well-maintained homes and living accommodations contribute significantly to the self-respect and ability of families to take part in the mainstream of American life and community enterprise; and

Whereas the rehabilitation of housing is the key to many of our successful urban programs both federally and locally assisted; and

Whereas the improvement, modernization, and rehabilitation of housing constitutes an enormous economic market for business, labor, and all segments of the building industry, and is a stimulant to prosperity and expanded employment; and

Whereas several of the States and many cities have enacted resolutions to encourage home improvement and rehabilitation of dwellings in orders to enhance the appearance and beauty of urban areas and to uplift the morale and civic pride of the citizenry: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the month of May 1967 be designated as "National Home Improvement Month", and that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe this month and its occasion with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

## RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKENS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last evening, the 25th of April, to address the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary on the subject of "Religious Persecution in U.S.S.R." My sincere belief is that a U.N. commission on the many allegations of persecution in the Soviet Union should be established. Accordingly, I have written the Honorable Arthur Goldberg, our U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., asking him to place a resolution before the General Assembly to commission such a body to study these alleged inhumanities toward people desiring real, not promised, religious freedom.

Following is the speech delivered to the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary:

FIRST ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL LECTURE ON COMMUNIST PERSECUTION OF RELIGION, APRIL 25, 1967

Reverend Clergy, ladies and gentlemen:

I am delighted to be here at the Ukrainian Studies' Center of the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary as the first Member of Congress to be invited to your Annual Congressional Lecture on "Communist Persecution of Religion." I am sure that this subject is of vital importance to all of us as Americans, as members and citizens of the free world.

I hope to be able to explain in the course of this lecture the why and the wherefore, some facts of Communist persecution, and whether there is anything we can do about it.

Why should the leading Communist government, which in its Constitution supposedly guarantees religious freedom, find it so necessary to persecute all religions?

Why must such a government be considered dangerous to the whole world? The answer to this is the key to our understanding of present world conflicts and upheavals; it is why Khrushchev could boast about burying us.

Communism as practiced in the world is based upon historical dialectical materialism advocated by Marx, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse Tung clearly recorded in their works. As Pope Pius XI pointed out in his March 28, 1937 Encyclical Letter "Atheistic Communism", this dialectical materialism accepts in the world only one reality: "Matter," the blind forces of which evolve into plant, animal and man. In such a doctrine there is no room for the idea of God, no room for the idea of matter combined with spirit, no difference between body and soul. There is no room for the idea of survival of the soul after death, nor any hope in a future life. As a result of this, Communism strips every human being of his innate dignity, strips him of his liberty, removes all of his rights, and all of those great concepts which find utterance in the Preamble to our Declaration of Independence, which states: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." All of these things are vitiated and denied by Soviet Communism. Proof of this is to be found in this statement of Lenin: "Atheism is a natural and inseparable portion of Marxism, of the theory and practice of scientific socialism. Our propaganda necessarily includes propaganda for atheism." Here Lenin is doing nothing more than restating article 124 of the Soviet Constitution: "In science, the Church in the USSR is separated from the State, and the school from the Church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." Note how clever this article of the Constitution is worded: Freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens. This is to say, that freedom for religious propaganda is *not* guaranteed because earlier in the same article "The Church in the USSR is separated from the State, and the *school* from the Church." In other words, the State takes over all the schools, the Church is allowed to operate none. Secondly, since the Church cannot operate schools, it cannot teach religion and since it is permitted only to worship but not to make religious propaganda, it is discriminated against in the same sentences which seemingly grants religious freedom. And so the famous article 124 which the Soviets and Communist sympathizers quote so liberally as guaranteeing religious freedom, when read in full context and full understanding of their terms shows that in reality it guarantees only the freedom to "phase-out" religion.

Communism knows that it cannot destroy man's rights and enslave him unless it first destroys the sovereignty of God. Dictatorship cannot tolerate allegiance to anyone or anything other than itself. Therefore, if it cannot twist religion to its own ends, it must necessarily destroy that religion, because religion is the visible tie, the visible reality, religion is all of that which encompasses man's relationship to and belief in a Supreme Being! It gives form and substance to the reality of the spirit world and to the existence of a Higher Authority other than the state. Therefore, it must be destroyed, or the state will find itself destroyed ultimately. Therefore, I suggest that the present protracted world crisis is not necessarily a political or economic crisis, but a religious crisis. In support of this, I quote Lunacharsky, Commissar of Public Education, "We hate Christianity and Christians; even the best of them must be looked upon as our worst enemies. They preach the love of our neighbors and mercy, contrary to our principles. Christian love is an obstacle to the development of the revolution. Down with the love of our neighbors; what we want is hatred. We must learn to hate and it is only then that we shall conquer the world." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 77, pp. 1539 and 1540.)

If you were to ask any group of Americans, whether college students, housewives, or factory workers, what their opinion was of Nazism, their reply would be unanimous. All would agree that Nazism had been brutal and barbaric. All would applaud our own resolute stand against it.

Yet, if you were to ask this same group their opinion of Communism, the results would be far different. There would, in fact, be as many answers as people questioned.

Some would speak of Marxism, others would point to Sputnik, or the method of teaching mathematics in Soviet schools. Most would say that Communism was not monolithic and that, even where it had once been tyrannical, it was now undergoing significant change. They would speak of "detente," and of building "bridges" to the East, and would characterize as unsophisticated those who painted a less optimistic picture.

All Americans, those who paint pictures which are optimistic and those who do not, would like to see a world at peace in which all men would possess dignity and freedom. This world, however, will never be brought about by refusing to see things as they are, admittedly an unpleasant undertaking when things are not good.

The Communists have cleverly adopted and used our own terminology and this is an obstacle difficult to surmount.

They say that they practice democracy, yet elections in Communist countries are uncontested. They say there is freedom of the press, yet no opposition papers are to be found. They boast of free speech, yet men languish in prison for uttering unpopular views. The elementary freedom for people to leave is even denied, as evidenced so eloquently by the Berlin Wall. Even Svetlana Stalin left without her children or worldly possessions. What kind of system fosters this kind of action?

In our own country one of the freedoms we hold most dear is the free exercise of our own chosen religion. Men and women of all faiths came to these shores so that they could practice their own religions in their own way. As George Washington wrote to the Jewish Congregation at Newport, Rhode Island, "There will be none to make you afraid."

In this country there are none to make any man afraid about his worship of God, and when we hear others in other places speak of freedom of religion, we assume that they are speaking of the way of life we ourselves have come to know.

Speaking on January 22, 1958 then Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev stated that "We are for the freedom of the religious convictions of the people and for respect for the religious views of every human being in every nation."

Those of us in the West who pose questions about the state of religion in the Soviet Union are referred to Article 124 of the Soviet Constitution. The decree on the separation of church and state and of school and church of January 23, 1918 was not aimed at religious freedom or tolerance but at the undermining of the very existence of the church.

The clergy were deprived of voting rights and were considered idlers and enemies of the people who were not productively working. By order of Lenin, the All Russian Extraordinary Committee for the Suppression of Counter-revolution was established in 1918 and during the first three years of Communist rule thousands of clergy were the victims of Soviet terror.

According to official Soviet data, for example, 423 churches were closed and 322 destroyed in the first half of 1929, and 1,440 churches were closed by the year's end. Synagogues were converted into clubs, Buddhist monasteries were closed, Moslem Mosques were converted into atheist museums and the printing of the Koran was prohibited.

The provision that the school shall be separated from the church denies to the church any educational functions. These are considered to be a monopoly of the state.

Another legal document, "Decree on Religious Associations," was enacted April 8, 1929, under Stalin by the Central Executive Committee of the People's Commissars. This legislation sets forth in 19 paragraphs what religious associations must do and not do. The right to participate in religious rites is defined by the Government as worship in an approved meeting place by a registered congregation led by acceptable ministers. There is strict enforcement of the regulation against giving religious instruction to the young, including parents giving religious instruction to their own children. Public worship is forbidden, as is any attempt to preaching the Gospel beyond the bounds of the approved meeting place. Baptism of children is likewise forbidden, and only those religious groups which have met the approval of the Government are even permitted to participate in this limited practice of their faith.

While those below the age of 21 may not be given religious instruction, they are the major target of the state's own anti-religious propaganda, also clearly protected by Article 124.

In 1925 the League of Militant Atheists was formed to publish and spread anti-religious material and, like the government economic plans, an atheistic 5 year plan was launched in 1927 and again in 1932. The program aimed at the complete disappearance of God's name from the USSR by 1937. In the late 1930s the League was reported to have 3.5 million members but it did not succeed in eliminating religion from the Soviet Union and because of its failures, and the need for a new and more conciliatory approach during World War II, the League was abolished in 1943. Just before and during World War II, some concessions were made to the Russian Orthodox Church, the Russian Orthodox Patriarchate was legalized, a climate was to be established among the masses more favorable to the Communist government, making them more willing to fight and die for Mother Russia.

During World War II the Communist government sought to unify the people against the German invader, and also attempted to create the image in the West of the Soviet Union as a democratic and freedom-loving state. The editors of papers and magazines were instructed to stop publication of articles attacking the church and although the laws and regulations relating to religion remained in force, they were not strictly applied.

With the end of the war came an increasing reign of terror. An example of the renewed vigor with which the Soviet Government attacked religion may be seen in the case of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

At the beginning of April, 1945 the Lviv newspaper, *Vil'na Ukraina* (Free Ukraine) printed a series of articles written by Yaroslav Halan an agent of the NKVD, headlined with the title: "With a Cross or a Knife?" and constituted a brutal attack on the late Metropolitan Andrei and the Ukrainian Catholic Church as a whole.

It is important to review the story of the Ukrainian Catholic (Uniat) Church in former Galicia and Carpatho-Ruthenia. The Soviet

regime, recognizing the Ukrainians as a separate national entity, considers them as one of the three branches of the all-Russian tree. The Latin Rite, celebrated in a language unfamiliar to them, was never popular among Eastern Slavs. The Uniat Church, which retained the Old Slavonic language, was much more attractive to them.

The Soviet Regime did not want to take the chance of allowing such a church to cross its borders in 1939 when it took over these territories. It did not wish to expose its nationals to the danger of joining a church which was Eastern in form but Western in faith and subject to authority from abroad. Therefore the Ukrainian Catholic (Uniat) was subjected to the severest persecution, and finally to formal extermination, not permitted to register as a religious association or group of believers. She became a silent church in the catacombs of the Soviet Union.

Statistics: The Ukrainian Catholic Church consisting of six million faithful was forced to abandon Rome. Closed or turned into Orthodox Parishes 3,040, churches and chapels, 4,400, monasteries 127, academies 5, schools 300+. Approximately 6,000 priests, nuns, monks and seminarians were imprisoned or murdered.

Only a few days after the publication of these articles, the Ukrainian Catholic Church received a cruel blow. On the night of April 11, 1945, Metropolitan Josyf was arrested, and with him the entire Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy: Bishops Hryhorii Khomyshyn from Stanyslaviv, Nykyta Budka of Lviv, Nykolai Charnetsky from Volhynia and Auxiliary Bishop Ivan Liatyshevsky from Stanyslaviv.

Barely two weeks after Metropolitan Josyf's arrest, Moscow Patriarch Alexei consecrated a Russian priest, Makarii, as Bishop of Lviv, and on April 28, 1945 a so-called Initiatory Group was organized in Lviv, whose purpose was to work to bring the Ukrainian Catholic Church into the Russian Orthodox Church. On March 8–10, 1946 a "councel" took place in Lviv with 216 priests and 19 laymen participating. It "invalidated" the decision of the Council of Brest in 1596, concerning the Union, and united the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the Russian Orthodox Church. However, out of 3,600 priests only 42 submitted to forcible reunion.

Metropolitan Josef was sentenced in 1946 and nothing was heard about him until the death of Stalin in 1953. At that time he was made the same proposition which he had refused in 1945: They demanded that he recognize the authority of the Patriarch of Moscow. But he again rejected this proposal and as the result of another trial in 1958 he was sentenced to an additional seven years of compulsory labor in a concentration camp.

The reason for the Soviet Government's desire to unite the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the Russian Orthodox Church brings us to another important aspect of the treatment of religion under Communism.

Just as the church was needed during World War II to increase the Soviet prestige in the eyes of the world and unite the people, so it is neeeded in peacetime to sell the Soviet foreign policy and the philosophy of Socialism.

Here was an example of foreign policy of the Soviet Union interplaying in the matter of religion. Any ties to the Vatican were considered dangerous to the Communists. Foreign policy has continued to be affected by religion and has been a source of serious hostility between the Church and the State in many of the East and Central European countries which are largely Catholic with ties to the Vatican. The story of Cardinal Mindzenty and the abortive Hungarian Revolution of 1956 is still troubling the foreign policy of the Hungarian Communist government. Cardinal Beran of Czechoslovakia is definitely persona non grata with the Communist government of that country. Cardinal Wyszynski of Poland and the Communist government there are often in open hostility. The Communist governments of the Catholic countries find it extremely difficult to directly confront the Church authorities. They fear that if they press too hard against the Church the people will revolt. They do not wish to bring on religious wars of revolution. They also fear that Communist revolutions in South America and other Catholic or Christian nations would be hampered by too much attention focused on Communist persecution of religion.

The Communist regime has learned to use the Church for its own ends. Where it has been able to get complete control of the hierarchy, as it has in the case of the Russian Orthodox Church, it has effectively utilized the Church. It is an interesting, though horrifying fact that Metropolitan Nikolai, Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, was willing to let the Church bear false witness to the murders of the Polish Officers at Katyn Forest. Metropolitan Nikolai certified that Katyn was the work of Nazi murderers. It is a well known and documented fact that it was the Russian Communist government which murdered the cream of the Polish officers in order to more easily take over Poland after the Nazi retreat.

Dr. Matthew Spinka, prominent church historian at the Hartford Theological Seminary, notes that the Soviet policy has ". . . resulted in the ever increasing subjection of the church to governmental control, so that in the end but little actual difference could be discerned between the external relations vis a vis the church which had existed under the Czarist regime and that which existed under the Soviets. It in turn established the pattern of relations which became not only the fixed form for Russia but for all communist-dominated countries as well. As such, this modus vivendi, whereby the church has been lulled into the belief of the possibility of a 'peaceful co-existence' and of preservation of its essential rights, in reality has been used as a tool for eliminating all religion from society. This presents perhaps the most difficult problem facing modern Christendom."

An example of the use of the Russian Orthodox Church in spreading political propaganda may be found by looking briefly at the Communist World Council of Peace which met in East Berlin on February 23, 1951.

At that time Metropolitan Nikolai of Moscow was the featured speaker. He stated the following: "And so we became convinced that the spirit and substance of Fascism have not disappeared, that the delirious dreams of the fanatic Hitler have found their continuers, now trying to realize them. Their followers do not lag behind their teachers. From the first day of the lawless aggression the American neofascists began a systematic, cannibalistic destruction of the 'lower' Korean race. What do we see? Cynically violated standards not only of international rights, but of human morals. Executions without trial and inquisitions, secret and public. Dreadful tortures of victims; the cutting off of ears and noses, breasts, and putting out of eyes, the breaking of arms and legs, the crucifixion of patriots, the burial alive in communal graves of women with children at their breasts."

In 1952 Metropolitan Nikolai charged that U.S. airmen in Korea were waging germ warfare: "Infected insects are being dropped from American aircraft on populated points, not only in Korea but in China . . . the Church cannot pass over in silence the suffering of the Korean people, which is perishing from the brigandlike attack and demoniac malice of these human monsters."

Concerning the Hungarian Revolution, Patriarch Alexei defended the brutal repression carried out by the Soviet army and noted that "When the fate of Hungary hung in the balance, Orthodox Christians in our country prayed for a speedy end to the bloodshed."

Testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Petr Deriabin said that "Most of the priests in the Soviet Union, and the religious people who help the priests, they are some kind of agents of KGB or the MGB or were at that time. It is impossible in the Soviet Union to serve God without serving the state security."

The Communists have actually extended the church's power in subjugated areas. In 1946, the 3.6 million Roman Catholics of Galicia were forced to accept the authority of the Russian Orthodox Church as a means of binding them closer to Moscow. The once independent Eastern Orthodox Churches of Albania, Rumania, and Bulgaria are now dominated by the Russian Church for the same imperialist reasons.

Not only the Russian Orthodox Church has fallen under the spell of favored treatment by the government. On the 40th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution, Jacov Zhidknv, vice president of the Baptist World Alliance, said that "The Evangelical Christian Baptists are thankful and praise God that the Soviet Government during the course of the past forty years has acted according to the high ideals precious to Christianity."

Lest the collaborationist churches obscure the very real story of religious persecution it is important to turn to some of the facts and figures which explain the scope of repression. Some, such as French author Francois Mauriac, have even declared that what is going on in Russia is much more than violent persecution, it is complete destruction.

Mr. Olivier Clement, an Orthodox professor, declared that from 1959 to 1962, the number of churches open decreased from 22,000 to 11,500 and the number of priests carrying on their functions from 30,000 to 14,000. More than half of the monasteries have been closed, from 69 in 1958 they were reduced to 31 in 1962. Of eight seminaries reopened in 1945, two have been closed and two have been almost stripped of their students.

Of the 2,455 religious institutions existing in pre-revolutionary Georgia, 2,335 churches, 27 monasteries, and 7 convents had been closed by the authorities by the end of 1923.

Judaism in the USSR is subjected to unique discrimination. Jewish congregations are not permitted to organize a nationwide federation or any other central organization. Judaism is permitted no publication facilities, and no Hebrew Testament has been published for Jews since 1917, nor is a Russian translation of the Jewish version of the Old Testament allowed. The study of Hebrew, even for religious purposes, has been outlawed and the production of religious objects, such as prayer shawls, is prohibited. The number of Jews in the Soviet Union is close to 3 million, of whom 1 million have been estimated to be believers. For these there are approximately 60 synagogues and rabbis, which amounts to one synagogue and rabbi per 50,000 Jews.

The fate of the Moslems has been similar. In 1942 there were only 1,312 mosques in the entire Soviet territory for the 24 million Moslem population. It was less than half the number existing in 1927, in the small territory of Bashkira with approximately one million Moslems.

Based on the assertion that Buddhism was in the service of the Japanese militarism, and that the lamas were allegedly carrying on counterrevolutionary activities, one monastery after another was closed and lamas disappeared. The party secretary of the Buriat Autonomous Republic reported to the Kremlin in 1935 that the number of lamas had fallen from 14,000 to 900, and 18 monasteries out of 37 were closed. The small Buddhist temple in Leningrad was also

closed and its lamas arrested and executed. In the Kalmyk Autonomous Republic, by 1936, the number of clergymen was reduced from 1,603 to 70 and the majority of monasteries were closed.

Reporting on a recent trip to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the Rev. Josef Nordenhaug, General Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, points out that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted and proclaimed by the United Nations states that "Everyone has a right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

The Rev. Nordenhaug notes that the "human rights declared by the United Nations do not spell out in detail the practical ordering of religious liberty. It is, however, clear that religious liberty includes public manifestation of one's religion."

For a Christian, religious liberty means the opportunity to confront people with the personal experience of salvation by grace through faith. Religious liberty also means that a person must be free to accept or reject such testimony. None of this, he said, exists today in the Soviet Union.

Last year a Lutheran pastor, the Rev. Richard Wurmbrand, arrived in the United States after fourteen years in Communist prisons. He recalled that when the Communists came to power in Rumania in 1945 they convened a meeting of Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Orthodox clergymen. More than 4,000 attended and were told that Rumanian Communism would be different from Russian Communism.

"We will not persecute the church," the Communists said, and according to the Rev. Wurmbrand, "There was only one in that Congress who protested and said that Communism can never change, that terror is an essential part of Communism." The Rev. Wurmbrand was that one man and he went to prison as a result of his refusal to stop preaching the Gospel.

Once in prison he said that "I met in prison all those who had praised Communism, all those who have collaborated with Communism, and they were treated just like me. They had been fools."

When asked the reason for his arrest, this was the Rev. Wurmbrand's reply to a Senate committee: "This is a question that is put to you in the West . . . with us the question is why somebody is not arrested. A colleague of mine was sentenced to seven years in prison because on Christmas Eve he preached that Jesus, being a babe, Herod wishes to kill Him, but His Holy Mother fled with him to Egypt. This was the charge: that he hoped Nasser would be on the side of the imperialists and therefore he mentioned Egypt."

Christian martyrs have been made in the prisons of Rumania and of other Communist countries. Men have died for their belief in God and in the integrity of the church. The Rev. Wurmbrand tells of Catholic priests dying "not only for Christ, but dying for the Pope." Asked if he believed in the Pope, one priest said that "Since St. Peter there has always been a Pope, and until Christ comes again there will always be a Pope." The Priest was tortured to death.

One question Richard Wurmbrand has asked over and over again is this: we pray for the saints and martyrs of years ago, and we should, but what of those of this very day?

At the present time, however, traditional Communist hostility to the churches is being downgraded, and no longer will Christians and Jews in the West hear the militantly atheistic appeals of Marxist leaders. It is as old as time: if you cannot defeat an enemy, make some arrangement to join him. If you cannot destroy the existence of a foe, destroy his ability to resist by carefully seducing him and using him for your own ends.

In the March, 1963 issue of *Political Affairs*, theoretical journal of the American Communist Party, Arnold Johnson notes that "Any serious idea of winning the majority of the American people for peace requires seeing not only the necessity but also the possibility of getting such a stand from the major church organizations and religious leaders."

Gus Hall, leader of the American Communist Party, characterized this new liberalized position as ". . . an aspect of the general political upsurge of these days, reflecting the most fundamental transition from one social system to another . . ."

Furthermore, *Political Affairs* devoted its entire issue for July 1966 to a discussion of the new relationship between Communism and religion made possible by the Vatican Council and the increasingly conciliatory position of the World Council of Churches.

Attempting to conceal the atheistic nature of world Communism, the editorial, entitled "Communism and the Church," which appeared in this issue urged Communists to accept a new approach: "We must fight to eradicate the sectarian idea that religious institutions are solely instruments of reaction and obscuritanism, and to make it clear that they have not only played a progressive—even revolutionary—role in past periods of history, but that under certain conditions they may play a progressive role today."

In an article entitled "Marxism and Religion," Herbert Aptheker, chief theoretician of the American Communist Party, states that "Marxism emphasizes the revolutionary quality of early Christianity." He quotes Engels, who wrote that "The sentiments of the masses were fed with religion to the exclusion of all else: it was therefore necessary to put forward their own interests in a religious guise in order to produce an impetuous movement."

Aptheker's point, in simple terms, is that since religion remains a force in society, it will be easier to get people to support Communist aims in the world if churchmen can be enlisted in the cause. In order to do this Aptheker clearly misstates the traditional Communist position, a position inherent in the materialistic world outlook it seeks foster. He writes that "An attitude of contempt for religion is an anti-Marxist attitude."

Roger Garaudy, French Communist theoretician, states that there is no real conflict between Communism and Christianity. In fact, he says: "Marxism must find and take over that which, underneath the myth, was the aspiration which gave birth to it . . . whereas early Christianity mentally abolished the distinction between slaves and free men, it did nothing to abolish it in actual fact, as did Spartacus, and did not even urge that it be eliminated." According to this thesis, Communism is simply applied Christianity.

We must not forget that while the outward thrust of Communism is one of conciliation with religion and that of using religious bodies to support Communist aims and programs, the reality of life for believing Christians, Jews, Moslems, and Buddhists in the Soviet Union and other Communist states is unchanged.

News from Eastern Europe during the past two years offers ample evidence of this fact. In Lithuania, for example, Father Vytautas Balciunas of Salanti was sentenced to forced labor in Siberia for "enticing children and arranging an outing for altar boys" and January, 1965 Father Valeatinas Sikahys, pastor at Pagramantis, drew a two year prison sentence for giving children First Communion. Churches which have not already been closed are now government property, are classified as places of amusement, and are taxed according to the plot of land they occupy. The Lutheran Church at Vilnius has been made into a Communist youth headquarters and the church at Jurbakas is now a jail. Cemeteries have been made into athletic fields, and what religion continues to exist has been forced underground.

While the Communists claim that religious freedom exists, their own news media tells quite a different story.

*Pravda Ukraini* for October 3, 1966 tells the story of "Brother Prokofiev" who had already been in prison three times, but as soon as he was released, he began to organize secret Sunday schools again. The result was a fourth arrest.

*Uchitelakaial Gasets* for February 19, 1966 said that the "illegal" Baptist organization in Rostov has an underground printing press, and that publications are printed in which youth are called to stand for their faith. The paper asks: "Why do teachers mix so timidly in the life of families in which children are idiotized (by religion)?"

Sowjestskaia Rossia recounts how the Baptist Marinkowa has had six children taken away from her because she gave them Christian faith and forbade them to wear the Communist pioneer necktie. When she heard the sentence, she said only, "I suffer for my faith." She now has to pay the boarding school bills of her children who are now in a state institution which preaches militant atheism.

The role of education in Communist countries is clearly that of indoctrinating young people in a militant atheistic philosophy. Lithuanian Communist Party Secretary A. Barkauskas made this clear in a meeting of the Central Communist Committee, February 12 and 13, 1963. He stated: "Without exception, all graduates of secondary and technical schools must be deeply convinced and active atheists. Newspapers must dwell extensively on atheistic topics. In literary works, whatever the theme being developed, must run a red threat of atheistic anti-clericalism."

In the face of such reports it is difficult to understand why so many church leaders in the West persist in believing that somehow religious freedom has begun to exist for those who live under Communism.

At a recent conference in Wiesbaden, Germany concerning "Christian Churches and Totalitarian Rule," Professor Will Herberg, author of the book *Protestant, Catholic, Jew* and Professor of Theology at Drew University, presented this assessment: "Some Christian leaders have even allowed themselves to become so bemused with the idea of socialism as a kind of wave of the future and with the 'liberal' delusion that the enemy is always on the right that they cannot see the flagrantly totalitarian character of the Soviet, East German, Chinese, and other Communist regimes, and tend to adopt attitudes running from friendly 'neutralism' and critical cooperation to outright support."

At this same conference Sir Arnold Lunn, British Catholic lay leader, noted that "No prominent Jew ever defended the Hitler regime. No prominent Negro defends apartheid in South Africa. Yet you can always find some Christians who defend Communists."

Lest any be truly misled as to the state of religious freedom in the Communist world today, it is important to review the most current material which has been received. At this very moment men are languishing in prison and suffering in labor camps for the "crimes" of distributing Bibles, holding Sunday schools, and preaching the Gospel. By no means is this what free men mean when they speak of religious liberty, unless, of course, words have ceased to be identified any longer with the concepts which gave them birth.

Religion has been the traditional enemy of all modern tyrannies. Mussolini stated that "Religion is a species of mental disease." Karl Marx called it the "Opium of the people" and Hitler denounced Christianity not only because Jesus was a Jew, but because it was cowardly to speak of giving love for hate.

We must not forget that tyranny is also the enemy of all religion, and of freedom as well. This may not be an optimistic picture, but real men in the real world cannot afford the luxury of dealing in pipe-dreams.

Only if we recognize things as they are can we change them, and to do this requires the kind of vision St. Matthew spoke of when he said: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto the mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

Having told you the why and the wherefore of Communist persecution of religion, having documented for you the fact of their persecution, it is now time to evaluate.

Let us not be confused by some changes of tactics by the Communist governments, such as permitting a Patriarchate in Moscow and by the visits of Gromyko and Podgorny to the Vatican.

Let us clearly evaluate these diplomatic steps in the light of existing facts, and the fact is that atheism still forms an integral part of Marxism, Leninism which requires a complete extermination of religious feeling in the masses. During the past years the Communist party has intensified its anti-religious propaganda. The earlier violence against religion has returned in the Soviet Union. The party uses all its agencies to repress religion. It has improved its methods by organizing in all Universities Chairs or Departments of Atheism.

The fact is that the Orthodox Patriarch is being used effectively as a tool of the Soviet Union's foreign policy and is a public relations office of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The diplomatic niceties between Moscow and the Vatican show a clear aim of the Communists to take control of the Catholic Church in the Soviet Union and degrade it to the same functions as the Patriarchate of the Orthodox Church.

I have no doubt that the Vatican is aware of the fact that one of the aims of Moscow is to make Communism in Europe and especially in Latin America more acceptable. The masterminds in Moscow attempt to use even Catholicism as a weapon against the United States, where the Catholic Church, as all religions, is a bulwark of freedom, justice, mercy and human dignity.

Let us therefore not be confused; the aim of Communism remains the same to eradicate religion. Only the tactics change. After the successful penetration and control of the Orthodox Church through its Patriarchate, the Communist party wants to penetrate other religious bodies in the same manner in order to use and to destroy. In the meantime they use them for anti-American propaganda.

Knowing the Communist aims toward religion is a step in the right direction. The problems are many. What can be done to expose the Communist deceptions? What can be done to protect our own religious freedom? What can be done to help the return of true religious freedom in the Captive Nations?

It occurs to me that to expose the Communist deceptions on the religious front it would be important for church and lay leaders to organize an annual conference on Communist persecution of religion. The Communist strategy and tactics could be exposed at such a conference. The findings of the conference would be given widest possible distribution.

Further I will recommend that the United States Department of State prepare a White Paper on Religious Freedom and present this to the United Nations. The State Department should call for the matter to be brought before the United Nations particularly in as much as the Charter of the Nations states that religious freedom is a fundamental human right. The right to worship God without fear must be a universal right for all people in all countries of the world.

I am much concerned about recommendations to tax church-owned property, to deny reading the Bible in public places such as our schools, to eliminate the words "In God We Trust" from our coins and to prohibit the use of the Bible in our courts. Atheists enjoy freedom of being non-religious; that is a right I would not deny them, but the atheist must not be allowed to deny religious people their right to worship God wherever and whenever they wish. It is my intention to speak about religious freedom and the persecution of religion anywhere I may be invited to do so. I believe that this is the great issue of our civilization.

---

## TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I offer today is designed to correct what I feel to be one of the most glaring inequities in our present tax laws. Our income tax is supposed to be a "graduated" tax—one based on an individual's ability to pay. If a man pays a $500 hospital bill, he can get tax relief for that expenditure. He can deduct the interest on his home mortgage from his gross taxable income. Any number of other "necessary" expenses are taken into account in determining his ability to pay. But, there remains one very necessary, one very important expenditure for which the present law provides no relief. This is the high cost of educating our children—of affording them the opportunity to go to college.

The aim of the bill which I offer today is to correct this situation—to give some tax relief to lower and middle income families who are struggling to pay their bills, maintain their homes, and still send their children to college. Let us face it gentlemen, a college education is no longer a luxury or just a nice thing to have. The technological advances of the 20th century have made a college education a necessity—a very costly necessity.

My bill would help to bring a college education within the reach of many qualified students who otherwise would not be able to afford it. It would allow a tax credit based on experience, including tuition, books, and supplies. The maximum credit would be $325, which would be deducted from the amount of income taxes owed the Federal Government.

Under my bill the credit is available to anyone who actually pays these expenses. It is available to students who are working their way through school and pay their own expenses; it is available to parents putting their children through college; it is available to other relatives; and it is available to those who would like to help a deserving student.

This approach would be a very practical help to those who need it most. It is not designed for the wealthy, but for the average American. Over two-thirds of the benefits would go to families earning less than $10,000 a year. It would give these Americans a better chance and a greater incentive to send their children to college.

I can think of no way to assure a better return on our dollars than to invest them in the future of our young people.

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MONOPOLY ON FLIGHT TEST RESEARCH BUSINESS SHOULD BE ERASED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at Long Beach, Calif., a comprehensive business flying service for evaluating components and systems for the aerospace industry has been established under the name of Flight Test Research, Inc. That business is being hobbled by the monopoly the Department of Defense imposes on this kind of activity. It is a monopoly which developed innocently, simply because no such service heretofore has been offered by private enterprise. Now that private enterprise is offering the service, the Department of Defense should take every reasonable step to ease its monopoly and permit the normal functioning of the American economic system. This will be difficult because not only is Government entrenchment in this business of long standing, but it also is widespread and diffused amongst a number of Air Force and naval installations. Furthermore, the aerospace industry is accustomed simply to turn to these Government installations and that pattern must be disrupted.

I make these remarks today so that persons in the aerospace industry may become aware of the problem and lend their help to the DOD in solving it. To better define the problem I have obtained unanimous consent to include with these remarks an article from Aviation Week & Space Technology for February 6, describing Flight Test Research, Inc.'s capabilities and my letter of April 25 to Defense Secretary Robert F. McNamara, requesting his good offices in taking remedial action. These two items follows:

BUSINESS FLYING: T-33's USED TO CHECK AEROSPACE SYSTEMS

(By George S. Hunter)

LONG BEACH, CALIF.—A comprehensive business flying service for evaluating components and systems for the aerospace industry is being conducted here by Flight Test Research, Inc.

The test load currently is apportioned be-

tween three Canadair T-33s, with two more due this month. Other Canadian jet aircraft are being acquired.

The company has used Canadian equipment thus far because jet aircraft potentially available in Canada are considered operational by the U.S. military services and cannot be acquired in this country.

FTR claims to be the only commercial contractor in the U.S. supplying this kind of service which, combined with a fast response to an industry request for quotation (test services, schedule and price) enables customers to score competitive advantages by being able to offer operationally debugged equipment quickly.

A recent test program conducted by FTR required only four days from initial customer inquiry to first flight. This fast action appeal, FTR claims, accounts for the current volume of its business.

Typical test programs since the start of operations in August, 1966, including those completed, currently under way or in the advanced planning stage for major aerospace firms, involve:

Inertial navigation, system trouble shooting and drift evaluation for commercial and military versions.

High-altitude antenna performance evaluation.

High-altitude spatial force-field survey.

Air-to-ground correlation seeker system evaluation. This system embodies a manual/optical scanner for ground target identification and selection; an automatic mode lock-on and hold by a terrain discrimination scanner, with coupling to automatic pilot to fly the weapons platform on a firing course; and a manual override operated in conjunction with a visual display.

High-speed rocket firing tests.

Napalm bomb drops in various flight modes.

Variety of aerial surveys and pace or chase aircraft services.

T-33 performance figures are 48,000-ft. ceiling and 1,300-naut. mi. range with auxiliary tip tanks; 50,000 ft. and 500 naut. mi. without tanks. Speed at 38,000 ft. with tip tanks is Mach. 0.82, and Mach 0.84 without tanks. At sea level, speed with tip tanks is 540 kt. and 480 kt. without tanks. Full-load rate of climb is 6,000 fpm. at sea-level, reduced to 1,000 fpm. at 35,000.

The aircraft offers volumes of up to 35 cu. ft. for test equipment installation in the rear cockpit, and up to 15 cu. ft. in the nose with its standard equipment removed or relocated. A variety of load concentrations and distributions of up to 3,000 lb. is possible within the maximum aircraft gross weight of 18,700 lb., with an additional payload margin of 400 lb. available in a clean configuration without tip tanks.

Program fees are negotiated individually, with charges tailored to the type of maneuvers, flight hours, equipment installation effort and the amount of transportation involved to and from the test site.

Transportation services are provided by a propeller fleet consisting of a Douglas DC-3 and an executive type eight-seat Cessna 411, which also are available for charter.

A supercharged Piper Aztec C is being used full-time to support a meteorological research program aimed at obtaining data on rate of ice accretion on wings and control surfaces during changing weather at altitudes of 35,000-38,000 ft.

Three Brantly helicopters also are used as support platforms for VTOL research programs, as well as providing for the Los Angeles CBS-KNX radio station service, which broadcasts highway traffic reports during peak hours.

All aircraft modification, maintenance and overhaul are carried out on FTR premises, except for jet overhaul, which is handled by Rolls-Royce in Canada.

Company installations at Long Beach include hangar facilities and machine sheet-metal forming, hydraulic, paint, avionic, radio and instrumentation shops. For example, each T-33 was acquired for $40,000 in Canada, cost an additional $10,000 in modifications and was readied for test services in three weeks.

FTR has a continuing arrangement with Douglas Aircraft Co. for airborne instrumentation, data acquisition devices and data reduction services for support of FTR programs. This includes such equipment as accelerometers, strain gages, oscilloscopes, multiple channel and multiplexed recorders, and telescopic-sight camera.

Douglas was supported by FTR with pace and chase aircraft service during flight test programs of the stretched version of the DC-9 and the DC-8-62 Series airliners.

FTR's key men are Russell O'Quinn, president and founder, and Jim Lucey, director of flight test. Both have broad flying and industrial backgrounds and current security clearances. A full-time helicopter pilot, administrative assistant, financial controller and a number of certified full-time and part-time mechanics round off the organization. Also on call are a stress-and-structures engineer and a number of type-certified pilots with military test experience to help out at peak loads.

O'Quinn hasn't yet resolved the important question concerning eventual acquisitions of supersonic and twin-engined jet aircraft, through purchase or bailment, to broaden the base of operational services. He accepts the fact that before long, if test demand trends continue, he might be pushing the design limits of his present equipment. Currently, required test program g-levels are being met by manipulating rates of turn. Pressure suits are available for high-altitude work.

FTR's organizational build-up began in March, 1966, under the name of Aeronautical Specialties, Inc., with combined backing from banks and private capital. Current aircraft investment is approaching half a million dollars.

---

APRIL 25, 1967.

Re: Federal Monopoly of Flight Test and Research Activities.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
*Secretary of Defense,*
*Department of Defense,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The issue about which this is written has been brought to my attention by Flight Test Research, Inc., 2680 East Wardlow Road, Long Beach, California 90807, of which Mr. Russell P. O'Quinn is president.

FTR is made up of personnel who have had years of experience in flight test and environmental testing of aerospace vehicles and products. Their experience obtained at military services' flight test centers or with major airframe manufacturers. Their goal is to achieve recognition by the Federal Government in all of its various related branches and services that a civilian flight test and research facility is now a reality and that this capability is available from private enterprise.

Put another way they desire that the United States government monopoly on this kind of activity be eased and that private enterprise be allowed to function in this legitimate area of economic endeavor.

Since the inception of the modern aeronautical and aerospace effort, no civilian organization or agency has ever before been established with the single aim and purpose of providing flight test and active inflight environment research and study services. As a result, the only flight test and research centers heretofore in existence were 100% government-owned and operated, as for instance at Wright-Patterson AFB, Edwards AFB, Patuxent River AFB, NAS, etc.

FTR has the capability to perform in the flight test and research areas of the aerospace industry, but, due to present policies of the military, the industry as a whole feels that it is obligated to use government-owned flight test facilities, particularly in relation to government-awarded contracts.

As an example: FTR had two requests for proposals to be submitted on major programs, one from the Douglas Aircraft Company and the other from Lockheed Aircraft. The reply to FTR's proposals was that Edwards Air Force Base could supply the same flight test services at a cheaper rate. The military price was just 10% above actual fuel costs.

Mr. O'Quinn on behalf of FTR points out that aerospace flight testing is made up of two separate phases, one of which pertains to the manufacturer's need to flight test during design and developmental stages and the other is certification and evaluation of the finished product. He further states:

"In the majority of all contracts and subcontracts let by the Federal Government and by prime contractors, it has been an unwritten rule, if not a written rule, that governmental flight testing and research services will be utilized for both the design and developmental phase as well as certification and evaluation phase. The reason for this has been simply no other capability existed heretofore. We desire to have a rule and/or policy established to the effect that prior to civilian or military products being committed, particularly in the design and developmental stages of flight test, to a governmental flight test facility, that a capability study be made to ascertain the availability of such services from private enterprise."

While in Washington a short time ago, Mr. O'Quinn discussed his firm and its problem with Mr. Thomas C. Muse, Assistant Director, Tactical Aircraft Systems of Your Research and Engineering Branch. Although Mr. Muse expressed interest both to Mr. O'Quinn and to me, the real problem seems to be the lack of any policy and directives which would permit the use of a private firm for flight testing and research services, such as set forth above, and prevent government facilities from monopolizing the business. I might point out that numerous companies have inquired of FTR about its availability for performance in flight test areas in relation to both civilian and military products, only to withdraw because of uncertainty due to the possibility of disturbing long established relations with the military and government flight test centers.

It is my belief and understanding that numerous provisions of law either discourage or prohibit competition by the government with private business. It is my understanding that long standing policy of the present Administration favors maximum utilization of the resources of private enterprise. I am aware of the Atomic Energy Commission's unceasing effort to withdraw from areas of commercial production whenever private firms are capable of supplying market demands for nuclear isotopes and similar products.

It strikes me that DoD is now confronted with precisely the same type of situation and that it deserves both quick action and action at the highest level, namely, Mr. Secretary, your own office. I say this because, for DoD the problem is somewhat unique, because it has ramifications in both the Navy and Air Force Departments, and because the provision of this type service by government is of such long standing that top level and explicit directives are going to be required to obtain results.

For your information, I am enclosing a brochure concerning FTR, as well as a reprint from Aviation Week & Space Technology. Mr. O'Quinn will be pleased to return to Washington and explain further the capability of this firm and discuss the entire problem with members of your staff.

I realize that this is a somewhat complex

problem but it embodies the very large principle of private enterprise confronted with a military competitor who is able to quote prices without relation to economics. It will be appreciated if you will let me know what steps may be taken through the Department of Defense to assist FTR.

By copies of this letter (less enclosures) I am requesting cooperation with you toward a solution of this matter by the House Government Operations and Small Business Committees and The Federal Aviation Agency.

Thank you for your courtesy and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. Speaker, an example of how the aerospace industry can assist in breaking the Government monopoly in this legitimate field of private business is the allegation by Lockheed and Douglas contained in my letter that Edwards Air Force Base was pricing a flight test research job at just 10 percent above actual fuel costs. As a matter of fact, Edwards Air Force Base bills separately for aircraft flight time, pilots pay, ground support facilities and other aspects of the total service. Aerospace industry accounting practice routes these various bills to different company departments. Had Lockheed and Douglas established any system whereby these separate billings could be brought together to establish the actual cost for the particular job involved, it is likely that a sensible consideration of FTR's proposal could have been made. Instead, it was rejected out of hand.

Hopefully I am looking for quick and favorable attention to my letter by the Secretary's office. I am also hopeful that whoever monitors the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the various aerospace companies will clip and forward these remarks to their top management.

## POTOMAC PARK CONFUSION

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if one were to select a single topic that has been discussed more in this Chamber than any other, I suspect it would involve the need for individual initiative, the importance of localities and States helping themselves, and the importance of cooperation rather than unilateral action by the Federal Government. Despite the general agreement and the constant effort to solicit individual action in resolving their own problems and urging that the Federal Government be a cooperator rather than a director, the Appropriations Committee, this day, has with one fell swoop laid to rest any support for this concept by the Congress.

Six years ago the citizens of Prince Georges County, Md., opposite George Washington's Home at Mount Vernon, after exhausting every avenue open to them as individuals and members of their community, came to the Federal Government with a request to establish a park, which would not only protect the land opposite Mount Vernon from commercial development, but for which these individuals and foundations offered land in fee and in less than fee to the Federal Government free of charge. The act passed the House and Senate without a dissenting vote. The State of Maryland passed enabling legislation to support and aid the Federal Government in its establishment of the park. Prince Georges County passed an ordinance that further enhanced the efforts to the Federal Government to complete the park.

From the very inception the Appropriations Committee has refused to allow the Federal Government to live up to its obligation. At one time the reason given by this committee was the failure of the authorization to be sufficient to complete the acquisition of land for the park. Legislation was introduced in the 89th Congress in order to increase this authorization as a result of a direct request by the Appropriations Committee. This passed both Houses without dissent and was signed into Public Law 89-513 by the President on July 19, 1966.

The fact that the request of the Appropriations Committee was complied with apparently made no impression, for on this day we are now in the unenviable position of telling the people who have contributed lands and rights to lands, which would cost the Federal Government $11,000,000 if they were to purchase them in fee simple, that their efforts are meaningless. We are saying to these people that we really did not mean what we said when we urged them to show initiative and to utilize local and State governmental bodies in a cooperative fashion. We are saying to them that we were not impressed by the fact that the value of your contributions are over twice the amount of the total appropriations requested. The Appropriations Committee has placed the Federal Government in the position of not being able in the future to extend any encouragement to individuals or groups of individuals to enter into any agreement with the Federal Government that requires good faith on both sides because the Federal Government cannot be trusted to honor its obligations.

Words are not enough to convince the American people that their efforts, if worthy of purpose, entered into in good faith, and diligently pursued, will be rewarded. The action of the Appropriations Committee this day will give added incentive to those who want to bring any and all problems to the Federal Government for solution and funding, for no credit will be given for self-help.

## FEDERAL PROTECTION OF PRIVATE PENSION PLANS FOR EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVANS of Colorado). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I today introduced a bill to establish a Federal system of protection of private pension plans. In doing so I join with one of my colleagues in the other body, the senior Senator from Indiana, Mr. HARTKE, who is introducing a similar bill in the Senate today.

Our basic concern in sponsoring this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is the security of the worker who has earned the right to rely upon the long-range value of a private pension system, and who stands to lose that security if the plan is terminated for any reason, such as bankruptcy, merger, or closing of a section of a business.

Employers at the present time do not generally assume any liability beyond their contributions to the plan. If the plan is terminated, as for example happened when Studebaker's South Bend, Ind., plant was forced to close down in 1964, thousands of workers, many of whom have been with the company for many years, may lose part or all of their pensions where the employer had no further obligation to contribute to the fund or no assets from which to contribute.

The bill I have introduced today would authorize the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under which the system of pension protection would be administered, to borrow moneys from the Treasury for the establishment of a pension protection fund. This money would be repaid by premiums which would be forthcoming from the plans which have met Internal Revenue Code tax incentive requirements, and which have been approved by the Secretary.

My bill would create a seven-member Federal Advisory Council for Insurance of employees' pension funds to assist the Secretary of HEW, and would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The pension protection program would provide the worker protection much the same way as is presently provided for his savings by insurance through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the insurance of the mortgagor's obligation to make future payments under the Federal Housing Act. Moreover, because of the self-financing feature of the bill, it would not necessitate the spending of any public funds.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has recognized the need for Federal support of private pension plans.

There follows at the end of this statement a summary of the January 1965 report of the President's Committee on Public Policy and Private Pension Plans on which Secretary of Labor Wirtz served as chairman. Recent comment by Congressman CURTIS of Missouri, on private pension programs can be found at page 10525 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1967.

Addressing the Senate Finance Committee hearings held August 1966 to consider legislation—S. 1575, 89th Congress, second session—to establish a Federal system of reinsurance for private pension plans, Secretary Wirtz said:

This is a matter of personal financial security for millions of individuals. Annual benefit payments from these plans now total some $3 billion—to almost 3 million beneficiaries. By 1980, coverage of these plans is expected to increase from the approximately 25 million employees now covered to about

42 million. Over the same period, the present $85 billion held in these funds will probably grow to $225 billion.

These facts make it plain that the Nation, as a whole, has a major stake in the private retirement system.

During the Finance Committee hearings, Secretary Wirtz cited a U.S. Department of Labor study with preliminary figures for the period of 1954 to 1965 which shows the termination of 4,243 pension plans involving 183,699 workers. Secretary Wirtz told the Committee:

The legislation which you are considering today is a serious, constructive attempt to deal with these difficulties and to provide beneficiaries of private pension plans with limited protection through a Federal reinsurance program . . . I whole heartedly endorse the purpose and objectives of this bill.

Walter P. Reuther, president, United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, AFL–CIO, and president of the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, also appeared before the Senate Finance Committee to support Federal protection for private pensions. In a prepared statement Mr. Reuther said:

With the tremendous expansion of private pension plans in America, and their development as a flexible and significant secondary source of retirement income, the security of the pension promise which they represent to millions of wages earners has clearly become a matter of vital public concern.

Establishment of a national mechanism to insure a portion of the risk of inadequacy of plan assets to meet benefit obligations in event of termination is in no sense a threat to the private pension system. On the contrary, such an undertaking will serve to strengthen the private system and to make it more effective while continuing to permit a wide latitude in the design and operation of plans to meet varying needs and circumstances.

The program will be self-financing and constitutes a direct and practical approach to a critical problem which only national legislative action can solve.

Lending Federal support to the pension plan system by the administration of a self-financing program would mean that financial security for those workers when they really need it most would be a reality, not an illusory promise.

I was pleased to introduce legislation—H.R. 17590—in this body in the second session of the 89th Congress to protect the rights of employees under pension plans—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 16, page 22080, for my statement and the bill. It is my earnest hope that my colleagues will give the legislation which I have introduced today their enthusiastic attention and support.

There follows the January 1965 report of the President's Committee on Public Policy and Private Pension Programs, containing a summary of major conclusions and recommendations concerning private employee retirement plans:

APPENDIX—SUMMARY OF MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 1965 REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON PRIVATE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT PLANS BY THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON CORPORATE PENSION FUNDS AND OTHER PRIVATE RETIREMENT AND WELFARE PROGRAMS

DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE RETIREMENT PLANS: CONCLUSIONS

Private retirement plans now cover about 25 million workers, about half of the employees in private nonfarm establishments. They pay almost $2¾ billion a year in benefits to nearly 2½ million beneficiaries. Their status as a major financial institution is reflected in their accumulated reserves of over $75 billion, in their annual accumulations of $6½ billion, and in their annual benefit payments of almost $2¾ billion a year.

It is estimated that by 1980 the number of employees covered by retirement plans will increase to 42 million, or three out of five employees then expected to be in private nonfarm establishments. The number of beneficiaries will increase to about 6½ million in 1980. According to these projections, plans will continue to build substantial reserves since the contributions paid into the funds, together with the funds' earnings, will be far in excess of benefit payments. Under the assumed conditions, total contributions, which amounted to nearly $7 billion in 1964, are expected to rise to about $11 billion a year by 1980, while benefit payments during the same period will increase to around $9 billion annually. Total reserves will grow to about $225 billion by 1980.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN PRIVATE RETIREMENT PLANS: CONCLUSION

Although the development of private retirement plans has largely been the result of business and labor initiative, public policy has encouraged and protected these plans through tax laws, labor relations statutes, standards of fiducial obligations of trustees, and more recently through specifically designed legislation requiring public disclosure of various aspects of retirement and welfare plans.

The prevailing tax provisions for private pensions make it possible to provide private pensions at a substantially lower cost than that which would result if no special tax provisions were available for pensions. Regardless of how the worker and the employer may share the benefits—in the form of higher pensions or reduced costs—which the special tax provisions for pensions make possible, it is evident that the advantages for both employers and workers are very significant. The loss of revenue to the Federal Government as a result of this special tax treatment is estimated to be more than $1 billion annually.

Several points underline the breadth and depth of the public interest in private retirement plans:

1. They represent a major element in the economic security of millions of American workers and their families.

2. They are a significant, growing source of economic and financial power.

3. They have an important impact on manpower in our economy.

4. They have a major, growing significance for Federal taxpayers because the special tax concessions reduce the tax base and put more burden on other tax sources.

RELATION OF PRIVATE PLANS TO THE PUBLIC RETIREMENT PROGRAM: CONCLUSIONS

The public program will continue to be the Nation's basic instrument for assuring reasonably adequate retirement income to workers, their widows and dependents.

Private pension plans should continue as a major element in the Nation's total retirement security program. Their strength rests on the supplementation they can provide to the basic public system.

The basic justification for the indirect public subsidy involved in favored tax treatment lies in the social purposes served by private pension plans. In view of these social purposes, public policy should continue to provide appropriate incentives to private plan growth, and by improving the basic soundness and equitable character of such plans, set a firmer foundation for their future development. Because protection will always be far from complete, private pension plans cannot be a substitute for public programs, but public policy can encourage developments which will provide supplementary retirement benefits to a growing proportion of the Nation's workers and will provide greater assurance that the promised benefits will be paid.

Continuing attention will be necessary to assure that the combined benefits available through OASDI and supplementary private pensions, for those receiving them, are reasonably related to wage levels and living standards in the economy.

PRIVATE PENSIONS, LABOR MOBILITY, AND MANPOWER POLICY: CONCLUSIONS

Private pensions, along with seniority and other benefits based on length of service, tend to reduce labor mobility by tying workers to a particular employer. While the effect of private pensions on mobility is significant, it is limited and selective. However, there is cause for concern in the selective impediments to mobility now erected by private pension plans and in the possibility that such plans in the future will not permit a rate of mobility among mature workers sufficient to accommodate a rapid rate of technological change.

Employers should be encouraged to adopt more widely those types of pension plans which do not involve significantly higher costs for older workers, in preference to those types which involve greater differences in cost between new employees in different age groups. However, legislation affecting private pensions is not recommended as a means of minimizing the use of rigid age limits in hiring.

The government should not attempt to regulate compulsory retirement practices, which should be left to private decision. However, employers should be encouraged to adopt flexibly administered systems of retirement. Measures to compel earlier retirement are not desirable or suitable as a general means of dealing with unemployment problems.

VESTING: CONCLUSIONS

The advantages which vesting brings to the private pension system are the following:

1. As a matter of equity and fair treatment, an employee covered by a pension plan is entitled, after a reasonable period of service, to protection of his future retirement benefit against any termination of his employment.

2. Vesting also provides special advantages to the employer.

3. By making private pension benefits more widely available, vesting strengthens the Nation's program for retirement protection.

4. Vesting enhances the mobility of the work force.

The values of vesting extend beyond the interests of the participants in pension plans. Benefits to the entire economy are involved, including the strengthening of economic security for retired workers and the effective operation of the Nation's system of labor markets.

*Recommendations*

A vesting requirement is necessary if private pension plans are to serve the broad social purpose justifying their favored status. The Internal Revenue Code should be amended to require that a private pension plan, in order to qualify for favored tax treatment, must provide some reasonable measure of vesting for the protection of employees. Several suggestions are made regarding the most effective method for implementing this requirement without creating obstacles to the future growth of the private pension system. The Committee suggests a system of graded deferred vesting based solely on service applicable to both single and multiemployer plans. An appropriate transition period should be provided, and special procedures made available to plans whose costs would be increased by more than 10 percent as a result of this recommendation, the recommendation of funding, or a combination of the two.

FUNDING FOR FINANCIAL SOLVENCY: CONCLUSION

Pension plans without adequate funding may turn out to be empty or only partially fulfilled promises. The minimum standards for funding under present tax law do not assure adequate funding. The setting of standards for adequate funding, therefore, becomes an important public concern.

*Recommendations*

The present minimum standard for funding needs to be strengthened by changes along the following lines:

1. As a minimum standard of funding for *stated benefit* plans, the plan should be required to fund fully all current service liabilities and to amortize fully all accrued liabilities over a period that roughly approximates the average work life of employees but not more than 30 years.

2. As a minimum standard for funding of *fixed contribution* plans, the contribution commitments of the plan should be realistically related to benefits promised and actually paid.

3. The funding process of every qualified plan should be certified at the inception of the plan and periodically thereafter by an actuary with acceptable professional qualifications.

4. The funding process should be subject to review by the Internal Revenue Service on the basis of guidelines or ranges of standards with respect to such actuarial assumptions. The guides should be specified by the Internal Revenue Service with the advice and consultation of a public advisory body of actuaries and other interested parties.

5. Concurrent with actuarial certification, a determination should be made by a professionally qualified public accountant with respect to the value of pension fund assets.

6. An appropriate transition period should be provided, and special procedures made available to plans whose costs would be increased by more than 10 percent as a result of this recommendation, the recommendation on vesting, or a combination of the two.

PORTABILITY AND INSURANCE: CONCLUSIONS

Two proposals are worthy of serious study to help fulfill the long-range promise of the private pension system:

1. The possibility of some institutional arrangement for transferring and accumulating private pension credits.

2. A system of insurance which, in the event of certain types of termination, would assure plan participants credit for accrued benefits.

INEQUITIES UNDER THE TAX LAWS: CONCLUSION

Present laws permit many serious inequities in qualified private retirement plans and in the tax treatment of benefits distributed by such plans.

*Recommendations*

1. The option which qualified retirement plans now have to cover only salaried or clerical employees should be eliminated, unless there is a showing of special circumstances.

2. The maximum period for which coverage of any employee can be deferred by a qualified plan should be reduced from five to three years.

3. Employees of tax-exempt institutions should be given tax favored treatment for pension benefits earned after the date of the change only where they participate in tax qualified plans.

4. An appropriate dollar limitation on contributions to qualified corporate pension plans for any employee or a commensurate limitation on benefits should be required, as to benefits earned after the date of the change, in order to prevent abuse and restrict favored tax treatment to private plans which furnish benefits consistent with public interest.

5. Qualified plans should be permitted to continue to integrate with OASDI, but, as to benefits earned after the date of the change, the employer should be given credit for no more than one-half of the social security benefit.

6. The present provision treating lump-sum distributions of retirement benefits as long-term capital gains should be replaced, as to benefits earned after the date of the change, by an appropriate averaging device which might take into account the individual's future income status.

7. The special tax treatment of distributions of employer securities to employees should be eliminated, with respect to appreciation in value arising after the date of the change.

8. Gift and estate taxes should apply to transfers of interests in qualified retirement plans in the same manner as they apply to transfers of similar types of property.

9. Deferred profit-sharing plans should be required to provide for employers' contributions in accordance with a predetermined formula.

10. The Committee's vesting requirement should also apply to deferred profit sharing plans designed primarily to provide retirement benefits but in such cases reallocation of forfeitures among the remaining participants would be prohibited. In the case of all other deferred profit-sharing plans, a provision granting immediate vested rights to all covered employees should be required.

11. An appropriate transition period should be provided and special procedures established for those plans whose costs would be substantially increased by these recommendations.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF RETIREMENT PLANS: CONCLUSIONS

The total amount of investments held by private retirement funds has increased from $12 billion at the end of 1950 to over $75 billion at the end of 1964. A further increase to around $225 billion is projected by 1980. However, the Committee does not believe there are sufficient grounds for recommending regulation of the size of retirement funds or of their rate of capital accumulation.

By 1964, the noninsured funds were investing half of their new resources in common stocks. This shift has certainly been one of the factors contributing to increases in common stock prices, particularly for the higher grade stock, although it would be very difficult to estimate the quantitative importance of this single factor.

In view of the wide legitimate differences regarding the most advantageous balance of retirement funds investments, the Committee does not believe it would be desirable on the basis of evidence to date to require conformity to a prescribed rule with respect to the proportion of stocks to other investments.

PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF EMPLOYEES IN THE INVESTMENT OF RETIREMENT FUNDS: CONCLUSIONS

Whatever the type of investments made by retirement funds, such investments should be made honestly, conscientiously and prudently; it is important that there be the greatest practical degree of assurance on these points.

This Committee recognizes the need for additional measures for the protection of the interests of employees, but doubts whether a major problem is the lack of appropriate standards of prudence. On the basis of present evidence, the Committee does not propose the substitution of a new set of statutory standards for the recognized standards of fiducial responsibility, although there appears to be a need for strengthening statutory provisions for assuring compliance with these standards.

Full disclosure of relevant facts is a prerequisite for self-help and for the enforcement of statutory measures for the protection of the individual's rights. It is premature, short of a more extensive test of the effectiveness of the disclosure approach as a means of assuring standards of fiducial responsibility, to make a recommendation for a regulatory agency to act as guardian for the collective interests of employees and their beneficiaries.

*Recommendations*

1. Future investments by retirement funds should be subject to a maximum limitation (perhaps 10 percent) on the portion of a fund that may be held in stock or obligations of the employer company or its affiliates, regardless of the ability of such investment to meet a fiducial test.

2. The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act should be amended by requiring the disclosure of additional information related to the investment holdings and activities of retirement plans.

FURTHER STUDY AND RESEARCH: CONCLUSIONS

The pension and welfare areas deserve greater emphasis in the planning of the Federal Government's research and statistical programs. Several suggestions are made for further research regarding private retirement plans.

---

## REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many in and out of Congress are looking forward to constructive progress in the efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Congress through reorganization legislation. No doubt many different approaches can be made and will be suggested to accomplish this goal. I am aware that the House Rules Committee cannot accept all of the recommendations that will be offered by interested Members, but I am offering a few suggestions to which I urge you to give serious consideration. If they are of such nature that they cannot be included in the present legislation under consideration, perhaps they can be a basis for future reorganization. I am making these proposals so they can be made part of the RECORD and my colleagues can study them.

I have studied the bill under consideration by the committee and find a great deal of merit in it. I will be looking forward to reading the suggestions of others who will be testifying on it. My suggestions will cover an area of activity which, I have found in my 4 years as a Member of this House, have created grave inconveniences to Members for which I feel there should be some relief. Perhaps these suggestions are such that they should be considered only by the House and be incorporated into the House rules. It may turn out that they may be impractical in terms of the present thinking regarding the responsibilities of Congress, but I will place them in the RECORD as a serious attempt on my part to make the House duties not only more convenient for the Members but help make Congress more responsive to the will of the people.

In outline, these are my suggestions:

First. The first 3 weeks of each month, beginning with the first Monday in the

month, should be scheduled as legislative weeks, with the House being in session from noon until 5 p.m., Mondays through Fridays.

Second. When the month includes five Mondays, there shall be four legislative weeks.

Third. Sessions each day shall be adjourned before 5 p.m. if legislative business does not require the full 5 hours. Sessions can be extended beyond 5 p.m. by consent of the Members. If such consent is not given, unfinished business will be the first matter of business on the next legislative day.

Fourth. Sessions can be held on Saturdays of legislative weeks by consent of the Members.

Fifth. From the close of the last legislative week in each month until noon of the first Monday of the succeeding month, Members will be free to return to their districts for such activities as they deem necessary to fulfill their responsibilities as representatives of their districts.

Sixth. If the Member chooses to return to his district, he will be furnished transportation equal to the amount of a round-trip airline ticket to the airport he chooses as his place of destination plus 10 cents a mile for transportation to and from his place of residence in the district.

Seventh. The present rule permitting deduction from pay if not present at a legislative session will be enforced unless, as in the case of sickness or official business, the Member is excused by the Speaker of the House.

Eighth. Congress will adjourn sine die on July 31 and return for sessions on the Monday following Labor Day. It shall continue in session until 1 week before Christmas unless the responsibilities of Congress are completed before that date.

Ninth. In even-numbered years Congress will stand in recess from the close of the last legislative day in October until the Monday following the day of the general election.

There would be distinct advantages to both the Member and his constituents should my suggestions be adopted. The foremost responsibility of every Member of the House is to represent his people. He needs an opportunity to make personal contact with his people on a regular basis so that he not only can report to them his stewardship, but so he can listen to what his constituents have to say; to hear their suggestions; to discuss pending legislation with those whose lives and fortunes are intimately, are directly, related to proposed legislation.

Here are the advantages:

First. The Member could schedule his office hours, speeches, and other activities in his district 2 years in advance and except for situations beyond his control would be spared the embarrassment and criticism of having to cancel appearances.

Second. He could thus arrange his schedules so that he could have personal contact with constituents from every part of his district.

Third. His constituents could also plan in advance such occasions as they desire with the assurance that, if their Congressman consents to appear, they have reasonable assurance he will attend.

Fourth. Meetings with individuals and groups could be planned in advance of upcoming legislation, giving the Member an opportunity to better understand how proposed legislation would affect his constituents.

Fifth. The Member could schedule office hours in his district with assurances that he can make an appearance on scheduled dates.

Sixth. Constituents being aware of the requirement that their Representative be present in Washington on specific days would not expect the Member to be in the district when he should be in Washington.

Seventh. The Member would be saved much of his precious time by making it possible for him to make one trip to accomplish ends which under present circumstances may require three or four trips back to his district. He would travel once to stay a week in the district instead of having to make two or three trips. This would provide him sufficient time to be with his constituents without absenting himself from his work in Washington when he is needed here.

Eighth. He would be paid for necessary travel associated with his work, thus relieving unnecessary financial strain on those like myself who are too close to Washington—in terms of flying time—not to go back to his district yet far enough away to make it financially burdensome as well as time consuming and inconvenient.

Ninth. Finally, it would give the Member a maximum amount of time to be with his family whether they have accompanied him to Washington or remain in the district. The midsummer recess would give him a few weeks to be with his children when they are out of school. I cannot impress upon you too much the very grave injustice being done the Members of Congress under the present arrangements.

I am not unaware that political considerations may dictate deviation from the plan I propose but our first responsibility and obligation is to give the best representation we can to our constituents. Washington need not continue to grow further and further away from the people. Congress can be and must become again truly the voice of the people and must reflect it. Anything we can do to accomplish this goal should and must be done if we are to recapture the confidence of the people in representative government.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I appreciate more than the gentleman could rightly know the depth of the study and the perception he has obviously put into what he reports to the House of Representatives of the Congress this evening. This is obviously erudite. It is based on many considerations, including the public trust, true representative government in a republic under a limited constitution, and how best to acquit ourselves.

I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the report of the select committee, the bipartisan joint committee established by the two bodies of the Congress, insofar as it pertains to these matters he has covered so well this evening. If not, I would recommend that the report be studied, since I had the privilege of serving on that committee for the past 2½ years, because many of the suggestions the gentleman makes are covered therein, such as the summer interval if the work is not accomplished by proper programing and proper leadership on the part of the House prior to that time, during the entire month of August. Then the Representatives would be off and at home with their families, and could come back to accomplish what further needed business was necessary in the fall.

Indeed the gentleman from Wisconsin has thought about this matter at obvious length.

The joint committee heard much testimony from many Members of Congress and from political scientists and from others who wanted to come before the committee, in public hearings, and spent much time in executive session on these very subjects of travel time, travel allowances, and days of work.

We did not involve either House in the Joint Committee, so far as the rules of a particular House were concerned, but we did address ourselves in some detail, at least in the hearings and in the markup of the bill, to the expedition of business, and the use of means by which to expedite the business of the Congress.

I want to commend this report to the gentleman, and certainly wish to associate myself with his studious remarks. I thank him for taking this special order and for having done the research he has done. I do so only in the spirit of helping with that, as I make these comments thanking the gentleman.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I thank the gentleman from Missouri, who, as always, makes constructive suggestions.

May I add one item to my remarks. I believe that the strain on the Members of Congress is something we ought to take a very serious look at, because I believe we could lessen many of the tensions present today if we would take some constructive step toward making it easier for the Member. In addition, he could represent his district better.

I realize that some will say this is a suggestion that we have 3 weeks of work and 1 week of play, but I have confidence in the American people. If they know the Congressman is going to have this 1 week a month, they will ask him to come back to the Congress and put his feet to the fire. They will ask questions.

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I, too, want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin and to commend him for the effort he has made in presenting these suggestions to the Members of the House.

I have had many private conversations with the gentleman in the well, and I know how dedicated he is to coming up with some constructive, positive reforms in our organizational structure that will

help us accomplish the business for the public.

Particularly I want to associate myself with the gentleman's suggestion for a summer recess.

Again, this is not going necessarily to be just one big vacation, because I know Members will be at home and available for their constituents to see. I think the gentleman has done a great job here, and I commend him for it.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I thank the gentleman very much.

---

## CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN RENEWS CALL FOR ACTION TO END CAMBODIAN "BACK DOOR" AID TO VIETCONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently, on February 27, a front-page New York Times story carried the headline, "GI's Sight Enemy on Cambodia Side: Patrol Watches as Armed Vietcong Squad Crosses Border Into Vietnam." Such stories about the aid and comfort derived by the enemies of South Vietnam from Cambodia are not unique. However, what would be unique would be a story telling of some effective action to prompt Cambodia to live up to its alleged policy of strict neutrality.

Disturbingly, the record appears to show that the administration is willing, albeit after some official handwringing, to cast a tolerant eye upon the role of Cambodia and the way it is being used by North Vietnam and the Vietcong. It is, regrettably, but another instance of our willingness to fight this war according to terms and conditions dictated by the enemy. Such an approach has not shortened the conflict nor tended to limit the cost in lives. On the contrary, quite the opposite may be true.

The compelling question remains: When is something going to be done to stop the expansion of the war by the enemy into Cambodia?

Upon my return last April from a special subcommittee mission to Vietnam for the Armed Services Committee, I first reported to the House on May 4, 1966, my deep concern over this problem. The alarming, and in some cases contradictory, reports in the press up to that time with respect to the role of Cambodia, prompted me to seek out firsthand information. As I said a year ago, I could find no military man with direct knowledge of the Vietnamese conflict that doubted for a moment that Cambodia was being used by Vietcong or North Vietnamese units.

For instance, while I was in Tay Ninh a briefing officer referred to a chart on the wall and pointed out three different areas where airfields were located just a few miles across the border in Cambodia which were being used daily for air flights to bring supplies for the Vietcong. We were also advised of another location within the general area that was being used as a training ground for the Vietcong.

I was particularly shocked to learn from a highly informed naval officer that while we were spending billions of dollars to bomb the North to cut off supplies, we had no effective control over the ships using the Mekong to insure that they were not helping to supply the enemy.

At that time I particularly urged that something be done about the "back-door" aid that the Vietcong were reported to be receiving, directly and indirectly, from ships moving up the Mekong River, 140 miles right through South Vietnam en route to Cambodia.

My urgings were greeted, however, by the State Department with only soothing evasions. As recently as last November 15, I was confidently told that there was:

> . . . a strict inspection system of foreign vessels bound for Cambodia to insure that their cargo does not include any secreted war materials that might be destined for the Viet Cong.

Furthermore, Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II continued:

> The movements of foreign vessels are also closely monitored in an effort to insure that they do not drop off any supplies for enemy forces during their transit of the Vietnamese portion of the Mekong.

Thus, it was asserted "all feasible measures" were being taken. There was, it was implied, nothing more that could or should be done.

In view of these unequivocal assertions, I was amazed to learn just 14 days later, from a news dispatch from Saigon appearing in the Washington Post on November 29, 1966, that—

> South Vietnamese gunboats have started escorting all foreign ships traveling the Mekong River to Cambodia to stop the smuggling of guns and ammunition to the Vietcong.

Since this new action was, presumably, in the view of the State Department as of November 15, neither feasible nor necessary, I consequently asked the Secretary of State for an explanation. The answer came down in a letter dated December 22, 1966, which merely stated that:

> Changes are made as needed in order to insure that controls operate effectively as possible.

Such changes are precisely what I had been advocating for months, because the problem had been there for months. It did not suddenly appear last November. This was again confirmed to me in a letter from the Department of Defense, dated February 2, 1967, which stated in part:

> During 1966, the GVN and the United States Government became increasingly concerned over reports of Vietcong acquisition of badly-needed supplies from ships with international registry moving up the Mekong River to Cambodia from the South China Sea. To deal with this problem, a convoy system was instituted in November 1966 and since that time there have been no reports of off-loading supplies for the Vietcong along the Mekong in South Vietnam. It is, of course, difficult to make an accurate assessment of the effectiveness of the system to date because there is no way of knowing how many vessels intended to deliver supplies to the Vietcong but the absence of such reports is encouraging.

This is, I agree, certainly encouraging news, and it is only to be regretted all the more that these steps were not taken long before I found it necessary to call attention to this problem months ago.

However, Mr. Speaker, this only represents part of the problem.

For example, there is still the difficulty of trying to insure that goods entering Cambodia via the Mekong River do not ultimately benefit the Vietcong. As I pointed out a year ago, there have been reports for some time indicating that these cargoes often seem to disappear once they reach Phnompenh; finding their way back into South Vietnam by land or by small boats on the Mekong. Such traffic is admittedly hard to control in an area of the world with a long tradition of smuggling.

In fact, Prince Sihanouk recently complained that smuggling operations are of such a scale that Cambodia cannot profitably export rice on the legitimate market because of the black market competition. Here, it should be noted, Sihanouk is apparently not concerned that the goods go to the Vietcong, but only that custom duties are evaded. Just as much as the smugglers, Sihanouk has considered it in his interest to help the enemies of South Vietnam. Consequently, there is little likelihood that either the clandestine or the open "back-door" aid that the Viet Cong derives from Cambodia will be stopped until it is in Silhanouk's interest to do so.

A year ago, I urged that the Mekong River be closed entirely to Cambodia-bound shipping. It will be recalled that in late 1965, the South Vietnamese closed the river to all Communist-flag ships in accordance with the treaty governing this international waterway which permits unilateral action when the security of a riparian state is threatened. Clearly, so long as Cambodia's alleged policy of strict neutrality results in aid and comfort to the enemies of South Vietnam due even in part to the shipping traffic on the Mekong River, I believe that the Saigon government is well within its rights to close the river entirely.

During 1966, there were a total of 309 free world ship arrivals at Phnompenh. In January and February of this year there were 41 such arrivals. Detailed information is as follows:

*Free world ship arrivals by flag, Phnompenh, Cambodia*

[PN—Panamanian; UK—United Kingdom; JA—Japanese; FR—French; NE—Netherlands; IT—Italian; DE—Denmark]

| | PN | UK | FR | JA | NE | IT | DE | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *1966* | | | | | | | | |
| January | 19 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 1 | ---- | ---- | 39 |
| February | 17 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 1 | ---- | 37 |
| March | 13 | 3 | 10 | 6 | ---- | ---- | ---- | 32 |
| April | 5 | 2 | 11 | 4 | ---- | ---- | ---- | 22 |
| May | 8 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 1 | ---- | 1 | 21 |
| June | 4 | 3 | 9 | 5 | ---- | ---- | ---- | 21 |
| July | 7 | 1 | 6 | 2 | ---- | ---- | ---- | 16 |
| August | 15 | 1 | 8 | 5 | ---- | ---- | ---- | 29 |
| September | 7 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 1 | ---- | ---- | 22 |
| October | 7 | 1 | 10 | 7 | ---- | ---- | ---- | 25 |
| November | 5 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 1 | ---- | ---- | 23 |
| December | 11 | 1 | 5 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 22 |
| Total | 118 | 25 | 97 | 61 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 309 |
| *1967* | | | | | | | | |
| January | 10 | 1 | 5 | 5 | ---- | ---- | ---- | 21 |
| February | 5 | ---- | 5 | 8 | 2 | ---- | ---- | 20 |
| Total | 21 | 3 | 20 | 17 | 2 | ---- | ---- | 41 |

While there were fewer arrivals in 1966 than in 1965, it should be noted that

the actual level of Cambodian imports last year rose substantially—particularly from Communist countries. I submit, therefore, that until there is some real assurance that this trade does not benefit in any way the Vietcong, why should Cambodia be permitted "business as usual" access to the South China Sea via the Mekong?

A year ago, in this Chamber, I posed the same question. Today an answer to it is, if anything, even more urgent and necessary. For, as the Vietcong loses more and more of its havens of safety within South Vietnam the value of Cambodia as a sanctuary and source of supply can only increase.

Yet, our policy toward Cambodia promises to continue to be one of tolerance and timidity, on the assumption apparently that only if we do nothing can the situation improve. This policy, it needs hardly to be stated, has achieved little except our own continual embarrassment, and has afforded Sihanouk a free hand to do as he wishes at the ultimate expense of American and South Vietnamese lives.

At the same time it has been our official policy to publicly disclaim the reports of our own military people on the scene and thereby to give credence to Cambodia's phony neutrality. It is difficult to say who is the more naive—the administration about Sihanouk, or Sihanouk about the Communists.

Press reports in recent days indicate that Sihanouk may have already lost his gamble in appeasement and with it his hope that the Communists would spare his country so long as Cambodia practiced a one-eyed neutrality policy of providing political and material support to the Vietcong. In an all too familiar pattern, Cambodian Red terrorists—whose "masters," according to Sihanouk himself, are the Vietcong—have begun assassinating civilians, setting fire to villages, harassing rice farmers, and seizing weapons from provincial guard posts.

In a story appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., April 16, 1967, William R. Frye comments on this turn of events and Sihanuok's reaction to it as follows:

The full text of Sihanouk's extraordinary broadcast has become available here. He says that if necessary, he will get the foreign exchange with which to buy weapons by such economies as closing all Cambodian embassies, calling home Cambodian diplomats, and suspending his cherished five-year development plan.

But he clearly cannot understand why it should be necessary. Cambodia has "given a great deal of aid to the Viet Minh (Communist-influenced rebels who drove out the French in the 1950s) and the Viet Cong," he points out.

"The Americans are aware of the fact that we have aided them (the Viet Cong) in the political and diplomatic fields. We have also given them aid in many other fields, which I cannot explain in detail." This, of course, is precisely what he has indignantly denied many times previously. "People's China, the great leader of communism, is also aware of all this," Sihanouk went on, "but why have they allowed their Khmer Viet Minh children to kill my partisans who are only nationalists?"

We can only hope that, confronted with the reality of Communist duplicity, Cambodia will now be prompted to make greater efforts to live up to its official ideal of strict neutrality. In any event, we should be doing, at the same time, everything we can to encourage Sihanouk to cooperate in sealing the Cambodian border with South Vietnam.

A prolonged war in southeast Asia is not in the interest of the Free World. Certainly one of the purposes of our involvement in Vietnam is to show the world that Communist aggression will not be permitted to succeed. The longer that it takes to achieve that purpose, the less encouraged will be those threatened peoples to make the costly effort to resist.

We cannot achieve our goals by continuing to ignore the basic realities of the situation. Too great a part of the tragedy that is Vietnam has been due to this failure. Too often our policy of a limited conflict has meant, in effect, only a policy of drift. Never before in our history have we been involved in a war and done so little to keep supplies from the enemy. This war is real. We have looked the other way until it has become necessary to commit forces greater than committed to the Korean conflict. We must give our soldiers every measure of support we possibly can.

With the recent actions along the Cambodian border in the Tay Ninh area it is clear that Cambodia has been a great source of help to the enemies of freedom. If Cambodia is to tolerate this situation the economic weapon of closing the Mekong should be used to insist upon a truly neutral Cambodia. Let that country get the message that we mean to back up our troops, that we mean to hasten the end of the war by keeping supplies from the enemy. In doing this, the Mekong River traffic will be forced to use the ocean port of Sihanoukville, in the Gulf of Siam, a harbor already choked with vessels from Communist countries delivering war materials.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to make greater use of the political and economic weapons in our arsenal if we are to keep faith with our fighting men.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert several pieces of correspondence and news stories which pertain to my preceding remarks.

OCTOBER 17, 1966.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
*The Secretary of State,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: From information available to me, it appears that there is substantial trade between South Vietnam and Cambodia via the Mekong River. I cannot determine what advantages accrue to each side, but I do note with some concern the size of the petroleum movement from Saigon to Phnom Penh in French vessels.

In light of Cambodia's openly professed sympathy and physical support for the Viet Cong, I wonder whether the Government of Vietnam is well-advised in maintaining a trade relationship with Cambodia. I would be grateful for your answers to the following questions:

1. What is the nature (size and content) of the trade between South Vietnam and Cambodia?

2. Are there any advantages to South Vietnam that make such trade desirable within the context of the present war and Cambodia's position with respect to it?

3. What measures are open to the United States to exert pressure on the GVN to stop this trade?

4. What would this action contribute to a larger program directed toward closer control over Mekong River traffic?

Thanking you for your courtesy, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, D.C., November 15, 1966.*

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: I have been requested to reply to your letter to the Secretary of October 17, concerning trade between Cambodia and the Republic of Viet-Nam.

There is no regular trade between Viet-Nam and Cambodia although illegal local trade occurs at many points along the 600 mile border between the two countries. As you know, the Mekong River is an International Waterway and freedom of navigation on it is guaranteed by a Convention and Protocol, ratified by the riparian states in December, 1954. However, under this Convention shipping on the river bound to or coming from Cambodia is subject to certain Vietnamese regulations pertaining to such matters as health and security.

In accordance with the security provisions of the Protocol, Viet-Nam has instituted a strict inspection system of foreign vessels bound for Cambodia to insure that their cargo does not include any secreted war materials that might be destined for the Viet Cong. The total volume of dry cargo carried in this trade is small. The movements of foreign vessels are also closely monitored in an effort to insure that they do not drop off any supplies for enemy forces during their transit of the Vietnamese portion of the Mekong. As a result of these measures we are satisfied that little, if any important war materials reach Phnom Penh via international shipping plying the Mekong River.

Your letter mentioned your particular concern about petroleum movements. According to the latest statistics available, all shipments loaded in South Viet-Nam for Cambodia are transshipments of petroleum products from third countries. Since large tankers cannot operate on the Mekong smaller vessels out of Phnom Penh pick up POL for Cambodia from commercial storage facilities located near Saigon. Our information shows that about 83 thousand tons of POL were transshipped to Cambodia through Viet-Nam during the first half of 1966. We do not consider this amount to be excessive to the needs of the Cambodian economy.

In short, the South Vietnamese do not conduct regular trade with Cambodia and are taking all feasible measures within the provisions of existing international agreements to prevent shipments for Cambodia which move through their territory from being diverted to the enemy. We believe these measures have been effective and you may be assured that they are being kept under continuing review.

Please call on me whenever I may be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
*Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.*

---

DECEMBER 1, 1966.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
*Secretary of State,*
*Department of State,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When I returned from attending the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference, I found on my desk the Department's response to my inquiry of October 17th concerning trade with Cambodia and South Vietnam.

It expressed the conclusion that the South Vietnamese were taking "all feasible measures within the provisions of existing international agreements to prevent shipments for Cambodia which move through their territory from being diverted to the enemy" and that the Department believes that "these measures have been effective".

In terms of these statements I was therefore surprised to read in the *Washington Post* of November 29th a new dispatch (copy enclosed) stating that the South Vietnamese Navy has found it necessary to take additional measures in this matter by requiring that all foreign ships traveling the Mekong route to Cambodia to have gun-boat escorts "to stop the smuggling of guns and ammunition to the Vietcong."

While I have not had an opportunity to verify this news report, if reliable, it would clearly raise doubts about the Department's assertion that everything that could or needed to be done was already being done. I would therefore appreciate the Department's further comments on this situation.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 29, 1966]

SHIPS BOUND TO CAMBODIA GET ESCORTS

SAIGON, Nov. 28.—South Vietnamese gunboats have started escorting all foreign ships traveling the Mekong River to Cambodia to stop the smuggling of guns and ammunition to the Vietcong, it was learned today.

Vietnamese naval authorities said the escort regulations went into effect two weeks ago. Previously, all South Vietnamese ships traveling the 140-mile waterway between the South China Sea and the Cambodian border had been escorted.

The official reason for the convoy order was "to protect foreign ships from Vietcong attacks." But South Vietnamese Navy sources said they had evidence that "many" ships traveling the Mekong had dropped ammunition and supplies to the Vietcong.

Lt. Cmdr. Nguyen An, the Vietnamese chief of naval operations, said none of the ships have been caught giving supplies to the enemy. "But we have caught items in Vietcong junks after they were freshly loaded from ships," he said in an interview with United Press International.

"I don't know why they do it . . . whether it's for profit, out of sympathy for the Vietcong, or a way of paying taxes so the Vietcong will leave them alone," he said.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, D.C., December 22, 1966.*

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: I have been asked to reply to your letter of December 1, to Secretary Rusk concerning controls on Mekong shipping to Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

As I mentioned in my letter of November 15, the United States and the Vietnamese Government are alert to the possibility that the Viet Cong might receive supplies from international shipping and are taking all feasible measures to prevent it. This whole problem of dealing with the possible diversion of cargoes to the Viet Cong is kept under continuing review and changes are made as needed in order to insure that controls operate effectively as possible.

The system of armed convoys up to the Cambodian border for shipping on the Mekong to and from Phnom Penh was instituted and is controlled entirely by the Vietnamese authorities. The convoys are part of the general monitoring effort and are intended to give more effective control over possible diversions as well as serving to protect shipping from enemy attack and insuring a clear passage on the Mekong waterway. Although the Vietnamese Government has stated that the new system became effective November 1, public announcement of the change was not made nor the first convoy formed until the latter half of the month.

Please call upon me whenever I may be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
*Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.*

JANUARY 20, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
*Secretary of Defense,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: If the press reports are accurate, some time in November of 1966, the South Vietnamese Navy began escorting all foreign ships traveling the Mekong River to Cambodia with gunboats, in order, as one dispatch put it, "to stop the smuggling of guns and ammunition to the Viet Cong." I would appreciate being provided a report on the success of this operation to date.

In addition I have noted a news story, copy included, filed by a New York Times correspondent from Saigon detailing such arrangements that were apparently made to expedite the flow of fuel oil to the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh via the Mekong waterway in order to insure that the power plant in that city would not be forced to shut down.

I would appreciate any comments the Department has on this story indicating the extent to which it agrees or disagrees with the statements made therein.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 2, 1966]

SAIGON SAID TO SPEED OIL TO CAMBODIA DESPITE MUTUAL HOSTILITY

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, Dec. 1.—An extraordinary diplomatic exercise, in which South Vietnam is about to come to the aid of an ostensible enemy, Cambodia, has been secretly played out in four world capitals during the last few days.

The affair will come to a climax in the next week or so, but the key move is reported already to have been made.

According to unimpeachable sources, the National Leadership Committee, the military-civilian junta that rules South Vietnam, decided at a meeting this morning to allow enough fuel oil to be shipped up the Mekong River to keep the power system of Pnompenh, the Cambodian capital, from shutting down.

The background of this decision is complex.

In November, the Saigon regime decided to require all ships using the Mekong to travel in convoys with registered pilots and, in some cases, with armed guards. Previously, ships had moved freely up the broad waterway from the South China Sea.

The South Vietnamese action was based upon a minor clause in the 1954 agreement among South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos regulating the use of the river.

The Mekong is the principal waterway—and, as such, the principal avenue of commerce—in all three countries.

Vietcong guerrillas control much of the territory along the banks of the Mekong near the South Vietnamese-Cambodian border, and ships are reported to have unloaded some cargoes in this area. To assist the United States Navy's Operation Game Warden, which seeks to re-establish allied control over the waterways in the Mekong Delta, the convey system was instituted.

Saigon's decision caught the Cambodians with a low supply of fuel oil for the Pnompenh plant. The city was threatened with a total blackout.

The Mekong is the only feasible route for large quantities of petroleum products tc reach the Cambodian capital, because the country's only deep-water port, Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Thailand, is without storage facilities and Cambodia lacks both the highways and the trucks to transport the oil overland.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Cambodian premier, has attempted to steer a relatively neutral course between East and West, although he has severed relations with the United States and with South Vietnam and has accepted some Communist assistance.

The shortage of fuel oil—Pnompenh is believed to have on hand only enough to last until Dec. 10—was a potential source of considerable embarrassment.

American experts on southeast Asia, as well as the Australians, who represent Cambodian interests here learned of the situation despite Prince Sihanouk's reluctance to discuss it in public. They determined to attempt to come to the Cambodians' rescue.

"Sihanouk is doing all right in his funny way," one highly placed source said tonight. "After all he is a natural leader, popular in his own country, and those are rare enough in Southeast Asia.

"Although there are times when the allies would like to cut his throat, none of us really want to see blood flow."

Convincing the South Vietnamese was another problem, however, and sheafs of messages have been exchanged among ministries in Washington, Canberra, Pnompenh and Saigon searching for some mutually acceptable solution. Such a solution now appears to be at hand.

The Vietnamese Government's hostility to the Cambodians is grounded in its belief that Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops use Cambodia as a sanctuary, and in Prince Sihanouk's friendliness with President de Gaulle, who has advocated a neutralist solution to the Vietnamese conflict.

Despite this context of conflicts, the allies decided that it was imperative to persuade the Saigon Government to permit fuel oil to reach Pnompenh as soon as possible.

The allies proposed, the sources said, that special arrangements he made for the shipment.

After today's meeting, however, it appeared more likely that a compromise would be worked out. The probable solution reportedly will be to load onto ships in a regular convoy enough oil to tide the Cambodians over—thus giving the impression of no special dispensation.

The convoy is scheduled to head up the Mekong on Saturday, or perhaps even tomorrow. It should arrive in Phompehn well before the deadline.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, D.C., February 2, 1967.*

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your letter to Secretary McNamara of January 20, 1967, concerning the Government of Vietnam's convoy system on the Mekong River has been referred to me for reply. Because the Department of State has been actively involved over the past several months in discussions with the GVN over inauguration of such a system, I am forwarding your letter to that Department for action. However, I will com-

ment briefly on the military aspects of the convoy system.

During 1966, the GVN and the United States Government became increasingly concerned over reports of Viet Cong acquisition of badly-needed supplies from ships with international registry moving up the Mekong River to Cambodia from the South China Sea. To deal with this problem, a convoy system was instituted in November 1966 and since that time there have been no reports of off-loading supplies for the Viet Cong along the Mekong in South Vietnam. It is, of course, difficult to make an accurate assessment of the effectiveness of the system to date because there is no way of knowing how many vessels intended to deliver supplies to the Viet Cong but the absence of such reports is encouraging.

I hope this information will be helpful.

Sincerely,

TOWNSEND HOOPES,
*Deputy Assistant Secretary.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, D.C., April 7, 1967.*

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
*The House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: Thank you for your letter of March 29 attaching correspondence regarding the Mekong River convoy system. Your letter of January 20 to the Department of Defense, which was to have been forwarded to the Department of State by Defense for additional comment, apparently went astray and we have no record of receiving it here. I regret the delay in replying to your inquiry.

The Vietnamese government instituted the convoy system last November as a security measure to guard against the possibility of diversion to the Viet Cong in Viet-Nam of supplies carried on ships transiting the Mekong to and from Cambodia. We believe that it has been effective for this purpose. The convoy system was not intended to be used as a weapon of economic warfare against Cambodia.

In the early days while the convoy system was shaking down there were some delays in the delivery of petroleum products to Cambodia. At that time our Embassy in Saigon and field representatives of oil companies operating in Cambodia worked with the Vietnamese authorities to improve the functioning of the system and the scheduling of shipments. Most of the initial problems have been worked out and there have been no recent reports of real or potential shortages of petroleum supplies in Cambodia.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
*Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.*

---

[From the New York Times, Feb. 27, 1967]

GI'S SIGHT ENEMY ON CAMBODIAN SIDE—PATROL WATCHES AS ARMED VIETCONG SQUAD CROSSES BORDER INTO VIETNAM

(By Tom Buckley)

LANDING ZONE MUSTANG, SOUTH VIETNAM, Feb. 26.—An American patrol probing to the Cambodian border has reported that it watched a squad of armed Vietcong cross from Cambodia into Vietnam.

The sighting was one of the few ever made public. American military intelligence officers have long asserted that the guerrillas and their North Vietnamese allies were using Cambodia as well as Laos farther north as a refuge from bombs, artillery and ground offensives.

Military sources agree that the nearby Cambodian refuge explains in part why so few enemy troops have been sighted in the 25,000-man operation Junction City, which began Wednesday. The operation, the largest of the war, is taking place in a 150-square-mile area in northwestern Tayninh Province.

PATROL TELLS OF MISSION

Today the members of the six-man patrol from the 196th Light Infantry Brigade told about their mission as they waited for their next assignment at the brigade's forward headquarters here.

Their leader, Specialist 4 Robert Webber of Little Rock, Ark., said the patrol set out through the tangled scrub and forest at 8 A.M. Thursday.

The patrol's route paralleled Highway 22. The road, which is depicted on most maps as a bright line of red and white, seemingly the equivalent of a four-lane highway in the United States, is hardly more than a rutted dirt track barely wide enough for a jeep.

The men, wearing mottled camouflage uniforms, slipped silently through the jungle. Their automatic rifles were covered with dull green tape. In the camouflage netting of their helmets they had fixed grass and twigs to break the outline. Their faces were daubed with shades of green, brown and black greasepaint.

"We got to within 100 yards of the border by 7 P.M.," said Specialist Webber, a slim and smiling 25-year-old who is a graduate of the Special Force reconnaissance and command school at Nhatrang.

"I posted a rear guard and flank guards and settled down in thick bushes a few feet off the road," he said.

At the point where the road crosses the border, maps show a hamlet called Xamet. In fact, said Specialist Webber, like many other such hamlets and villages in these uplands, it no longer exists. Its inhabitants moved away long ago. Their reed and thatch huts have been burned down or simply decayed.

Even so, the patrol leader said, the junction of roads and trails showed many footprints made by the sandals worn by the guerrillas, as well as other signs of frequent use.

FOE COMES DOWN THE ROAD

"At 9:30 we heard sounds in the distance," he said, "the guerrillas came down the road from Cambodia. They were moving fast, almost trotting. The first guy was wearing white pajamas, not black ones." The Vietcong usually wear black pajamas.

The patrol's job was to observe, not to fight, so the men remained motionless. Specialist Webber communicated the sighting to his headquarters by radio. No words were needed, only a code based on the use of the "squelch" button which alters the pitch of the radio's steady tone.

For two more hours the patrol waited. "Then we heard voices to our rear," Specialist Webber said.

It was a different group, heading north. But before the guerrillas got to the border, three of them slipt off.

"When they got to be only 10 or 15 feet away from us we had to open up," Specialist McMahon said.

The quick blaze of fire killed the three guerrillas. The two G.I.5s ran to a prearranged meeting point a few hundred yards away. From there, Specialist Webber ordered in artillery.

By dawn yesterday, the men were back at their base camp. Their platoon leader, First Lieut. John M. Maxwell of Lakeland, Fla., has recommended Specialists Webber and McMahon for the Bronze Star. Today they were congratulated by Brig. Gen. Richard Knowles, the brigade commander.

---

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, Apr. 6, 1967]

U.S. WINS MEAN CAMBODIA MORE VALUABLE TO VIET CONG

WASHINGTON (UPI).—The problem of Viet Cong sanctuary in neutral Cambodia is increasing as bigger battles are fought in border areas of South Vietnam, Pentagon officials said today.

The problem grows worse as U.S. military fortunes in Vietnam improve, they said. The more successful Allied forces are, the more the Communists flee into Cambodia to rest, bind up their wounds and gather strength before returning to battle.

Defense Department officials would give no estimates of how many North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops have been using Cambodian territory as sanctuary. But they denied published reports from the field that more than one North Vietnamese division is based there.

The Pentagon lists no Communist units as "based" in Cambodia. Officials described the border situation as fluid, a constant coming and going. A regiment may be there one day and gone the next.

But larger battles do mean larger sanctuary, according to officials. In some of the major fighting of Operation Junction City in the Tay Ninh area near the border it is believed the Communists had nowhere to go but Cambodia.

Lt. Gen. Jonathan O. Seaman, former Field Force II commander in charge of Junction City, told a news conference in South Vietnam before leaving for a Washington assignment that he could not "prove" Communist forces fled to Cambodia but he was "willing to venture" some did.

---

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 24, 1967]

HOW PEKING DOUBLECROSSES A FRIEND

Another Chinese ally in trouble is Cambodia's Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

For years, Sihanouk has proclaimed his country's neutrality, the while sidling up to Red China and North Vietnam. Now, he admits to being doublecrossed by the very people he has been covertly aiding.

In a recent speech in Pnompenh, the Prince declared he faces armed insurrection on two fronts.

In the West, near the Thai border, Cambodian Reds have mounted a campaign of terror. In the East, Viet Cong elements, driven into Cambodia by American operations in South Vietnam, are starting a "liberation war" of their own.

"People's China," said Sihanouk, "the great leader of Communism, is aware of all this. But why have they allowed their Khmer Viet Minh children to kill my partisans, who are only nationalists?"

There was another reason why Sihanouk was suddenly at outs with Peking. A major leak in Cambodia's foreign exchange comes from the sale of rice by overseas Chinese in Cambodia to Communist forces in South Vietnam. Now Sihanouk is trying to crack down on these sales—and those who foster them.

The Prince said no foreign intervention would be solicited to put down the Communist threats. This was in part an admission that he has nowhere to turn.

Cambodia broke diplomatic relations with the U.S. in May of 1965. In November of that year, Moscow told him they were "too busy" to receive him.

An American official in Saigon summed it up this way:

"It's refreshing to see Sihanouk boiling in his own rice bowl. Maybe it'll bring him back to reality."

---

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Apr. 16, 1967]

APPEASEMENT FAILS—SIHANOUK VOWS TO "REPRESS" REDS

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Behind the silken curtain which Prince Sihanouk has erected between Cambodia and the outside world, fascinating and astonishing things are taking place.

A Communist revolt has broken out, similar in many respects to Viet Cong terrorism

in Vietnam and Pathet Lao insurgency in Laos.

Red terrorists, objecting to the results of recent elections in which the Left lost ground, have gone into hiding in the forests and are emerging to assassinate civilians, set fire to villages, harass rice farmers and seize weapons from provincial guard posts.

What they are doing is described by Sihanouk—who has rarely so much as slapped a Communist on the wrist—as "groundless revolution."

Refusing to bow to Red demands for a sweeping change in the government (two officials were ousted in a vain effort to satisfy them), he has vowed to "repress" the revolt. In effect, he has declared war.

This is an extraordinary turn of events for Cambodia. For a long time, Sihanouk sought to work closely with the Communists—cutting his ties to the West, giving the Viet Cong sanctuary and supplies, and orienting his diplomacy toward Moscow and Peking, whom he termed his "great friends". In large part, this is still his policy.

WANT ALL OR NOTHING

As in Indonesia, however, none of this satisfied the Reds. They wanted all or nothing, and are now reaching for the complete prize. Appeasement has crumbled at Sihanouk's feet.

The prince's reaction is that of a confused, dismayed and angry man. He has identified the "masters" of the Cambodian rebels as the Viet Cong. He says he will resist. But he will not turn to the West for help.

"I will absolutely not ask for support from the Americans," he told the nation in a recent radiocast. He said he refused to become "lackeys of the Vietnamese or Thai." Without any real explanation, he said he would not even turn to France for help, though Paris has been helping him against right-wing rebel forces.

PLAINTIVE, NAIVE COMMENT

Where else to turn? In a plaintive and naive passage which must be one of the more remarkable comments of a head of state in recent times, Sihanouk asked his people:

"How can we ask China and Russia for ammunition and rifles to fight against the Khmer (Cambodian) Reds? . . . I dare not ask them."

The full text of Sihanouk's extraordinary broadcast has become available here. He says that if necessary, he will get the foreign exchange with which to buy weapons by such economies as closing all Cambodian embassies, calling home Cambodian diplomats, and suspending his cherished five-year development plan.

But he clearly cannot understand why it should be necessary. Cambodia has "given a great deal of aid to the Viet Minh (Communist-influenced rebels who drove out the French in the 1950s) and the Viet Cong," he points out.

"The Americans are aware of the fact that we have aided them (the Viet Cong) in the political and diplomatic fields. We have also given them aid in many other fields, which I cannot explain in detail." This, of course, is precisely what he has indignantly denied many times previously.

"People's China, the great leader of communism, is also aware of all this," Sihanouk went on, "but why have they allowed their Khmer Viet Minh children to kill my partisans who are only nationalists?"

In a climatic gesture comprehensible, no doubt, to an Asian audience, he spreads out his arms and offers to commit political harikari (presumably knowing that popular opinion will not let him).

If the communists want to take over power, he says, he will resign. "I have also written letters asking them (the Reds) to take over power. However, they have refused, and some of them do not even bother to answer.

"I beg you, Communists, to turn the nation into a Communist nation as of today, and not to mistreat the nation . . ."

But if they insist on fighting for power, he says he will go all out to prevent it.

TRAGI-COMIC STORY

What emerges is a tragi-comic story of the education of still another well-meaning fellow-traveler: a man who has been painfully disillusioned but is still clinging to the thorns that are tormenting him; who has found from experience that Communists cannot be smothered by kindness, but who is still trying to smother them—and fight them at the same time.

Perhaps the only comfort for an outsider is that the Sukarnos and the Nehrus who have followed the path of appeasement in the past have been inundated by their own naivete—and their successors are showing signs of having learned the lesson. It may well be happening again in Cambodia.

Thus it may be that communism—by its very brutality and double-dealing—is helping to destroy itself.

---

## A BLATANT REPUBLICAN ATTEMPT TO DESTROY THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may include charts and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I begin with this question: Do not most of our colleagues believe that our Government should be working to eliminate the forces that perpetuate poverty and ignorance in our land, conditions which breed misery and crime?

Do not most of us believe that our Government should be actively working to improve the quality of education available to all American schoolchildren?

Obviously, most of us agree with these concepts. And so do the overwhelming majority of Americans. We all believe that in America today there should be no justification for ignorance, hopelessness or despair.

Yet, such basic concepts as eliminating poverty and improving the quality of American education are under heavy attack from our Republican colleagues. Many programs initiated by the Johnson administration face a serious threat this year, and are being challenged by a well-organized Republican attempt to wipe out the progress of the 89th Congress and the Great Society.

Last week I spoke about Republican attempts to wreck the administration's war against poverty.

Today, I want to speak to you about another proposal presented to Congress by the Republican wrecking crew. This proposal would do nothing less than destroy the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Of course, the Republicans claim they are not trying to destroy anything. They say their only purpose is to improve existing programs. But the fact is that if the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota on the Education Act are passed, the Republicans will have succeeded in killing one of the most important laws enacted by an American Congress in many decades.

The Quie amendment is based on an old Republican operational philosophy: the people be damned, especially those in need, whether they are in need of an education, or housing, or help. It is always very difficult for the Republicans to understand how anybody could need anything.

We have learned that to improve the quality of education—particularly for schoolchildren who are economically deprived—we need the full cooperation of Federal, State, and local educational agencies.

Yet the Republican proposal would destroy the very spirit of cooperation that we have worked so hard to create. The Republicans would give complete control of funds to the States, thus depriving local school districts of the ability to create programs responsive to local needs and local conditions.

The Quie amendment cannot stand on its own merits. He knows it. And so he is trying to prime the pump of a destructive program with money. In fact, he has proposed a gigantic piggy bank to dispense funds and instead of giving the keys to educators he is giving the keys to hometown politicians. He has drawn up a phony list of figures which purportedly demonstrates that most States would receive less money under the administration's bill than under his amendments.

His chart contains two columns—the first shows what States would receive under his proposal—a total of $3 billion. The second column shows what States would receive under what he thinks the Congress would appropriate for title I, and he thinks $1 billion less than what the administration has requested.

In other words, he has loaded the dice in favor of his own bill—hoping to win support from our colleagues whom he knows would not otherwise give his proposals a second glance.

The truth is that most States would receive far less under the Quie proposal. For example, my own State of New York would receive $122 million less. I was a little more than curious, after seeing how poorly my own State of New York fared, to see how Minnesota would make out. Imagine my surprise when I learned that Minnesota's share will go from $58.8 million to $61.3 million, or a gain of $2½ million under the gentleman's proposal. I would certainly like to know what magic formula produced these differences. I also could wonder why Georgia would lose $30 million under the Quie amendment or close to 30 percent; and, West Virginia, a State that has been doing everything possible to help itself, would lose $12 million, or 25 percent loss as compared to the administration bill. I can understand how the District of Columbia would lose $6 million or 50 percent of its allocation under the committee bill, for after all, the District of Columbia does not have anybody to stand up to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota and his meat ax.

Southern and border States as a group would receive $373 million less. Our great industrial States like California, Illinois, and New Jersey would also be big losers.

As a New York Congressman, I could not possibly vote for this proposal. The educational needs of the Empire State are no different from those of most other sections of the Nation. We need more money to build new schools; we need to raise the salaries of our underpaid teachers; we need to raise the level of our educational competency. We cannot hope to achieve these goals with less money. On this score alone, the Quie amendment would be a catastrophe for education in New York State now and for years to come.

But the issues involved in this amendment transcend any concern about its effects only on my home district and State. For the Republicans want nothing less than an end to our Federal Government's program of aid to American education. This is the real meaning of the Quie amendment.

Consider the consequences of this proposal.

The Republicans would earmark only 50 percent of funds for educationally deprived children. The existing Elementary and Secondary Education Act sets aside 75 percent for this purpose.

The Republican amendment wipes out—yes, completely eliminates—special programs for migrant workers and their families, foster children, dependent children overseas, and Indian children. It also entirely eliminates the promising Teacher Corps program and special educational programs for handicapped, neglected, or delinquent children.

The Republican bill authorizes no requirements for program evaluation—the States simply get the money, and that is that. There are no legislative safeguards to insure that money is spent fairly or properly, and absolutely no concern for our goal of educational equality throughout the United States.

In short, where Federal programs in education insist upon adequate scope and quality from those administering the programs, the Republicans blatantly insist on nothing. How is that for a carte blanche invitation to chaos? Republicans cry about Federal money with strings attached. But the truth is that so-called strings really mean standards that are imposed upon those participating in Federal programs.

I can sum up the Republican proposal in one phrase: They would take from the poor and give to the rich. It is a very old Republican scheme.

And by so doing, they would dash the hopes of millions of Americans who are participating in one of the most successful educational programs the world has ever seen.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has already enriched the lives of 8.3 million schoolchildren in nearly 18,000 school districts in every State in the Union.

Nearly $1 billion has been provided for Federal educational services ranging from remedial reading, to student and parent night classes, educational television, and bus service in isolated areas.

This program began only after we had identified the greatest needs in our society. It was shaped to be responsive to those needs. And it is doing so right today.

Now, I ask you—do we want to do away with such a vital program?

Do we want to stop now? Just as we have begun to feel the impact across the country?

Do we want to go back to where we were 6 years ago when the Federal Government looked the other way on educational needs?

Federal aid to primary and secondary schools was established for one reason and one reason only, because the people needed it and needed it badly.

As we all know, most of the money to finance education is raised by local property taxes. This type of taxation was adequate 100 years ago. It has long since outgrown its usefulness. The biggest share of this inequitable tax system falls on the shoulders of the small property owner and the small businessman. The large corporations and those able to pay, contribute virtually nothing under our present system. Only through Federal aid to education with the money coming from everybody's income tax, equitably and proportionately, can we hope to raise the great sums of money that we need today and the even far greater sums that will be required in the near future. If American education is to continue to reshape our country and our world, it can no longer depend on the frail base of local property taxes that virtually exempt those most capable of supporting it.

I can tell this distinguished body that no program enacted by Congress has meant more to President Johnson and his administration than this program, and I can further assure you that no one is willing to fight harder against these Republican attempts to scuttle this great act than our President and those of us who believe with him that education is the first order of public business of this administration's domestic policy.

Who are these Republicans who have suddenly taken a great interest in American education?

Where were they in 1965 when 68 percent of House Republicans voted to recommit this bill?

Where were they when 73 percent of House Republicans voted against final passage?

Are we really to believe that these Republicans are now suddenly interested in or committed to improving the quality of our education in this country?

Let us look at the voting record of the man who says he is the greatest friend that American education has, the author of the block grant substitute bill, the distinguished and capable gentleman from Minnesota.

In 1960, the gentleman voted against a $1,300,000,000 public school construction bill, to be administered by the States under their own plans.

In 1961, he voted against a $325 million emergency school construction program and a continuation of the student loan program of NDEA and the federally impacted areas program.

In 1963, this "great friend of education" voted against the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act.

In December of 1963, the gentleman voted to recommit the Vocational Education Act and voted against the adoption of the conference report on this groundbreaking legislation.

In 1964, he voted twice to kill support for urban public library services and for library construction assistance. In 1965, education's friend and the vast majority of his Republican colleagues voted to recommit the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and against final passage of this act which is the cornerstone of our system of Federal aid to education.

Again in 1965, this self-proclaimed champion of Federal assistance voted twice to kill the Higher Education Act of 1965.

With friends like this, those American children who are in desperate need of a decent education, need no enemies. I submit, that on the basis of this gentleman's previous voting record on education bills, it is about as wise to follow his suggestions as to send your kid sister out for a walk with Jack-the-Ripper.

I, for one, would appreciate it if the gentleman from Minnesota would explain to me when his great conversion in favor of Federal aid to education took place. When did Dr. Jekyll suddenly turn into Mr. Hyde? What strange brew or vapors have caused the distinguished gentleman to be transformed into a devoted, dedicated friend of American education? Perhaps the gentleman could share this most essential formula that made his conversion so that we could use it on some of his Republican colleagues who, while insisting they are friends of American children and the cause of better education, try to prove it by voting against the legislation that will provide the one essential ingredient for better education—money.

The Quie bill is unjust and immoral. It would do little for those who need help most. In States where racial discrimination is rampant, Federal standards provide the only chance for fairness to Negro students. There are no such standards in the Republican bill. They have planned it that way.

I call it unjust and immoral for still another reason. The gentleman from Minnesota and his Republican colleagues know that for decades Congress and various administrations have struggled to find a formula that would provide Federal aid to education and still maintain the traditional separation of church and state. They know full well that if the formula that was so carefully worked out to provide aid to both public and private schools is upset, all Federal aid runs the risk of being declared unconstitutional. By maintaining the standards of the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act, by providing aid to the student and not to the school, we have found a fair and equitable solution to a most difficult problem. I know of no surer way of killing this whole program than to upset the balance and open it up to charges of unconstitutionality.

This is a struggle between those who believe in progress for all of the people and those who do not. I know that there are frustrations in dealing with a bureaucracy. I know that some school administrators are minor and can be overcome.

The real issue is this: We have a good and sound educational program that works and works well. The 89th Congress passed this law with high hopes. And President Johnson signed this law with pride of accomplishment.

Those of us who served in the 89th Congress know full well that if we had listened to the Republican voices of "doom" and "gloom" and "it can't be done," that the 89th would never have been known as the Congress of accomplishment. President Johnson's administration, in partnership with the school boards and administrators and teachers and students proved it could be done. It will be up to us to see that this great concept continues to grow and flourish.

I think we are making progress, however. In the past, Republicans would simply vote against legislation aimed at educational advancement and would openly admit they were against these measures. Now, at least, they are doing their best to camouflage their opposition and to make it appear as though they are in favor of Federal aid to education. But I think it is reasonable to assume that neither the Members of this distinguished body nor the great American public will be misled for long by this modern legislative version of the old shell game.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the distinguished Commissioner of the Office of Education, as well as the chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee, spoke out against this Republican proposal. I include in the RECORD the remarks of Commissioner Howe and Chairman PERKINS:

CHAIRMAN PERKINS REPLIES: "QUIE OFFERS PHONY FIGURES TO GARNER VOTES"

Representative Quie, in introducing his third substitute to H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 (the bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965), inserted in the Congressional Record for April 20, 1967, a table purporting to show the comparative distribution of funds among States under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as now constituted and under his proposed amendment. According to Mr. Quie, all States except New York and the District of Columbia would benefit from the block grants proposed by the Quie substitute. However, the claim of increases reflected in Mr. Quie's table is utterly false.

The major fallacy in Rep. Quie's statistics is that he compares authorization for the block-grant substitute with what he imagines the Administration will request in appropriations for fiscal year 1969. No budget for fiscal year 1969 will be submitted to the Congress until January 1968, and no one now knows how much money will be requested. An honest comparison of amounts States would receive under two alternative proposals should compare like with like, authorization with authorization.

The attached table compares authorizations under the Quie substitute with authorizations under the four titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which it would replace.

Several things are clear from this table. First, the $3 billion lump-sum figure in the Quie substitute is actually a substantial decrease in Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education—a cut of $281.5 million from the existing authorization!

Second, 25 States would receive substantially less money under the Quie substitute than they would receive under ESEA. (The Department of Defense Overseas Schools and the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools would be excluded altogether.) The States thus hurt include all the Southern and border States, with the exception of Maryland, and some of our Nation's biggest and most populous States—New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas, for example. It is precisely these States—States with low per-pupil expenditures for education or States with the largest numbers of educationally disadvantaged children enrolled in school—which need Federal assistance the most.

*Comparison of authorizations under H.R. 7819 as approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor and under the proposed substitute by Representative Quie (H.R. 8983), fiscal year 1969* [1]

| | Committee bill | Quie bill | Net gain or loss (col. 2 minus col. 1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| U.S. and outlying areas | $3,281,467,883 | [2] $3,000,000,000 | $281,467,883 |
| 50 States and the District of Columbia | 3,198,470,325 | 2,910,000,000 | 288,470,325 |
| Alabama | 106,719,767 | 74,984,127 | 31,735,640 |
| Alaska | 5,467,596 | 4,113,410 | 1,354,186 |
| Arizona | 25,664,306 | 30,283,668 | 4,619,362 |
| Arkansas | 65,786,875 | 39,088,258 | 26,698,617 |
| California | 208,855,676 | 206,119,222 | 2,736,454 |
| Colorado | 26,914,439 | 31,768,327 | 4,853,888 |
| Connecticut | 26,705,283 | 28,098,959 | 1,393,676 |
| Delaware | 6,897,339 | 6,390,385 | 506,954 |
| Florida | 94,349,862 | 88,597,972 | 5,751,890 |
| Georgia | 118,208,361 | 88,063,650 | 30,144,711 |
| Hawaii | 8,308,769 | 11,671,947 | 3,363,178 |
| Idaho | 10,360,644 | 14,094,094 | 3,733,450 |
| Illinois | 127,666,495 | 119,475,294 | 8,191,201 |
| Indiana | 55,880,401 | 76,079,751 | 20,199,350 |
| Iowa | 44,788,350 | 44,191,479 | 596,871 |
| Kansas | 30,089,487 | 35,134,269 | 5,044,782 |
| Kentucky | 87,489,613 | 62,954,095 | 24,535,518 |
| Louisiana | 97,811,654 | 78,535,534 | 19,276,120 |
| Maine | 14,643,927 | 17,471,949 | 2,828,022 |
| Maryland | 43,129,420 | 50,996,592 | 7,867,172 |
| Massachusetts | 49,776,056 | 60,738,670 | 10,962,614 |
| Michigan | 95,459,641 | 132,509,268 | 37,049,627 |
| Minnesota | 58,866,056 | 61,379,507 | 2,513,451 |
| Mississippi | 99,529,772 | 52,013,966 | 47,515,806 |
| Missouri | 72,835,424 | 64,100,525 | 8,734,899 |
| **50 States and etc.—Continued** | | | |
| Montana | $11,162,661 | $13,277,485 | $2,114,824 |
| Nebraska | 23,072,816 | 23,124,793 | 51,977 |
| Nevada | 4,197,514 | 4,506,765 | 309,251 |
| New Hampshire | 6,762,289 | 10,254,911 | 3,492,622 |
| New Jersey | 70,762,078 | 70,052,005 | 710,073 |
| New Mexico | 22,277,154 | 23,384,655 | 1,107,501 |
| New York | 286,213,671 | 164,309,713 | 121,903,958 |
| North Carolina | 150,361,444 | 100,797,585 | 49,563,859 |
| North Dakota | 14,648,447 | 13,340,319 | 1,308,128 |
| Ohio | 110,928,936 | 159,489,128 | 48,560,192 |
| Oklahoma | 47,998,215 | 40,586,581 | 7,411,634 |
| Oregon | 23,349,537 | 29,127,896 | 5,778,309 |
| Pennsylvania | 141,557,132 | 157,773,688 | 16,216,556 |
| Rhode Island | 11,097,377 | 11,211,904 | 114,527 |
| South Carolina | 89,735,037 | 56,841,559 | 32,893,478 |
| South Dakota | 16,517,657 | 14,122,708 | 2,394,949 |
| Tennessee | 103,901,688 | 74,748,791 | 29,152,897 |
| Texas | 222,871,660 | 198,291,363 | 24,580,297 |
| Utah | 10,975,409 | 21,925,807 | 10,950,398 |
| Vermont | 6,627,603 | 7,260,951 | 633,348 |
| Virginia | 89,751,592 | 77,159,025 | 12,592,567 |
| Washington | 32,580,281 | 43,028,933 | 10,448,652 |
| West Virginia | 48,384,092 | 36,279,296 | 12,104,796 |
| Wisconsin | 52,157,299 | 67,615,259 | 15,457,960 |
| Wyoming | 5,381,397 | 5,899,625 | 518,228 |
| District of Columbia | 12,992,076 | 6,734,337 | 6,257,739 |
| Outlying areas | 82,997,558 | 90,000,000 | 7,002,448 |

[1] Estimated authorizations based on:

Title I, estimated 5 to 17 population; low-income factor, $3,000 per annum; AFDC 1965; estimated ADA handicapped children (January 1967); estimated migratory children of migratory workers (FTE 1965); juvenile delinquents (January 1967); dependent and neglected children (January 1967); estimated children 5 to 17 in foster homes supported by public funds (January 1967) and 50 percent State or National average estimated CE per pupil in ADA 1966–67 (except migratory children). Estimated authorizations for administration are 1 percent of estimated authorization for programs or $150,000, whichever is greater. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 2½ percent 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title II, estimated distribution of $150,000,000 to the 50 States and District of Columbia on the basis of total public and estimated nonpublic K–12 enrollment, fall 1966. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 3 percent of 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title III, estimated distribution of $500,000,000 to the 50 States and District of Columbia with a basic allotment of $200,000 and the balance distributed 50 percent on the basis of the 5 to 17 resident population, July 1, 1965, and 50 percent on the basis of total resident population, July 1, 1965. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 3 percent of 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title V(A), estimated distribution of $56,000,000 with 15 percent ($8,400,000) withheld for special projects, 2 percent ($952,000) of the balance withheld for outlying areas and the remainder ($46,648,000) distributed (a) 40 percent ($18,659,200) among the States in equal amounts and (b) 60 percent ($27,988,800) distributed on the basis of the total K–12 public school enrollment, fall 1966.

[2] Estimated distribution of $3,000,000,000 with 3 percent reserved for the outlying areas and the balance distributed on the basis of the State products of (1) fiscal year 1968–69 NDEA allotment ratios which are based on total personal income per school-age (5 to 17) child for 1963, 1964 and 1965 with allotment ratio limits of 33⅓ percent and 66⅔ percent, and (2) estimated 5 to 17 populations, July 1, 1965.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH QUIE SUBSTITUTE

I. Procedurally, not considered by the Commitee. No hearings held. Don't know what's in the bill. The April 20 Quie bill is the third version introduced this month! Unlike the present ESEA, the Quie bill is not supported by the world of education.

II. Administratively, it would throw American education into chaos. It would change all the ground rules and upset the patterns of successful innovation and service begun in the past 2 years.

III. It would launch a new Holy War, reintroducing the bitter divisiveness of the church-state issue. Disadvantaged private school students, now enjoying the benefit of participating in many local public school programs, would be excluded under the Quie plan if administered by many State departments of education.

IV. Formula of Quie bill takes from the poorer States and gives to the wealthier. (It would reduce the authorizations for 16 Southern and border States by $373 million. It would also cut New York, California, Illinois, and New Jersey by $134 million.) Proposed formula change is contradictory to last Quie amendment (½ the national average per pupil expenditure) which was designed to help poorer States.

V. Many States are not yet ready to handle the entire job. State departments of educa-

tion are being strengthened, but only gradually.

VI. The Quie bill sets aside 50 percent of all funds for the educationally deprived, while the ESEA earmarks 75 percent for this critical national purpose. The Quie bill has no guarantee that cities will not suffer from discrimination in the distribution of funds. The strength of the present ESEA is that the Congress, not Governors or the State departments of education, guarantees that certain essential jobs will be done which were formerly neglected by the States.

VII. No local school district would know its entitlement under the Quie bill, unlike ESEA which establishes definite entitlements for each county and, through the States, for each local school district.

VIII. The Quie substitute would wipe out programs for specified beneficiaries of the present ESEA: children of migrant workers, foster children, children in the Department of Defense's Overseas Schools, Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools. It would also delete provisions for successfully operating programs: Teacher Corps, special education for children in State institutions for the handicapped, neglected or delinquent, etc.

COMPARISON OF AUTHORIZATIONS UNDER COMMITTEE BILL (H.R. 7819) AND QUIE SUBSTITUTE

Fiscal year 1968; no change.

Fiscal year 1969; losses as follows, compared to the committee bill:

| | In millions |
|---|---|
| Alabama | —$32 |
| Arkansas | —27 |
| Florida | — 6 |
| Georgia | —31 |
| Kentucky | —24 |
| Louisiana | —22 |
| Mississippi | —46 |
| Missouri | — 4 |
| North Carolina | —50 |
| Oklahoma | —$5 |
| South Carolina | —31 |
| Tennessee | —28 |
| Texas | —27 |
| Virginia | —22 |
| West Virginia | —12 |
| District of Columbia | — 6 |
| 16 Southern and border States | —373 |

(Overall, the Quie substitute slashes the authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by $281 million, to a total of $3 billion. As noted above, substantially more than this overall cut—or $373 million—is attributed to reductions in the entitlements of 16 Southern and border States.)

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967, AS REPORTED (H.R. 7819) BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

I. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (P.L. 89–10).

Entire act extended one year through FY 1969.

Title I—*Opportunity for Disadvantaged Children:* $2.4 billion authorized for FY 1968; formula used in FY 1967 ($2000 low-income factor, ½ State average expenditure per pupil) is continued in effect until new formula ($3000, ½ State or ½ National average) is fully funded by appropriations.

Title II—*Library Resources and Textbooks:* $154.4 million authorized for FY 1968; No major amendments.

Title III—*Supplementary Centers and Services:* $515 million authorized for FY 1968; No major amendments.

Title IV—*Research* (Cooperative Research Act); No amendments.

Title V—*Strengthening State Departments of Education:* $45.5 million authorized for FY 1968; New $19.5 million program for comprehensive educational planning and evaluation.

*Title VI—Education of Handicapped Children:* $154.5 million authorized for FY 1968; New $7.5 million program for Regional Centers to diagnose and treat handicapped children's educational problems.

II. *Teacher Corps.*

$21 million authorized for FY 1968 for payment of Corpsmen's salaries; Extension of Teacher Corps for two years through FY 1969; Authorization of grants to school districts to employ Teacher Corps teams (Provisions for recruitment, selection and higher education training now pending in higher education subcommittee).

III. *Federally Affected Areas* (*P.L. 815 and P.L. 874*).

Both laws extended one year for school construction and for maintenance and operations.

DURATION OF AND AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PROGRAMS

SEC. 301.—Paragraph (a) extends title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (title II, Public Law 81–874) to June 30, 1969.

Paragraph (b) extends title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to June 30, 1969, and authorizes appropriations of $150 million for fiscal year 1969 for such title.

Paragraph (c) extends title III of ESEA to June 30, 1969, and authorizes appropriations of $500 million for the fiscal year 1969 for such title.

Paragraph (d) extends part A of title VI to June 30, 1969, and authorizes appropriations of $150 million for the fiscal year 1969 for such part.

Paragraph (e) extends the dissemination of information provision of title VII of ESEA to June 30, 1969, and authorizes $2 million for such provision for fiscal year 1969.

*Estimated maximum authorizations for fiscal year 1968 for titles I, II, III, V, pt. A, V, pt. B, VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*

| | Total estimated authorization | Estimated authorization: title I | Estimated authorization: title II | Estimated authorization: title III | Estimated authorization: title IV, pt. A | Estimated authorization: title V, pt. B | Estimated authorization: title VI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| United States and outlying areas | $3, 319, 637, 720 | $2, 442, 337, 720 | $154, 500, 000 | $515, 000, 000 | $38, 675, 000 | $14, 625, 000 | $154, 500, 000 |
| 50 States and District of Columbia | 3, 235, 033, 891 | 2, 382, 799, 891 | 150, 000, 000 | 500, 000, 000 | 37, 901, 500 | 14, 332, 500 | 150, 000, 000 |
| Alabama | 105, 390, 302 | 89, 269, 808 | 2, 731, 113 | 9, 322, 523 | 758, 217 | 267, 103 | 3, 041, 538 |
| Alaska | 5, 546, 462 | 3, 773, 026 | 193, 035 | 914, 593 | 329, 765 | 124, 259 | 211, 784 |
| Arizona | 26, 002, 094 | 18, 523, 773 | 1, 263, 305 | 4, 335, 875 | 499, 686 | 182, 302 | 1, 197, 153 |
| Arkansas | 64, 657, 197 | 55, 825, 587 | 1, 399, 317 | 5, 111, 898 | 535, 452 | 198, 544 | 1, 586, 399 |
| California | 215, 048, 083 | 138, 130, 306 | 14, 448, 594 | 46, 170, 314 | 2, 599, 036 | 929, 050 | 12, 770, 783 |
| Colorado | 27, 582, 099 | 18, 426, 286 | 1, 647, 185 | 5, 229, 772 | 560, 550 | 198, 899 | 1, 519, 407 |
| Connecticut | 27, 980, 548 | 15, 785, 810 | 2, 171, 080 | 7, 205, 237 | 612, 511 | 237, 993 | 1, 967, 917 |
| Delaware | 7, 110, 857 | 4, 348, 418 | 403, 210 | 1, 496, 940 | 356, 763 | 134, 732 | 370, 794 |
| Florida | 94, 866, 936 | 71, 040, 924 | 4, 096, 585 | 14, 475, 412 | 962, 850 | 369, 610 | 3, 921, 555 |
| Georgia | 117, 083, 122 | 97, 369, 339 | 3, 324, 106 | 11, 583, 035 | 864, 379 | 307, 263 | 3, 635, 000 |
| Hawaii | 8, 726, 557 | 4, 934, 866 | 598, 700 | 2, 062, 233 | 384, 833 | 143, 917 | 602, 008 |
| Idaho | 10, 697, 127 | 6, 948, 650 | 556, 915 | 2, 035, 852 | 389, 449 | 143, 163 | 623, 098 |
| Illinois | 131, 519, 936 | 86, 580, 633 | 8, 289, 828 | 26, 696, 694 | 1, 437, 739 | 584, 609 | 7, 930, 433 |
| Indiana | 58, 154, 845 | 36, 306, 622 | 3, 925, 009 | 12, 717, 065 | 907, 278 | 329, 539 | 3, 969, 332 |
| Iowa | 45, 536, 270 | 32, 929, 023 | 2, 245, 656 | 7, 187, 724 | 633, 341 | 234, 798 | 2, 305, 728 |
| Kansas | 30, 937, 807 | 20, 728, 355 | 1, 727, 053 | 5, 896, 633 | 569, 684 | 212, 167 | 1, 803, 915 |
| Kentucky | 86, 688, 094 | 72, 408, 151 | 2, 332, 424 | 8, 324, 472 | 653, 507 | 253, 214 | 2, 716, 326 |
| Louisiana | 96, 940, 872 | 80, 268, 352 | 2, 950, 410 | 9, 680, 553 | 730, 720 | 270, 387 | 3, 040, 450 |
| Maine | 15, 023, 943 | 10, 162, 772 | 785, 055 | 2, 685, 333 | 414, 524 | 156, 165 | 820, 094 |
| Maryland | 44, 427, 623 | 28, 728, 875 | 2, 837, 887 | 9, 246, 027 | 715, 020 | 269, 233 | 2, 630, 581 |
| Massachusetts | 52, 435, 785 | 29, 776, 412 | 4, 127, 343 | 13, 313, 389 | 869, 362 | 350, 307 | 3, 998, 972 |
| Michigan | 99, 304, 613 | 61, 576, 074 | 7, 185, 401 | 21, 942, 477 | 1, 361, 554 | 481, 481 | 6, 757, 626 |
| Minnesota | 59, 746, 091 | 43, 268, 972 | 3, 071, 862 | 9, 452, 855 | 738, 371 | 270, 476 | 2, 943, 555 |
| Mississippi | 97, 421, 102 | 86, 270, 962 | 1, 812, 389 | 6, 390, 085 | 603, 860 | 214, 874 | 2, 128, 932 |
| Missouri | 73, 662, 459 | 54, 347, 983 | 3, 468, 884 | 11, 309, 004 | 806, 344 | 311, 745 | 3, 418, 499 |
| Montana | 11, 438, 429 | 7, 691, 331 | 575, 773 | 2, 043, 590 | 385, 992 | 143, 607 | 598, 136 |
| Nebraska | 23, 469, 142 | 16, 635, 971 | 1, 151, 397 | 3, 880, 683 | 465, 661 | 177, 155 | 1, 158, 275 |
| Nevada | 4, 381, 534 | 2, 041, 776 | 338, 013 | 1, 287, 283 | 354, 161 | 131, 670 | 228, 631 |
| New Hampshire | 7, 135, 896 | 3, 728, 917 | 518, 558 | 1, 883, 219 | 367, 887 | 142, 276 | 495, 039 |
| New Jersey | 73, 290, 856 | 45, 439, 457 | 4, 991, 252 | 16, 832, 124 | 997, 636 | 413, 320 | 4, 617, 067 |
| New Mexico | 22, 420, 150 | 16, 994, 388 | 906, 125 | 2, 985, 231 | 440, 172 | 157, 408 | 936, 828 |
| New York | 288, 255, 819 | 216, 532, 645 | 12, 619, 222 | 43, 757, 254 | 2, 013, 174 | 915, 871 | 12, 417, 659 |
| North Carolina | 148, 452, 766 | 126, 329, 326 | 3, 634, 274 | 12, 946, 483 | 922, 471 | 331, 403 | 4, 288, 809 |
| North Dakota | 14, 731, 861 | 11, 205, 420 | 513, 039 | 1, 915, 461 | 375, 213 | 141, 344 | 581, 384 |
| Ohio | 115, 703, 689 | 70, 732, 588 | 8, 305, 644 | 26, 480, 206 | 1, 522, 642 | 566, 859 | 8, 095, 750 |
| Oklahoma | 48, 169, 820 | 37, 252, 388 | 1, 871, 559 | 6, 257, 144 | 613, 329 | 221, 042 | 1, 954, 358 |
| Oregon | 24, 144, 363 | 15, 269, 755 | 1, 543, 745 | 5, 098, 310 | 547, 762 | 198, 410 | 1, 486, 381 |
| Pennsylvania | 145, 879, 860 | 97, 439, 456 | 8, 688, 249 | 28, 754, 145 | 1, 465, 340 | 626, 410 | 8, 906, 260 |
| Rhode Island | 11, 486, 815 | 7, 245, 338 | 658, 410 | 2, 369, 343 | 381, 614 | 151, 949 | 680, 161 |
| South Carolina | 88, 396, 764 | 76, 158, 304 | 1, 987, 356 | 6, 998, 344 | 636, 574 | 225, 568 | 2, 390, 618 |
| South Dakota | 16, 542, 400 | 12, 831, 195 | 584, 748 | 1, 992, 717 | 385, 927 | 142, 852 | 604, 961 |
| Tennessee | 102, 867, 701 | 85, 974, 498 | 2, 740, 727 | 9, 953, 965 | 759, 056 | 283, 256 | 3, 156, 199 |
| Texas | 222, 781, 192 | 176, 179, 204 | 8, 229, 062 | 27, 622, 982 | 1, 651, 043 | 582, 390 | 8, 516, 511 |
| Utah | 11, 603, 277 | 6, 282, 663 | 899, 995 | 2, 930, 566 | 451, 405 | 156, 520 | 882, 128 |
| Vermont | 6, 801, 378 | 4, 442, 660 | 322, 578 | 1, 224, 879 | 343, 534 | 130, 339 | 337, 388 |
| Virginia | 89, 859, 088 | 70, 549, 173 | 3, 209, 083 | 11, 448, 239 | 827, 062 | 308, 550 | 3, 516, 981 |

*Estimated maximum authorizations for fiscal year 1968 for titles I, II, III, V, pt. A, V, pt. B, VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*—Continued

| | Total estimated authorization | Estimated authorization: title I | Estimated authorization: title II | Estimated authorization: title III | Estimated authorization: title IV, pt. A | Estimated authorization: title V, pt. B | Estimated authorization: title VI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 States and District of Columbia—Continued | | | | | | | |
| Washington | $34,047,571 | $20,493,564 | $$2,458,750 | $7,748,432 | $695,023 | $244,339 | $2,407,463 |
| West Virginia | 48,150,281 | 39,598,127 | 1,326,693 | 4,840,005 | 519,612 | 192,952 | 1,672,894 |
| Wisconsin | 53,854,634 | 35,077,745 | 3,532,161 | 10,839,678 | 767,579 | 296,125 | 3,331,346 |
| Wyoming | 5,556,169 | 3,462,815 | 269,254 | 1,062,786 | 342,115 | 127,055 | 292,144 |
| District of Columbia | 13,121,612 | 9,481,208 | 521,989 | 2,060,936 | 374,721 | 148,000 | 534,758 |
| Outlying areas | 84,603,829 | 59,537,829 | 4,500,000 | 15,000,000 | 773,500 | 292,500 | 4,500,000 |

Paragraph (f) extends the temporary provisions of Public Law 81–815 to June 30, 1968.

Paragraph (g) extends the temporary provisions of Public Law 81–874 to June 30, 1969.

WHY A TEACHER CORPS?

The schools aren't reaching the slum kids, or kids in poor rural areas. When the schools fail, so do the kids. They are the ones who commit the crimes, wind up on welfare, are the dropouts from society. And the universities aren't training teachers who want to take on these jobs.

Local school systems and universities are now getting together to work out their own solutions, to develop Teacher Corps programs that must have state approval. As Dr. Sam Spinks of the Hattiesburg, Mississippi Public Schools says, "We have complete control of the program from the selection of personnel to defining and assigning duties and responsibilities." The job is part in the schools and part in the community, an effort to get slum parents to give more help to their own kids.

There are 1200 Corps members now. The $12,500,000 FY supplemental will pay tuition for present Corps members, enroll and train 2,500 more. The $36,000,000 requested for FY 68 (21,000,000 in the Elementary and Secondary Act and 15,000,000 in the Higher Education Act) will pay second year costs of the 2,500 Corps members and train 3,000 in the summer of 1968.

Experienced teachers, selected by the school systems, serve as team leaders for four to eight college graduates who work two years in the schools as intern teachers. At the same time they are enrolled in a local university. In two years they complete a Master's Degree program that prepares them for work in their tough schools.

Recruiting is a series of local efforts backed up by national publicity. Applicants are screened by the Teacher Corps for legal and minimum requirements, then selected by the school systems and universities.

The program works. It's at work in 20 of the 25 major cities and in rural communities in Appalachia, the Ozarks, on Indian reservations, in Mexican-American communities and Migrant areas. The NEA polled the superintendents and principals. Seventy-five percent said it's doing a better job in their schools, that it's a better way to train teachers. They want three times the number they have. And hundreds of other school systems have asked for Corpsmen. The universities have developed programs that not only work for Teacher Corps but will serve regular students in education.

The interns will receive less pay than students on a graduate fellowship. They seek a tough job in the schools that most need help. And most will stick. Far more persons in graduate teaching programs stay in the schools than do regular teacher graduates.

The Teacher Corps is mostly a program to get teachers who can help kids decide early that they can make it on their own. As one in the Dade County program said, "I like it in that class. I'm smart in there."

COMMISSIONER HOWE STATEMENT ON QUIE SUBSTITUTE, H.R. 8983

The proposed substitute for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 raises serious questions about the continuity of major reforms in education launched by the Congress two years ago.

The key provision of the substitute is a system of "block" grants to States, starting in Fiscal Year 1969 with a total authorization of $3 billion—about $300 million less than authorized by present legislation. States could use block grants for eight listed categories of expenditure except that 50 percent of the funds must be used for educationally deprived children and 7 percent for library resources, textbooks, and equipment. Funds would be allocated to the States on the basis of the number of school children and relative income per child.

I regard this proposal as a backward step. Here are some of the reasons why:

Our analysis of the Quie formula shows that funds would be taken from the poorer States and given to the wealthier. In the 16 Southern and border States, authorizations would be reduced by $373 million in Fiscal Year 1969.

Some of the States with the largest concentrations of disadvantaged children would also lose authorized funds in Fiscal Year 1969. For example, New York, California, and Illinois would lose a total of approximately $133 million.

Disadvantaged private school students, now enjoying the benefits of participation in many local public school programs, would not have the same guarantees of eligibility under the Quie plan. Jeopardy to their participation could shatter the emergent spirit of good will and cooperation now developing between public and private school educators under the legislation enacted by the 89th Congress.

The Quie bill sets aside a minimum of 50 percent of all funds for the educationally deprived starting in fiscal 1969. Under the Administration bill for FY 1969, more than 80 percent of the authorization is allocated for these children under Title I—$2.6 billion, compared to the $1.5 billion called for by the Quie proposal. This watering down of our commitment to the least fortunate pupils is a step backward.

The substitute fails to guarantee special programs for children of migratory workers or children enrolled in Indian schools. These are two of the Nation's neediest groups of children. We have just begun to overcome the grave deficiencies of the education these children have been getting.

The proposal is damaging administratively to local school districts because they would not know their entitlements as they do under ESEA, which establishes definite entitlements for each county and—through the States—for each local school district.

The Quie substitute would delete specific provisions for programs that are operating successfully and deserve to live—among them, the Teacher Corps and special education programs for children in State institutions for the handicapped, neglected, and delinquent, and children in foster homes.

There is no requirement for evaluation of on-going programs by State and local educational agencies. The Congress would have no way of knowing if funds were being used effectively, or if the block grant approach paid off in better education than our broad categorical approach.

Many States are not yet ready to handle the entire job under block grants. State Departments of Education, with assistance from Federal funds, are gradually being strengthened, but many still lack the resources for this task.

There is no guarantee that an adequate share of funds to help educationally deprived children would be channeled by the States to the large cities, where the problem of teaching the disadvantaged is most acute. The cities have no specific entitlement under the Quie proposal, and in many States where political differences exist between the State capital and the metropolitan center, the victims of political disagreement may well be disadvantaged children.

In Fiscal Year 1968, which starts next July 1, the Quie proposal would make less money available to the large cities than would the bill reported out by the House Committee on Education and Labor. It is important to point out in regard to Mr. Quie's proposed legislation that some of the information entered by him on pages 10369–10370 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (House) for April 20 is in error. Particularly the table of financial comparisons on page 10370 is misleading. Attached is a document which gives corrected figures. It compares authorizations in Fiscal 1969 under the Quie proposal with those under the Committee bill. In the table that Mr. Quie entered in the RECORD, he compared the authorization under the Quie bill with his estimate of appropriations under the Committee bill. Such a comparison is not valid.

The wording of the Quie proposal is such as to raise the possibility that Federal funds will be used to supplant local and State funds without any added benefit to children. Section 740(a)7 requires that Federal funds for library resources and textbooks be over and above normal State and local expenditures for these purposes, but the large percentage of funds to be given the States under the Quie proposal are subject to no such requirement.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1967]

SCHOOL AID UNDER ATTACK

The House Republicans are playing a dangerous game with the program for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools.

As worked out in the 1965 law, this program managed skillfully to steer around racial and religious antagonisms that had previously killed school-aid bills for a generation. Instead of general school aid, the law provides for assistance to individual school districts based upon the number of their children from families with annual incomes under $3,000. This provision funnels the aid to the districts that need it most.

Under this law the Federal funds remain under the control of public officials, but children in parochial schools are qualified to receive the same kind of supplementary assistance as those in public schools. In practice, such aid means providing them with the services of a remedial reading teacher or a guidance counselor or with a hot breakfast program. No money goes directly to any private or parochial school. Naturally, the program involves some fairly detailed Federal requirements including racial equality, but it has worked well because it also elicits cooperation between public and pa-

rochial school administrators at the local district level.

In place of this intricate and ingenious compromise, the Republican minority on the House Education and Labor Committee under leadership of Representative Quie of Minnesota proposes the substitution of block grants to the states for educational purposes. The formula of the Quie bill would provide less money for the impoverished rural districts of the South, but it appeals to racist sentiment because state education commissioners in the South could more easily evade Federal desegregation requirements.

The Quie bill attempts to pacify parochial school supporters by including a proviso that one-half of the block grants would have to be used for special programs in which poor children in religious schools could participate, much as they do now. But most states have language in their constitutions forbidding the spending of public money for private schools, and this restrictive language might be held to apply if the states received any genuine discretion in the use of these Federal grants. Moreover, unfortunately, some states have a history of bitter ill-will between their state departments of education and parochial school systems.

If Republicans and Southern Democrats unite to substitute the Quie bill for the simple renewal of the existing law, the effect may be to kill school aid altogether. This is because most Catholic members are likely then to vote against the bill on final passage. In short, there is serious danger that the nasty quarrels of the past will be exacerbated.

It is possible that block grants to the states might usefully be substituted for some existing Federal programs, but such a change would have to be made on an extremely limited, experimental basis and with great caution. The highly charged school aid program is the least promising place to begin.

## LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965: SECOND ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Attorney General submitted to the President and to the Congress its second annual report on the activities of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance.

I had the privilege of authoring the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965—Public Law 89–197—and the 1966 amendments to the act—Public Law 89–798. In passing this legislation, the Congress recognized the need for a national commitment in the war against crime. In signing the act on September 22, 1965, the President stated:

> We are not dealing here in subsidies. The basic responsibility for dealing with local crime and criminals is, must be, and remains local. But the Federal Government can provide an infusion of ideas and support for research, for experiments, for new programs.

The experiences of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance have demonstrated the great need not only for a continuation of our commitment but for an expansion of assistance to the State and local law enforcement agencies if our joint efforts in the fight against crime are to be effective. The proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967, now under consideration in the House Committee on the Judiciary, will incorporate the provisions of Public Law 89–197 and 89–798. In his annual report, the Attorney General stated:

> The proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967 is a logical extension of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, offering more direct, operational aid to law enforcement agencies while preserving the research and demonstration emphasis which provided the cornerstone for the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

Under the act some $11.7 million, covering 194 projects, have been approved to date, with funds going to virtually every State in the Nation. Funded projects range from a computer-assisted patrol allocation project in St. Louis to a prosecutional training program for senior law students at Boston University.

The projects covered under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act's program operation are divided into seven categories: First, law enforcement training projects; second, law enforcement agency improvement; third, corrections projects; fourth, criminal justice projects; fifth, general studies and surveys; sixth, District of Columbia comprehensive program; and seventh, special Law Enforcement Assistance Act's programs.

I would like to call the attention of the House to a few of the awards made during the first year's operation of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance. These will offer an indication of the crime-fighting efforts which have benefited from this program.

Law enforcement training projects:

South Carolina Law Enforcement Division, Columbia, S.C. A training program for closed circuit monthly presentations on basic police science topics for all State law enforcement personnel; estimated 3,000 participants.

University of Wyoming. A statewide training program—more than 600 officers—involving three training conferences per year at five regional locations in subjects relating to law enforcement.

Kentucky State Police. Four 1-day training conferences for Kentucky law enforcement officers from county and local agencies which do not provide regular training.

Law enforcement-agency improvement projects:

Los Angeles County, Calif. Sheriff's department, demonstration in routine police patrol utilizing helicopters.

Minneapolis Police Department. Placement of specially selected juvenile officers in Minneapolis junior high schools for improved preventive, educational, and school-police liaison work.

City of Phoenix, Ariz. Police records and data system study designed to modernize and integrate existing local systems and improve their capacity for meeting operational, analytical, and reporting requirements.

Corrections projects:

Opportunities, Inc., Providence, R.I. To establish model residential treatment facility for juvenile offenders as rehabilitation alternative between probation supervision in home and state training school commitment.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder Colo. Regional training program for correctional personnel.

Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga. Institute on manpower and training needs for correctional rehabilitation in the South.

Criminal justice projects—training, demonstration, and studies:

National District Attorneys Association, Chicago. Two-part training project in five Midwestern States.

Judicial Research Foundation, Denver, Colo. To define problem areas and needs in lower court systems relative to criminal case handling and recommend methods for dealing with such problems.

General studies and survey projects:

Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass. Study of illicit traffic in narcotics and drugs and law enforcement methods for control and suppression.

National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. Study of the incidence of crime and attitudes of victims and nonvictims toward law enforcement personnel agencies.

Special Law Enforcement Assistance Act projects:

Wisconsin: Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement and Crime.

Law enforcement degree program development projects at: Eastern Kentucky State College, Memphis State University, University of Georgia, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

The second year grants and projects continued to encourage the kind of crime fighting innovations which the first year's program emphasized.

In the short time of its existence the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance has accomplished a great deal. Projects were distributed over a wide geographical range and the programs that were developed were meaningful and important in the effort to combat the rising trend of crime in our country.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Office under the Department of Justice is to be highly commended on its swift and efficient implementation of Public Law 89–197.

## NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LIII

Mr. WALKER. 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, opponents of an all volunteer force have issued dire predictions that its makeup will be one of racial imbalance. They assume that a military career would have more appeal to young men from lower economic positions in society and since Negroes make up a large portion of this element, hence, it follows that Negroes then would constitute a very large per-

centage of a voluntary army. In a recent article by Gus Tyler of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, he warned that "the voluntary army would be an army of the 'other America,' especially Negroes." The latest exponent of this position is Senator EDWARD KENNEDY. In a speech in Evanston, Ill., the senior Senator from Massachusetts implied that a volunteer army would contain a disproportionate number of Negroes and said that he opposed creating an all-volunteer army because it would be a "black army fighting wars for the rest of the country."

It is true that first term reenlistment rates for Negroes, which averaged some 45 percent in 1965, are quite high when compared to that of the white, which in that same year was 17 percent. Perhaps this is because the Army is the one fully desegregated institution in our society. Here the Negro has an opportunity to live on equal terms with his white colleague, to develop his talents, obtain a guaranteed income, gain promotion on merit and have a sense of accomplishment.

I do not think, however, that it is fair to say that Negroes alone, will rush in overwhelming numbers to join a volunteer army. The military has always appealed to certain segments within our society and will continue to do so, particularly when pay and other incentives are increased. I cannot understand why the Negro is deliberately singled out as the one element within our society that would be attracted to serve in a voluntary armed force. Such assumptions are entirely without merit.

I, of course, am not swayed by such talk. Even if Negroes should enlist in greater numbers than they presently do, I cannot see how this Government can discriminate against them by denying their right to serve their country. For those who are seriously concerned that the Negro will enlist in military service solely because it is the only avenue open to him for personal fulfilment, let me say to these people that they should show some concern now about developing other opportunities for the Negro youth within our society.

## THE MENACE OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in our legislative efforts during the past two decades to combat the menace of air and water pollution, the Congress has enacted legislation of three types: First, financial assistance to the States to aid their programs for the construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities; second, grants for research and the development of antipollution devices; and third, the development of judicial weapons against industrial and other polluters.

Today, I have reintroduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement equipment. The time has come, I feel, for the Congress to initiate this new approach in its struggle against air and water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, one vital aspect of the challenge of a growing America is the preservation and reclamation of our limited natural resources, and in particular, curbing the ominous problem of contamination in the air we breathe and the water we drink. In 1960, America's water needs stood at more than 300 billion gallons a day. By 1980, those needs will more than double. By the turn of the century they will more than triple. Can we meet this future demand if we continue to lose more than 20 billion gallons of water each day to pollution? The air is free, but who wants to breathe it knowing it is contaminated? Each year over 133 million tons of pollutants are released into our atmosphere, of which nearly a third is directly attributable to industrial waste.

My legislation is designed to provide industrial plant owners with an economic incentive to install pollution control equipment. Under the provisions of this bill, the owner will be able to claim a tax deduction at an accelerated rate, spanning 36 months. To take advantage of this tax benefit, the owner need only notify the appropriate State pollution authority that he has installed the proper equipment. The State authority would then certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the newly installed equipment meets all requirements established by the Secretary of the Treasury that the owner was eligible for the tax benefit.

Congress must take steps to assist and encourage industrial owners in their efforts to check pollution. The purchase and installment of pollution-control equipment is an extremely expensive undertaking. The competitiveness of our economy discourages capital outlay for nonproductive equipment and inhibits civic-minded businesses from taking action against pollution. It is in the public interest, their health and welfare, that the Federal Government assist those businesses that wish to help control pollution. The benefits of tax incentives have been proven in other fields. I am certain such an approach will work in this area as well.

## PROCURE PHOTOCOPYING MACHINES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am offering today a resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House to procure or lease photocopying machinery so that Members may be provided with copies of pending amendments during debate.

Last August, shortly after the 12-day debate on the civil rights bill, I called the Members' attention to the frequent difficulty of finding out the exact language, and even sometimes the general thrust, of amendments offered; and I suggested:

> With today's marvelous copying machines, there would seem to be no reason why copies of amendments could not be run off as soon as they are sent to the Clerk's desk, so as to become available to Members shortly thereafter.

I know that all Members are concerned with improving House procedures. Surely the present practice with regard to the consideration of amendments leaves something to be desired. The reading of amendments by the Clerk is necessarily hurried and often even the reading is waived by unanimous consent. Normally, the Members have to rely on the explanation of amendments offered by the proponents under the 5-minute rule.

Sometimes, copies of amendments being considered are available at the committee's tables, at other times they are not. In any event, Members are naturally reluctant to disturb those at the committee tables who are managing the bill.

This unsatisfactory situation could be readily solved by the use of one of the modern, high-speed copying machines, which would make copies of amendments available in a matter of minutes to Members interested. Even amendments covering several pages could be made available quickly.

I am advised that all that is needed is a simple resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to acquire, by purchase or lease, appropriate photocopying machinery to enable him to furnish one copy of any pending amendment to Members who may request it.

The text of my proposed resolution follows:

H. RES. 452

A resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to furnish Members of the House of Representatives with copies of amendments offered for consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives

*Resolved*, That there is authorized to be expended from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary for the Clerk of the House of Representatives to acquire, by purchase or lease, such photocopying or similar equipment as may be necessary to enable him to furnish during debate one copy of any amendment offered for consideration in the House of Representatives or in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to any Member of the House of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico) who requests such a copy.

## GENERAL WESTMORELAND A FINE SOLDIER, BUT SHOULD NOT BE ADMINISTRATION SPOKESMAN

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Gen. William C. Westmoreland is a fine soldier, and deserves recognition as such.

However, I find it deeply disturbing that he should be using his prominent position to speak out on subjects that are essentially political and go far beyond the proper province, in my view, of a commanding general in the field.

His condemnation of dissent and debate on the subject of the war was, in my judgment, deplorable. Moreover, it will have, if anything, the opposite effect from that which the general intended.

I was also greatly concerned by the following paragraph in the general's address to the Associated Press:

> Before leaving the military situation, I must honestly say that I am concerned about cease-fire proposals. In other wars, a cease-fire was an acceptable condition, but, in this war inevitably it will be a military advantage to the enemy and a detriment to our side. This is because of the clandestine character and covert methods of the enemy. Traditionally he has used covertly cease-fire periods to reinforce and resupply his units, and to strengthen and realign his political posture.

Even in short-range terms, this statement is highly questionable. Our side, too, has used periods of truce to rush forward supplies. Moreover, the political advantage of a period of truce may be far greater for the South Vietnamese—who can use a period of quiet to carry forward the "revolutionary development" program—than for the NLF and the Vietcong.

But a far more grievous error in the general's statement is that it totally overlooks the possibility that a cease-fire might lead to negotiations and ultimately to a peaceful settlement consistent with our goal of preserving the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future. To this extent, the general's statement seems to be in conflict with the position of the administration, and particularly President Johnson's acceptance in principle of the proposals recently made by Secretary General U Thant for a mutual cease-fire and standstill to lead to negotiations.

Taken to its logical conclusion, the general's statement seems to be in conflict with his own recognition that this is a war of limited objectives. If, as he says, our goal is not total victory over North Vietnam, then an agreed cease-fire must necessarily be a first step in bringing the conflict to an end. It cannot be ended any other way.

In the nature of things, the military commander in the field sees only one side of a complex problem, the military side. His concern for his troops is natural and indeed commendable. But he cannot be expected to give full weight to the broad and psychological aspects of the situation, which may well determine the ultimate outcome.

Some commentators have concluded that General Westmoreland is acting as a spokesman for the administration. If that is so, and if his comments signal a change in the President's policy of seeking a negotiated settlement, then the country is entitled to know the facts.

I prefer to believe that, when General Westmoreland speaks on nonmilitary matters, he is speaking as an individual and without official authorization.

In either case, the net effect is bad. The world is being given an impression that our tradition of civilian supremacy is being undermined.

---

## INDISPENSABLE CLASSROOM EQUIPMENT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about education. Not just about education in general, but about that educational asset which is vital and necessary if we are going to have good education. It is: A good teacher in every classroom.

This Nation has been aroused to our dangerous lag in educational progress. On the one hand, we have wrought a marvelous nation which has taken great strides in science, economics, and social benefits. But the complex world in which we live requires trained intelligence to operate it. Sometimes it seems to me that we are trying to run a modern world of machines and gadgets with a horse-and-buggy educational program.

When we start to consider what we need in education, the first thing most of us think about is money. That is, if we only had more money, the problem would solve itself. Others among us say that more organization, an improved hierarchy, would result in great strides. These are essentials of a strong and effective educational system. We do need money, and much of it. We do need intelligent and imaginative and forceful leaders to tie our educational efforts together. But neither, nor both put together, will give us the kind of education we want unless we have the services of the right persons to meet our children face to face in the classroom, participating in the endless struggle to relay the wisdom and aspirations of the ages. Above all, we need the good classroom teacher if our educational problems are to be solved.

In this age, we tend to look for a substitute when the real thing is lacking. So we more or less instinctively turn to what might be substitutes for good teachers.

Some would accept organization as a substitute. An impressive staff of administrators, supervisors, specialists, experts, executives, and consultants is assembled. The theory is that the combined wisdom and ability of the carefully selected staff will somehow seep down to the gladiators immersed in the dust and sweat of the educational arena. A good organization is a requisite for an effective operations, admitted. But it is not a substitute for high quality work at the teaching level.

New gadgets are gaining in popularity among our educators. Our children sit for hours before television screens in the classrooms, before teaching machines and other computerized instruments. The contributions undeniably are impressive.

But these are tools. They are not instructors. We cannot automate all our instruction. Machines are dead and the breath of life is not in them. The learning process also requires animate, sentient, intelligent beings—acting and reacting toward one another. Good education requires a passionate devotion to the truths and mysteries and beauties of the universe. It requires an ardent desire to advance a new generation one step further along the road to understanding. It requires a dedicated individual, on fire with interest and enthusiasm and inspiration.

This is the indispensable classroom equipment.

In a recent message to Congress on the subject of education, the President stated:

> I do not recommend more of the same, but more that is better—to solve old problems, to create new institutions, to fulfill the potentialities of each individual in our land.

He stressed education because, it not only overcomes ignorance, but "arms the citizen against the other evils which afflict him.

He said that nothing is more fundamental to all we seek than our programs in health and education.

President Johnson backed his goals with proposals for additional funds.

Most of the States in the last few years have been making heroic efforts to increase funds for education. My own State of West Virginia is one of them. Under the leadership of a progressive Governor, with the active cooperation of a concerned State department of education, West Virginia is moving rapidly forward in building new schools to meet the demands of a new age. Additionally, we must find in West Virginia the ways and means of obtaining and keeping the good classroom teacher.

The colleges and universities of West Virginia are training capable teachers in reasonable numbers. Our tragedy is that our teachers are not always available to serve in local schools. School officials from States nearby and far, attracted by superior teachers bred and reared and trained in West Virginia, come to raid us.

"Come and help us," they say. "We have prestige schools and we will pay you more as a beginner than you may hope to earn after a lifetime of service in your home State."

Many of our most talented young people, naturally, respond. But the loss of ability to the State which reared and trained this superior individual is a "brain drain" of the most pernicious character.

The answer, of course, is to meet the competition. In industry, in business, in the professions, demand fixes price. Whatever pay is needed to obtain those who will meet the need is paid. In West Virginia, as in other States, we have made progress. But it is just a beginning.

We need not only to meet the competition in money but we need to assure the young teacher, and the older teacher,

that we cherish his efforts and his sacrifices. We need to confer prestige on the occupation of instructing the young.

They serve with too few rewards, these dedicated individuals to whom we have entrusted our young people. In too many cases, we pay them poorly and treat them shabbily. We work them too hard and place too large demands on them.

The body is a deep mystery and only the highly trained physician can deal with it. His rewards, both financial and in public esteem, are great. But the mind is a deeper mystery. Something happens there when we learn but nobody knows exactly what. How to stimulate the mind to activity is even more of a mystery. How ironic, then, that the people to whom we turn for unlocking of the deeper mystery are too often shunted aside as we hurtle along other byways. We tend to drift from the main road, failing to put first things first.

Master educators, teachers in the classrooms, deserve more than what we have given them.

It is said that education is the capstone of the arch which supports civilization. If the capstone crumbles, the arch caves in on itself, and the edifice collapses in ruin. The teacher is the capstone on which everything rests.

My State, my Nation—our States, our Nation—must find ways to see that the capstone is strengthened and cherished.

## VISIT OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous success of the recent visit by Vice President HUMPHREY to the nations of Western Europe drew acclaim in the European press. Likewise, here at home, the American press has lauded the firmness with which he withstood barrages of anti-American criticism.

The Vice President passed off the incidents which saw him splattered with paint and bombarded with eggs and flour. He pursued with devotion and determination the goals of his visit and he returned home with words of praise and the cheers of the vast majority of Europeans ringing in his ears.

Mr. HUMPHREY reminded Europe that America's resolve to shoulder its commitment to freedom in southeast Asia is indicative of the resolve with which America views its commitments in Europe.

The Call-Chronicle newspaper of Allentown, Pa., on its editorial page in the April 9 edition, lauded the Vice President for his composure, firmness, and frankness during his European trip.

This editorial was written by Mr. W. D. Reimert who had an opportunity to observe Mr. HUMPHREY's persuasiveness when the Vice President addressed the kickoff dinner of the Lehigh County United Fund Campaign and the student body of Muhlenberg, both in Allentown, last September 23.

I feel Mr. Reimert has written a comprehensive appraisal of what Vice President HUMPHREY achieved in Europe, and I include his appraisal in the RECORD:

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Call-Chronicle, Apr. 9, 1967]

HUBERT HORATIO TO THE RESCUE

(By W. D. Reimer)

Lyndon B. Johnson's lot is at best an unhappy one. In the earlier days of his presidency, he was often accused of concentrating too much on domestic problems and neglecting the war in Vietnam.

His answer to this was to escalate the war in all directions. Then, of course, came the accusations that he was concentrating so much on the war that domestic matters were being neglected. In addition to this, it was found to his embarrassment, that the nation could not fight the war and have its butter too. So he proposed increasing taxes that had been repealed just a short while before.

More recently, a certain restiveness on the part of Uncle Sam's allies in Europe over the war in Vietnam and other matters such as NATO and the proposed nuclear proliferation treaty with Russia has caused considerable concern and was followed by accusations of concentrating too hard on the war and domestic matters to the neglect of important allies. England is unhappy. France is downright hostile and has summarily ordered American armed forces off the lot. Germany chafes under the restrictions of World War peace treaties.

So to answer the criticism and to take soundings in preparation for a projected trip to Europe the President dispatched Vice President Hubert Horatio Humphrey to the scene.

Everything considered, it is hard to see how he could have made a better choice. The United States needed a new face and a new approach in Europe. The statesmen of the continent were becoming a bit tired of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the monotony of his line.

No secretary of state has ever worked harder than the indefatigable Rusk. The way he has stood up under the pressures of one of the world's toughest assignments has been just short of miraculous.

A lesser man would have folded up long ago and sought the surcease of private life. What is more, the attacks on the United States and its war policies have been so persistent and so vicious as to force the secretary of state into an unfortunately defensive position. And the more he was on the defense the less convincing he became. Europe wanted to hear another American voice.

In the few days he has been abroad, Hubert Humphrey has been anything but defensive. It is not his nature to be so. He has never been apologetic about anything he believes in. Like Harry Truman, the haberdasher from Kansas, Hubert Humphrey, the druggist from South Dakota, approaches things directly and simply. He is more of a spellbinder than Truman, and any one who has heard him in person will agree that his speeches though long are seldom dull.

Let it be recorded then that his current trip shapes up as a significant journey. By avoiding the double-talk of diplomacy and the tired cliches of all these years of the Vietnam war, by being just himself, a Mid-Western American who does not beat around the bush, Humphrey is believed to have made a deep impression on his hearers and a favorable one.

This in spite of the emphasis placed by the news services on demonstrations by anti-Vietnam war and Communist groups. Actually, the roughhouse that got so many headlines was relatively minor except in France. Some booing in England, a minor bomb scare, flour and eggs in Germany, some paint in Italy.

In London he stood up admirably to a barrage of pointed and slanted questions. After a cool reception from members of Parliament, he wound up being loudly cheered. To the British he said in effect: We are not asking you to stop criticizing the United States. We may be at fault in some things ourselves. But we do ask that in all fairness the criticism should be less one-sided. Hanoi and the Viet Cong are at fault, too. If you really want peace, stop making the United States the sole scapegoat for what is going on in Vietnam.

In Berlin Humphrey got more cheers than jeers. There he was roundly applauded when he said:

"Berliners know better than anyone else the value of commitments kept. And I know the people of Berlin know, as all free peoples know, that our commitment to freedom in one place is no less than our commitment to freedom in another place."

In France, Humphrey, who can act as well as orate, must have done exactly the right thing. For he was able to elicit from the dour De Gaulle the first kind words about the United States in many a long month:

"Despite whatever currently may be the difference in our respective actions in the midst of a troubled and, alas, bloodied world, your visit allows us to mark the long-standing and active friendship French people maintain towards the American people."

The violence of French demonstrations was not unexpected. There the Communists are more active and more emotionally voluble than in the other countries Humphrey visited. Certainly the burning of the American flag was a senseless and needless insult to an old ally, and the demonstrations as well as the failure of Paris police to hold them more firmly in hand may result in an indefinite postponement of President Johnson's visit. But, in the final analysis, what happened in man to man talks with French officials is what counted most, and in this respect Humphrey is believed to have put across a few important points.

When all is said and done, the nations of Western Europe shudder at the thought of what might happen if the United States ever withdraws its protective umbrella from its skies. Its statesmen know that if we violate our commitments in the Far East, we can just as easily do the same in Europe. They may take a certain pleasure in making Uncle Sam the scapegoat in Vietnam. But they know where their bread is buttered.

Humphrey's frankness and his fresh approach have reassured Europe that our concentration on Vietnam does not mean we are forgetting our obligations elsewhere. All this does not mean that West Europeans will love us more. But the chances are they now understand us better.

## THE PROMOTION OF SAFETY OF PASSENGERS AND EMPLOYEES ON AMERICAN RAILROADS

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, many of the major safety requirements which affect the railroad industry were either initiated by law or are now bolstered by

legislative action. The Congress has the traditional and important task of legislating in the area of railroad safety.

The 60-year-old statute which limits railroad operating employees to 16 hours on duty in 24 and provides for specific rest periods following the legal limit of work has gone unchanged since 1907 with the exception of some adjustments in the penalty provisions.

As I understand it, the law currently permits railroads to work engineers, firemen, conductors, brakemen, and switchmen up to 16 consecutive hours without rest. They are also permitted to work the men an aggregate of 16 hours in 24 without having to provide them with an 8-hour consecutive rest period.

The amendments I am introducing today reduces the 16-hour limit to a more reasonable 12 hours and provides that all employees subject to the law be given at least 8 consecutive hours' rest in the preceding 24-hour period.

Many changes have taken place in the character of railroad operations in the last 60 years, as you know. The speed of trains; the length of trains; the tonnage carried on trains have nearly doubled in just the last 20 years.

Yet there has been no move to require the railroads to provide operating employees with adequate rest periods in order to insure safe and efficient operation in view of this added burden and responsibility which falls upon them. I find it amazing that this law has not been amended earlier.

Impressive support for my amendments is found in reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission clearly indicating the increasing rate of accidents on our railroads. Indeed, we have a responsibility to pay greater attention to safety regulations. I do not think it is an unwarranted assumption to say excessive work hours imposed on the men who operate our Nation's trains have been one cause of the month-by-month increase in train accidents.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we should have acted before, that the Congress has been remiss in this area of its responsibility and that we have an obligation to act now to eliminate the threat imposed on our railroad employees and on the general public by the absence of stricter regulations. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and in the House to give serious consideration to the amendments I introduce today.

## AMENDMENT TO THE MINERAL LEASING ACT OF 1920

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 by repealing the limitations on the leasing of Federal coal lands imposed upon railroads.

Section 2(c) of the act prohibits the acquisition by a common carrier railroad of a permit or lease for any coal deposits except for its own use for railroad purposes, and in such event is limited to no more than 10,240 acres in the aggregate. Because the use of coal for railroad locomotive fuel ceased with the dieselization of the railroads, section 2(c) in practical effect prohibits the acquisition by a railroad of a Federal coal lease.

The results of these restrictions has been to impede the development of vast coal deposits on the public domain in the railroad checkerboard land-grant areas in our Western States, particularly in my State of Montana and our neighboring State of Wyoming.

At one time the Northern Pacific Railroad had extensive coal mining operations in Montana and Washington. Its Federal coal leases contained these restrictions. When the railroad changed to diesel locomotives, eventually all mining operations ceased. However, the railroad still owns large coal reserves and desires to develop them by entering into cooperative ventures with responsible members of the coal industry.

There is rapidly developing in the West a market for large quantities of coal to supply the vastly expanding network of large electric powerplant installations. In addition, markets will develop in the foreseeable future for huge tonnages of coal for the production of hydrocarbon chemicals and gasoline. The mining of these vast undeveloped coal reserves will bring employment to thousands of coal miners, a flow of new capital investment, a substantial increase in income and tax revenues, and will bring economic growth and technical progress to the West.

The reasons for the restrictions placed upon the rights of the railroads to assist in the development of this valuable resource, however valid they may have been in 1920, are no longer applicable. They have become unnecessarily restrictive and discriminatory, and there is no reason to continue them in effect when the result clearly has been to cause my State and other Western States rich in coal reserves to suffer a drastic economic impact.

The common carrier railroads of America will not be given an undue economic advantage over other prospective Federal coal lessees by the enactment of this legislation. They are subject to the vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws and regulations, the rate and general regulatory powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the control of the Federal Power Commission and State public utility commissions. The rights of the public will be adequately and carefully protected by the Department of the Interior.

I call upon my fellow Members of Congress to support this effort to unlock and bring about the development of our valuable western coal reserves.

## POVERTY PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have all seen articles in the press reporting shortcomings in programs directed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The press is quick to report the occasional scandal in one program or another. I do not deny that there have been scandals, and I do not condemn the press. It is an unfortunate truth that errors in administration or scandals in operation have greater reader appeal than do the routine success stories related by individuals who have watched these programs in action.

There have been mistakes. There have been errors in the administration of these relatively new programs. No one denies this. On the other hand, however, a tremendous amount of good has been done through such programs as work-study, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Headstart.

I have just received a letter from Marilyn M. Rusoff, president of the Missoula, Mont., League of Women Voters. It is an excellent, unsolicited testimonial to the work that is being done by OEO. I want to share it with you, and I insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Here is a part of a success story yet to be told:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
*Missoula, Mont., April 12, 1967.*

MY DEAR MR. OLSEN: Following a two-year study, the League of Women Voters strongly supports policies and programs in the United States to provide for all people equality of opportunity for education and employment. Our study here in Missoula encompassed both the national acts (OEO, MDT, Civil Rights, etc.) and a very direct, personal association, and in some cases involvement, with the initiation and development of the "War on Poverty" here. We have come to feel great confidence in Mr. Paul Carpino as the very capable and dedicated director of our local CAP program and we are distressed that this CAP program especially is under fire and seems likely to be further cut in funds and limited in its scope by the earmarking of the funds. Here in Missoula the initiation and development of measures to combat poverty have been carefully tailored to local needs as determined by an initial survey of over 1000 low-income families and we see the exercise of local initiative as one of the strengths of the whole OEO program.

In a community of this size we come into direct contact with persons who are helped by various OEO programs and we could describe many specific cases. A Crow Indian high school girl, without family assistance, has supported herself working for her "keep" for years and now with her Youth Corps job for the first time has money to buy clothes and school supplies. The training and experience she is getting in the Youth Corps are helping greatly to give her the self-confidence she needs to persist in the face of extra difficulties she will encounter, as an Indian, in job seeking. With this help and encouragement we now feel she may well succeed in developing the real potential she has to become a self-respecting and self-supporting young woman.

A college student from a very low-income rural Montana home is enabled to stay at the University without periodically taking time out to work because of his Work-Study job. Often the top student in his classes, he is getting experience in working in his chosen

field and providing valuable research assistance for his professor.

We have visited the new North Side Community Center, set up with much volunteer effort on the part of the residents of the area and the assistance of the CAP. We find that already every evening for several weeks is booked at the center; adult basic education classes, volunteer tutoring classes for high school students; homemaker classes for young mothers, legal aid counseling, and recreation programs for all ages. A day Care Center is providing child care for a young mother we know who is enabled to get business training under MDT which she needs because her husband has deserted her and several small children.

The Community Action Program here has been in effect not much more than a year but is certainly showing its worth. We Leaguers in Missoula do not know what is happening in big cities or rural areas over the country but we do know that right here we are making a real beginning in reaching the disadvantaged and helping them to improve their lot.

We urge you to support these programs.

Yours sincerely,

MARILYN M. RUSOFF,
*President.*

## COOPERATIVE LEAGUE, A STRONG BACKER OF TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Cooperative League of the USA has long fought for the passage of meaningful truth-in-lending legislation.

The league is a national federation of all types of customer-owned businesses which deal with some 18 million families in our country. Last week, Mr. Shelby Southard, of the Cooperative League, appeared before the Senate Banking Committee's Financial Institutions Subcommittee to testify on behalf of S. 5, the Truth in Lending Act.

Not only did Mr. Southard strongly endorse the legislation, but he issued a warning against any attempts to water down the bill. In part, Mr. Southard said:

> Be certain that "Truth in Lending" describes your final product accurately. You owe this much to a long line of persons in and out of public life who have worked selflessly through three Administrations to insure passage of a bill which deserves that label, and—more importantly, you owe it to the people of this country.

Because of the strong stand that the Cooperative League has taken in favor of truth in lending, I am including a copy of Mr. Southard's testimony in my remarks:

STATEMENT OF SHELBY EDW. SOUTHARD, OF THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE USA, TO SENATE BANKING COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, REGARDING SENATE BILL S. 5—THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT

Mr. Chairman, the Cooperative League of the USA thanks your Committee for giving us the opportunity to share with you our views on the legislation before you, the Truth in Lending Bill (S. 5).

The League, which is a national federation of all types of customer-owned businesses with members in all 50 States, was one of the pioneer groups to urge upon Congress the wisdom of a bill such as this, which has as its central purpose to make the typical consumer more alive to what his use of credit is costing him. Wise credit use is often the touchstone of business success and in the management of our personal financial affairs as well.

This is especially true of cooperative business. It is so whether it be in the field of housing, insurance, rural electrics, the grocery business, farm supply and marketing, prepaid group health plans, or credit unions. We can speak with considerable assurance on this point because League member organizations are active in every one of those fields, so that our activities extend now to over 18 million families in this country.

It is through the credit unions that we are most vividly conscious of the need to make people aware of what credit is costing them when they borrow money or buy on the installment plan. The dramatic growth in the number of credit unions and their lengthening membership rolls are solid evidence that, as people do discover how important this is, they do something about it.

Senator Proxmire's bill differs only slightly from the earlier bill on this subject introduced several times by former Senator Paul Douglas. We supported and worked for the Douglas bill and we have compared carefully the provisions of his bill with the one proposed by Senator Proxmire. To be effective the bill must require that the cost of credit be expressed as an annual percentage, including in that rate the "incidentals" for fees, credit reports, and the like, which have a way of mounting alarmingly without the customer's noticing it. Also at the crux of the matter is the requirement that all forms of consumer credit including small loans, installment purchases, revolving credit, and home mortgages be covered.

We are pleased that the Proxmire bill includes all these points. They are the important ones. Unless we have such a law, there can be no assurance that consumers have those elementary facts they need to make wise decisions when they buy. No one argues when the car buyer wants to look at the motor, the tires, the upholstery, the air conditioning. These are components by which the manufacturer competes for the buyer's favor. But another component, frequently more important than any of these, is the cost of credit. There is no logical reason the buyer should not also know precisely what the credit component is going to cost—and not buried beneath a suffocating blanket of detail which has as its purpose, not to inform, but to cover up its real cost.

During the earlier rounds of this now 6-year-old debate, the opponents made some headway by raising a series of questions beginning "What if—?" These iffy questions all had to do with how difficult such a law would be to enforce, and its friends could only say then that it is a simple thing to print up rate tables covering every conceivable variation of interest charges. (In fact, the Treasury Department and Department of Defense have recently done so—so simply any clerk can use them.) But the answer to such iffy questions now is that the State of Massachusetts has had such a law for a considerable period of time and the experience up there has answered them in the most effective way possible. None of these hypothetical fears have proved to have a basis in fact. This is the verdict of those who have a role in administering the law, and indeed some of its former critics have been fair and said their earlier fears before the law was passed were unjustified. That is your answer, Mr. Chairman. If these fears were real, the trouble would have surfaced by now, and you can bet we would be hearing about it.

Having followed closely the long debate excited by this legislation, we are confident in our prediction that many reputable but misguided business witnesses who have opposed it will find upon its enactment that they have been freed from competition by segments of their business which exist in its shadows and on its fringes, making bad medicine for everybody.

It is the familiar history of earlier consumer protection laws—first strenuous resistance based on fears of alleged government interference. But in practice the law will interfere only with those people who bring discredit on their business by preying on the uninformed, the gullible, and ones least able to protect themselves. Firms which extend credit on a level of integrity and reasonable concern for their customers will be able to do so without harassment from the "quick buck" operators who give them unfair competition and who have demeaned for too long an honorable sector of our economy.

In closing we urge the Committee to review again the essential points which comprise a meaningful Truth in Lending law and make sure those provisions are in the bill which you report to the Senate floor for action. You can take little satisfaction, and the people of this country will derive little good, from a law which bears a persuasive title but lacks the elements to make it truly descriptive of what the bill contains. Make sure that in the changes and amendments you consider you do not violate the spirit of another bill Congress passed last year called Fair Packaging and Labeling. The label on S. 5 now reads "Truth in Lending." Be certain that "Truth in Lending" describes your final product accurately. You owe this much to a long line of persons in and out of public life who have worked selflessly through three Administrations to insure passage of a bill which deserves that label, and—more importantly, you owe it to the people of this country.

## EXTENSION OF NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, 1965, President Johnson signed into law the National Teacher Corps bill. At that time, he hailed the program as one that would be of tremendous assistance to the children of America.

During the past school year, 1,200 corps members have been at work in 275 schools across our Nation. They have been assigned to those areas where their services are most urgently needed—in isolated rural area schools, in ghetto schools, in Indian reservation schools, and in depressed area schools.

These dedicated, determined young teachers, who make up the Corps, have worked hard to reach the disadvantaged children of America. During the short time that the Corps has been in existence, their efforts have borne fruit. The corps members have proven that apathetic, underprepared, and neglected children can be reached, and can be taught, and can be guided toward becoming good citizens and useful, productive members of the communities in which they live.

The record shows unmistakably that the National Teacher Corps is too badly needed to be discontinued. An editorial

which appeared in the Washington Post on April 24 discusses this urgent need and echoes the sentiments of the President for continuing the Teacher Corps. I am happy to insert this editorial, which follows, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TEACHING TEACHERS

Congress ought to give thoughtful consideration to a report just released by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. The report is an appraisal of the Teacher Corps during its first year of operation; and it is strikingly enthusiastic about the performance and the potentialities of this fledgling group in a period when it was peculiarly handicapped by problems of organization and by inadequate funds. At the same time, the report is something more: it is an insightful discussion of the special problems of teaching "disadvantaged" children.

A major educational challenge confronts the country. Public school systems in every major city are flooded today with the flotsam of a vast new migration—from rural areas to urban centers. Many of these migrants, uneducated, even illiterate and accustomed to agricultural employment, are wholly unequipped for participation in an industrial economy; and often, in consequence, they find themselves crowded into decaying neighborhoods, unemployed, exploited and desperate. Their children, often, are in a real sense disinherited—deprived of any cultural stimulation or any incentive to learn.

It is for these children that the schools must today undertake a special task—a task analogous to but different from the task accomplished by the public schools at the turn of the century in making the melting pot a reality for the children of the migrants from Europe. "For centuries," the report of the Advisory Council observes, "schools have dealt almost wholly with students who have valued learning and have come to school in search of it. Among the children with whom the Teacher Corps works, the first task is not so much to *teach* them as to *reach* them, in order to persuade them that they can learn—and that learning can be useful, interesting and rewarding."

The Teacher Corps recruits idealistic and committed young college graduates who want to do this specialized and difficult type of teaching; and it trains them for the task in participating universities and in the public schools of disadvantaged neighborhoods which have asked for their help. During the past school year, some 1200 Corps members have served in 275 schools in 111 school districts in 29 states, serving in each case at the invitation of a local school system. Usually they work in teams of three to ten interns, headed by a team leader who is an experienced teacher. They are subordinates of the local school authorities, conforming to local rules and practices, paid at a rate equal to that received by the least experienced teachers in the local school district.

The Teacher Corps brings with it not only specialized training and some fresh ideas; even more significantly it brings the ardor of dedicated young people. It has made a great beginning; it can, if it gets the chance, render even richer service in the future. But it will be obliged to go out of business entirely by the end of June unless Congress quickly votes to extend its life and to give it the supplemental appropriation it needs to carry on through the summer. No better investment could be made toward the education of the disadvantaged.

## PANAMA CANAL: SANITATION IN TERMINAL CITIES

Mr. WALKER. 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House in the RECORD of March 22, 1967, I quoted a March 5 letter from the isthmus reporting an increase of rodent population in the Republic of Panama incident to accumulations of garbage and a resulting rat invasion of the Canal Zone.

In this connection it is important to know that until the 1955 treaty with Panama, at the request of that country, relieved United States for responsibility for enforcement of sanitary and health ordinances in the cities of Panama and Colon, this function was performed satisfactorily by our Government under provision of article VII of the 1903 treaty with Panama.

Since my March 22 statement, I have received a news story from an isthmian newspaper confirming one of the points made in the March 5 letter and have sent a copy to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service as additional information.

The indicated news story follows:

[From the Panama American, Mar. 4, 1967]

EXTERMINATORS SLAY 934 RATS AT REPUBLIC OF PANAMA HOSPITAL

The Rodent Control Section of the Municipal Health Board yesterday estimated that rats are probably eating 20 per cent of the food supplied to the Matias Hernandez Psychiatric Hospital. The Rodent Control Section trapped 934 rats in one eight hour day.

Rats average more than two pounds in weight, a spokesman said.

## THE PANAMA CANAL: 1967 ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA

Mr. WALKER. 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the last decade I have read widely on the subject of interoceanic canals, including articles on the Panama Canal in standard reference works. Among the latest such contributions is a comprehensive historical sketch on the Panama Canal in the 1967 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, who is a distinguished historian of the Panama Canal and an outstanding and objective authority on interoceanic canal problems.

The more I have studied isthmian questions the more I realize the importance of studying the history involved. Unless this is done we shall be destined to repeat the mistakes of the past that could be easily avoided. This lesson applies particularly with respect to the Panama Canal, which, throughout its existence, has been the subject of a series of crises. The tragic situation with which we are now confronted at Panama has been brought about by impractical and uninformed theorists who ignore in their calculations and actions all semblance of wisdom. They seem to know nothing of the past nor to care in the least for the past. They are in nowise objective and appear to be wholly influenced by foolish sentimentality and the failure to appreciate what such a canal means to the United States and the free world, especially Latin America, including Panama, from a military and protective standpoint.

The final section of the indicated Britannica article, which deals with Panama-United States relations, is the joint product of Almon R. Wright, senior historian, U.S. Department of State, and Captain DuVal. The article has a most helpful bibliography which will be of great value to all who wish to go more deeply into the subject.

Because of the inherent value of the indicated contribution, I consider it of the highest importance for study by those concerned with the canal question, both in and out of government, especially cognizant committees of the Congress and their staffs.

The subject article follows:

[From the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1967 edition]

PANAMA CANAL

(By Capt. Miles P. DuVal, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired)

Panama Canal, a high-level artificial interoceanic waterway of the lake and lock type at the Isthmus of Panama connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, owned, operated and controlled by the United States under treaty, for the transit of vessels of commerce and of war of all nations on terms of equality, with tolls that are just and equitable. The Canal Zone, through which it was built, is the constitutionally acquired domain of the United States granted in perpetuity by the Republic of Panama, for the construction of the canal, and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection.

By using the canal, vessels plying between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States can eliminate the Cape Horn route and save a distance of about 8,000 nautical mi., while journeys between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the North and South American continents can be reduced by 3,000–4,000 mi.; vessels from Europe to western Asia and Australia can effect a saving of 1,000–2,000 mi. Hence the canal is of the greatest international importance, strategically and economically.

This article is divided into the following sections:

I. THE WATERWAY

1. Description
2. Navigation

II. CANAL ZONE

1. Area and Tidewaters
2. Sovereignty
3. Administration
4. Tolls
5. Canal Traffic
6. Defense

III. HISTORY

1. Panama Railroad, 1849–55
2. French Project, 1879–1904
3. United States Policy, 1850–81
4. Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1901
5. U.S. Diplomacy, 1901–03
6. Building the Canal, 1904–14
7. Principal Engineering and Construction Projects After 1914
8. Reorganization and Policy Determination
9. Panama-U.S. relations

I. THE WATERWAY

1. Description.—The Panama canal does not cross the isthmus from east to west as generally supposed, but from northwest to southeast, with the Atlantic entrance 33½ mi. N. and 27 mi. W. of the Pacific entrance. Located in one of the heavier rainfall areas of the world with its longest section formed by impounding the waters of the Chagres river valley by a dam at Gatun, its principal features include: twin-flight locks, dams and spillways at both ends of the canal; the summit-level Gatun lake; an excavated gorge across the continental divide, renamed as Gaillard cut, connecting Gatun lake with the Pacific locks; a small Miraflores lake between two sets of Pacific locks; and two terminals.

The Atlantic terminus is at Cristobal on Limon bay, a natural harbour protected against storms from the north by east and west breakwaters. The Pacific terminus is at Balboa, a sheltered artificial harbour with its Pacific entrance channel safeguarded from silt-bearing currents by a causeway from the mainland to the fortified islands in the Bay of Panama.

The canal length from shore line to shore line is 40.27 statute miles; and from deep water to deep water, 50.72 miles. From north to south, its main parts are:

1. Atlantic sea level dredged channel of 500 ft. bottom width from deep water to Gatun locks, about 7.4 mi.

2. Gatun locks in three steps from sea level to Gatun lake, 85 ft. above sea level.

3. Gatun lake section with channels varying in width from 1,000 ft. at Gatun to 500 ft. at Gamboa where Gaillard cut begins, distance about 24 mi.

4. Gaillard cut of 300–500 ft. minimum bottom widths to Pedro Miguel locks at the south-end of the cut, distance about 8 mi.

5. Pedro Miguel locks in one step (31 ft.) to the intermediate Miraflores lake, 54 ft. above sea level.

6. Miraflores lake with channel 750 ft. wide to Miraflores locks, distance about 1 mi.

7. Miraflores locks in two steps to Pacific sea level.

8. Pacific sea level dredged section to the Bay of Panama, distance about 8.5 mi.

The controlling depth for the Atlantic dredged section from deep water to Gatun locks is 42 ft. below mean low water; from Gatun locks to Pedro Miguel, 42 ft. below the minimum Gatun lake level of 82 ft.; from Pedro Miguel locks to Miraflores, 42 ft. below the minimum Miraflores lake level of 54 ft.; and from Miraflores locks to deep water in the Pacific, 42.4 ft. below mean low water spring (maximum) tides.

The canal is equipped with modern aids to navigation. The Panama canal has had no major operational improvement since opening to traffic in 1914 with the exception of the Madden Dam and Power project, with its upstream lake to conserve water for lockages and maintenance of channel depths in Gatun lake during dry seasons and to reduce the danger of floods from the upper Chagres in wet seasons, and of the enlargement of the Gaillard cut started in 1959.

*Locks.*—No part of the canal attracts more attention than its massive locks. Constructed in duplicate to enable simultaneous lockages of vessels in the same or opposite direction, all locks have usable dimensions of 1,000 ft. length, 110 ft. width, and a depth to accommodate vessels drawing 40 ft. in salt water. Each lock gate has two leaves, the leaves being floatable structures 65 ft. wide by 7 ft. thick, varying in height from 47 to 82 ft., weighing from 400 to 750 tons, and operated by 25 h.p. motors through gear arrangements.

Locks are equipped with unique safety devices, notably hydraulically operated fender chains and electric towing locomotives. The fender chains protect lock gates against vessels that may get out of control when approaching locks, and are dropped into grooves to permit passage. With the exception of small craft, vessels are not allowed to pass through locks under their own power, but are required to be drawn by towing locomotives, varying in number from four to eight, depending on ship characteristics.

The time required for passage through the locks depends upon many factors, including size of vessel and its handling features. Generally, lockage intervals are 80 min. at Gatun, 40 min. at Pedro Miguel, and 60 min. at Miraflores.

*Gatun Dam and Spillway.*—The key structure of the Panama canal is Gatun dam, near the end of the Chagres river valley. It is about 1½ mi. long on its crest, ½ mi. wide at the base, 400 ft. wide at the water surface, 100 ft. wide at the top, and its crest is 105 ft. above sea level. It contains 22,958,069 cu.yd. of material.

Located on a natural hill of rock near the centre of the dam, Gatun spillway was designed to provide adequate control of Gatun lake levels during the maximum known discharge of the Chagres river. The dam and spillway together with Gatun locks form the northern barrier that creates Gatun lake.

*Gatun Lake and Gaillard Cut.*—Gatun lake, at its normal height of 85 ft., has an area of 166 sq.mi. and a shore line of 1,100 mi.; with a watershed of 1,285 sq.mi., which includes territory of the Republic of Panama. Its designed operating range is 5 ft., between water levels of 87 and 82 ft. above sea level.

Gaillard cut, formerly called Culebra cut, is an artificial extension of Gatun lake across the continental divide to Pedro Miguel locks, with its original bottom at a maximum of 40 ft. above sea level, on an alignment that passes between Gold hill and Contractors hill. Its restricted channel and rocky banks make this cut the most hazardous part of the canal. A steady growth in vessel sizes and number carrying hazardous cargo has increased the frequency of transits requiring one-way navigation in Gaillard cut.

*Pacific Dams, Miraflores Lake and Spillway.*—Across the south end of Gaillard cut, a pair of one-lift (31 ft.) Pedro Miguel locks and two flanking dams to nearby hills form the southern barrier closing the upper valley of the Rio Grande and holding the Gatun lake water level. With crests 105 ft. above sea level, the east dam extends about 300 ft. to Cerro Luisa and the west extends about 1,400 feet to Cerro Paraiso. The east dam is a concrete wall, 260 ft. long, covered with earth; the west is earth and rock, containing 699,518 cu.yd. of material.

At Miraflores, a set of two-lift locks and two dams form a second barrier closing the lower valley of the Rio Grande and creating the intermediate Miraflores lake. This lake, at 54 ft. above sea level, has an area of 1.5 sq.mi. Its watershed is 38 sq.mi.

The major part of the east dam at Miraflores is the spillway, designed to handle free flow of water from Gatun lake through one chamber at Pedro Miguel in event of accident. The west dam, with crest 40 ft. wide and 70 ft. above sea level extending 2,700 ft. to Cerro Cocoli, is the second largest dam of the canal, containing about 2,388,423 cu. yd. of material.

*Terminal Facilities.*—The Atlantic terminus affords safe anchorages in Limón bay and convenient pier berths at Cristóbal. The Pacific terminus has mooring buoy, dock and pier berths at Balboa; also an unprotected outer anchorage in the Bay of Panama. All piers are modern, 1,000 ft. long by 200 ft. wide, with enclosed sheds and railroad service, ample for storage of consignments and transhipment of cargo.

Both terminals are equipped for servicing to vessels, provisioning and repairs. The principal repair installations are on the Atlantic side near Mount Hope, with a 386-ft. dry dock. Larger marine and railway repair shops on the Pacific side are closed, with a 1,044 ft. dry dock in a stand-by status. Salvage tugs and other wrecking equipment are available.

2. Navigation.—All vessels entering or leaving a terminal port, maneuvering in Canal Zone waters, or in transit, in general, are required to take pilots, who have charge of navigation and movement. Transits are made under rigid traffic controls. The average time required to transit is from seven to eight hours.

II. CANAL ZONE

1. Area and Tidewaters.—The Canal Zone is a strip of land and land under water 10 mi. wide with boundaries generally 5 mi. from the centre of the canal except for the western salient covering the mouth of the Chagres river, the arms of Gatun lake extending into the Republic of Panama, and Madden lake. Beginning in the Caribbean, "three marine miles" from mean low water as provided by treaty, the zone extends across the isthmus to a distance of "three marine miles" from mean low water in the Pacific, but excludes the Panamanian cities of Colón and Panama.

The Canal Zone includes all of Gatun lake and surrounding shores up to the 100 ft. contour and all of Madden lake and its shores up to the 260 ft. contour. The total area of the Canal Zone is 647.29 sq. mi.—372.32 sq. mi. land, 185.52 sq. mi. fresh water, and 89.45 sq. mi. salt water, including the Atlantic and Pacific coastal waters within the three-mile limit.

The tides at the Atlantic and Pacific terminals differ in both magnitude and character. At Cristóbal on the Atlantic side they are irregular and small, with an extreme range of 3.05 ft. At Balboa on the Pacific side, they are remarkably regular with two highs and two lows every lunar day of 24 hr. and 50 min., with an extreme range of 22.7 ft.

2. Sovereignty.—Under the authority of the Panama Canal act of 1912 and in conformity with treaty, Pres. William H. Taft, by executive order of Dec. 5, 1912, declared that "all land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, protection, and sanitation of the Panama Canal." Since title to all such land was acquired by the United States, the Canal Zone, in its entirety, is a United States government reservation.

The only private enterprise activities permitted within the zone are on lands rented under revocable licenses, normally to shipping interests, agriculturists and others directly connected with the canal or its operation. Areas assigned for other government purposes, in the mid-1960s, included 141 sq. mi. for the armed forces, with 108 to the army, 22 to the navy and 11 to the air force; 6 to the Smithsonian institution as a wildlife preserve on Barro Colorado; 5 as the Madden Forest preserve; 0.96 to the Federal Aviation agency; 4 to commercial licences and 13 to Canal Zone town sites. Remaining land, largely mountain or jungle, totals over 200 sq. mi. All areas continue subject to the civil jurisdiction of the Canal Zone government in conformity with the Canal Zone code.

3. Administration.—The Panama canal enterprise, as reorganized July 1, 1951, under public law 841, 81st congress, approved Sept. 29, 1950 (Thompson act), consists of two main units, the Panama Canal company and the Canal Zone government, with the dominant mission of the safe, convenient and economic transit of vessels. The Canal Zone is divided into two districts, the Balboa (or Pacific) subdivision and the Cristóbal (or Atlantic) subdivision.

*Balboa and Cristóbal.*—These subdivisions are coterminous with the Balboa and Cristóbal divisions of the U.S. district court. Their common boundary crosses the Canal Zone at right angles just northwest of Barbacoas Island. The Balboa subdivision includes all Canal Zone area lying southeast-

erly of this boundary, and the Cristóbal subdivision, all lying northwesterly of it.

Towns, except Gamboa, are clustered near the terminals convenient to canal and shipping activities, in which, directly or indirectly, most of the civilian population in the zone is employed. Gamboa, because it is the headquarters of dredging operations, is located north of Gaillard cut to prevent isolation of equipment from lake dumps in event of slides. All towns have the facilities of well-managed communities in the United States, with high standards of health, sanitation and education. The canal administrative centre is at Balboa Heights.

A long-felt defect in the 1903 treaty was failure to provide for adequate public crossings of the canal for the Canal Zone and Panama, both divided by the waterway. This condition was initially corrected by the United States by a toll-free ferry at Balboa in 1932 under legislation sponsored by Rep. Maurice H. Thatcher, former member of the Isthmian Canal commission for whom it was named; and finally, in 1962, pursuant to treaty, by the toll-free Thatcher Ferry bridge to replace the ferries.

The civilian population in the 1960 census including dependents of the U.S. armed forces, was 42,122, with 11,499 in the Cristóbal district and 30,623 in the Balboa district. The population of the principal communities was 3,489 for Gamboa and 3,139 for Balboa.

*The Panama Canal Company.*—This is a corporate instrumentality of the United States, operated under the management of its board of directors and charged with the maintenance and operation of the Panama canal and the conduct of business-type operations incident thereto and to the civil government of the Canal Zone.

The basic law requires that the company be self-sustaining. Its obligations include its own operating expenses, the net cost of civil government, interest and depreciation on United States investment in the enterprise, and $430,000 of the $1,930,000 annuity paid to the Republic of Panama, the remainder being provided by the department of state, and thereby excluded in fixing tolls.

*The Canal Zone Government.*—This is an independent agency of the United States, administered by a governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the president, or such officer of the United States as may be designated by him (secretary of the army). It performs the functions of city, county and state governments, with certain attributes of diplomatic character in connection with the Republic of Panama. The governor, who is appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate, is ex-officio a director and president of the Panama Canal company.

The judicial functions of the Canal Zone government are performed by two magistrate's courts, Balboa and Cristóbal, each presided over by a magistrate appointed by the governor; and by a United States district court of the fifth judicial circuit, consisting of two divisions, Balboa and Cristóbal, presided over by one judge appointed by the president.

4. Tolls.—The levy of tolls is subject to provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty (1901), the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty (1903), and the Thomson-Urrutia treaty proclaimed in 1922. Exempted from transit tolls in accordance with treaty are vessels owned, operated or chartered by the government of the Republic of Panama and war vessels of the Republic of Colombia; also vessels in transit solely for repairs at Panama canal shops.

Tolls are assessed on the basis of Panama canal net tonnage of actual earning capacity, a net vessel ton being 100 cu. ft. of space. Tolls cover all normal transit charges, including pilot service. Vessels operated by the United States, including warships and auxiliaries, are assessed tolls.

Tolls in 1964 were 90 cents per net ton for merchant vessels, army and navy transports, tankers, hospital and supply ships, and yachts, when carrying passengers or cargo; 72 cents per net ton on such vessels in ballast without passengers or cargo; and 50 cents per ton of displacement for other types. The average measurement per ocean-going commercial vessel in fiscal year 1964 was 5,910 net tons and average tolls per vessel, $5,175.

The Panama Canal company is authorized to prescribe and, from time to time, change rules for the measurement of vessels and tolls, subject to requirements for six months notice, public hearings and approval by the president of the United States, whose action shall be final and conclusive.

| Fiscal year | Total transits [1] | Total long tons of cargo [1] | Total tolls and toll credits |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1929 | 7,157 | 30,781,755 | $27,128,893 |
| 1933 | 5,032 | 18,269,917 | 19,621,181 |
| 1939 | 7,449 | 27,993,144 | 23,699,430 |
| 1943 | 4,372 | 11,030,105 | 7,368,739 |
| 1950 | 7,690 | 30,364,982 | 24,511,713 |
| 1955 | 8,786 | 41,523,432 | 35,136,529 |
| 1960 | 12,135 | 60,391,655 | 51,803,032 |
| 1962 | 12,099 | 69,036,591 | 58,347,290 |
| 1964 | 12,839 | 71,746,561 | 62,546,391 |
| 1965 | 12,909 | 78,899,012 | 67,148,451 |

[1] Exclusive of transits for repairs.

Source: Annual Report of Board of Directors, Panama Canal Company, 1964.

5. Canal Traffic.—Although the Panama canal was conceived and built primarily as an artery of world trade, its traffic, except during World War II, has had an irregular but sustained growth since 1916 in the number of commercial transits and cargo tonnage. Its traffic volume is extremely sensitive to wars and depressions, and to appreciable political, economic or other upheavals in any part of the world, such as crop failure, strikes, destruction by tropical storms, development of foreign industries and closure of the Suez canal.

A significant feature of Panama canal traffic is the pattern of its trade routes, of which eight are well defined.

The lowest traffic volume after 1933 occurred in 1943, when there were 4,372 transits by ocean-going commercial vessels with 11,030,105 tons of cargo. A high point in traffic history occurred in fiscal year 1962 when, for the 11th consecutive year, new records in the number of transits, toll revenue, and tons of cargo were made. Growing numbers of commercial vessels with beams over 80 ft. were using the canal, thus emphasizing the need for increased capacity.

6. Defense.—The Panama Canal act of 1912 vests responsibility for protection of the Panama canal and Canal Zone in the governor, this protection being the normal exercise of police authority within the Canal Zone. Defense against external aggression is a function of the armed forces, for which the commander in chief, Southern Command, is responsible. These include army, navy and air force units, located in the Canal Zone and elsewhere.

The act further provides that "in time of war in which the United States shall be engaged, or when, in the opinion of the president, war is imminent," the president is authorized to vest exclusive authority and jurisdiction over the Panama canal and Canal Zone government in such officer of the army as the president may designate, with the governor subject in all respects to the orders and directions of the designated officer of the army.

During war or emergency, elaborate security precautions are taken by both civil and military authorities, including careful examination of arriving vessels and use of specially trained security guards during transits.

### III. HISTORY

The advantageous geographical location of the Central American isthmus was recognized by the early Spanish who, within a few years after the visit there by Columbus in 1502, followed with extended explorations focused on four main route areas: Tehuantepec, Nicaragua, Panama and the Darién-Atrato. Not finding a strait, they promptly conceived the idea of constructing one.

Because of lower continental divides at Panama and Nicaragua, with penetration by large valleys, these two avenues became rivals for isthmian transit. At Panama, mountainous terrain and torrential rivers, notably the Chagres, at the time presented insuperable barriers to a canal. Lake Nicaragua, 3,089 sq. mi. in area, with its then navigable San Juan river flowing into the Atlantic, reduced the magnitude of the task to cutting across the narrow strip which separated the lake from the Pacific. Eventually, control of the Nicaragua route became a focal point of international conflict, with Great Britain and the United States in a diplomatic deadlock. This situation was prolonged by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty (1850) which deprived the United States of exclusive control over any isthmian canal that it might construct.

1. Panama Railroad, 1849–55.—When United States westward expansion in the late 1840s required better means for transit, three North Americans of vision, John Lloyd Stephens, William Henry Aspinwall, and Henry Chauncey, organized the Panama Railroad company. Chartered in 1849 by the state of New York, this company, under enormous difficulties, completed building the Panama railroad in 1855—the first transcontinental railroad of the Americas. Running from Aspinwall (Colón) close to the line of the future canal, this 47.5-mi. strategic rail link was the first concrete step toward construction of the Panama canal, giving it a tremendous advantage over Nicaragua in the choice of route.

In view of the key functions that this celebrated railroad was later to fill in Panama canal history, it is important to note a treaty of 1846 between the United States and New Granada (Colombia). This treaty was an offensive and defensive alliance aimed primarily toward securing a canal at Panama, even then recognized by Pres. James K. Polk as the most practicable route. It provided that the United States should guarantee the "perfect neutrality" of the isthmus and its free and uninterrupted transit.

2. French Project, 1879–1904.—Meanwhile, French interests under the dynamic leadership of Ferdinand de Lesseps (*q.v.*), hero of the Suez canal, decided to construct a canal across the American isthmus. An International Congress for Consideration of an Interoceanic Canal, consisting of 135 delegates, convened at Paris on May 15, 1879, to decide upon site and type. As president of the congress, De Lesseps applied his prestige and genius toward securing approval for a sea-level type of canal at Panama.

Adolphe Godin De Lépinay de Brusly, an engineer who had studied the American isthmus, protested strongly at this trend. He understood the topography at Nicaragua and how its large natural lake, 105.5 feet high, would contribute toward construction of a canal at that location. He knew the surface features at Panama—the continental divide about 10 mi. from the Pacific, the torrential Chagres river flowing into the Atlantic and the smaller Rio Grande into the Pacific, both through valleys suitable for the formation of lakes. He emphasized the key problems at Panama as the control of the Chagres river and excavation of Culebra cut, recognized the lake idea as offering the best solution, and proposed a "practical" plan for building the Panama canal. It called for a dam at Gatun and another at Miraflores, or as close to the seas as the configuration of the land permitted, letting the waters rise to form two lakes about 80 ft. high, joining the lakes by cutting across the continental divide, and connecting them with the oceans by locks. This design, he

explained, was not only best for engineering but also most advantageous for navigation.

Unfortunately for the French, De Lépinay's idea was ignored. His conception, however, and its dramatic presentation before the Paris congress of 1879, established him as an architectural and engineering genius and the originator of the plan from which the Panama canal was eventually built. The French Panama Canal company, despite De Lépinay's timely warning, launched upon its ill-fated undertaking. Ten years later, in 1889, its effort collapsed due to a combination of bankruptcy, lack of planning and disease. In France, it resulted in a sensational financial scandal. Yet, before failing, the company, to save money and time, was forced to change its plans from sea-level to a high-level lock type.

Reorganized in 1894 as the New Panama Canal company, its officers realized that their only chance of assuring any return on the investment was to hold on until the United States could be induced to take control. Thus until 1904 they limited their activities to technical studies and such excavation as were required to protect the concession from Colombia. The total French excavation was 78,146,960 cu. yd. of material, of which 29,908,000 were later useful to the United States.

3. United States Policy, 1850–81.—With active canal endeavours temporarily checked by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and transit facilities met by the Panama railroad, United States efforts were generally restricted to explorations. It was not until Gen. Ulysses S. Grant became president in 1869 that major interest revived, with extensive naval exploring expeditions starting in 1870 and covering the more important canal sites.

With the objective of securing the best type of canal at the best site, and at least expense, the reports of these expeditions were reviewed by the first United States Interoceanic Canal commission 1872–76, consisting of Brig. Gen. Andrew A. Humphries, chief of U.S. army engineers; C. P. Patterson, U.S. Coast survey; and Commodore Daniel Ammen, chief of the bureau of navigation of the navy. Reporting to President Grant on Feb. 7, 1876, the commission was unanimous in recommending a Nicaragua canal starting on the Atlantic side near Greytown, following the San Juan river to Lake Nicaragua, through the lake, and thence across the land to Brito. Thus, the United States became definitely committed to the Nicaragua route, then complicated by British control of its eastern terminus through their protectorate over the Mosquito kingdom.

Viewing an isthmian canal as "virtually a part of the coastline of the United States" and alarmed by the energetic measures taken by French interests at Panama, United States leaders determined to change American policy. This attitude found expression on March 8, 1880, when the Select Committee on Interoceanic Canals of the house of representatives recommended a resolution by the congress declaring that any form of protectorate on this continent was contrary to the Monroe Doctrine (*q.v.*), that the United States asserts and maintains its right to possess and control any artificial means of isthmian transit, and that the president be requested to take steps to abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. This objective was supported by former President Grant, who, in Feb. 1881, publicly commended "an American canal, on American soil, to the American people."

4. Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1901.—The French failure in 1889 rendered the canal situation less acute, requiring a new crisis to dramatize the issue. This was supplied by the historic voyage of the U.S.S. "Oregon" during the Spanish-American War in 1898, which emphasized the need for an isthmian canal. The result was that Pres. William McKinley, in 1899, appointed an Isthmian Canal commission, with Rear Admiral John G. Walker, U.S.N. (ret.), as president, to investigate all canal routes, particularly Nicaragua and Panama, and to recommend the most practicable. In its first report on Nov. 16, 1901, the commission estimated the cost of a Nicaragua canal at $189,846,062, and Panama at $144,233,358; and the value of the French holdings at $40,000,000. But as the French company was demanding $109,141,500 for its property, the total estimate for Panama was $253,374,858. Because of the excess cost for a canal at Panama, it recommended Nicaragua as the only practicable route.

5. U.S. Diplomacy, 1901–03.—Meanwhile, the United States government, under the leadership of Secretary of State John Hay, negotiated with Great Britain the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of Nov. 18, 1901, which superseded the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and recognized the exclusive right of the United States to construct, regulate and manage any Isthmian canal. It further adopted the principal points in the Convention of Constantinople (1888) for the Suez canal as rules for the operation and neutralization of the American canal. These rules provided that the canal should be free and open to vessels of commerce and of war of all nations on terms of entire equality, with tolls that were just and equitable. The United States was also authorized to protect the canal against lawlessness and disorder.

The New Panama Canal company in Paris, reacting to the commission's recommendation for Nicaragua, on Jan. 9, 1902, cabled Admiral Walker its readiness to accept the United States offer of $40,000,000 for its holdings. Thereupon the commission, in a supplementary report on Jan. 18, 1902, canceled its first recommendation and recommended Panama as the most practicable and feasible route for an Isthmian canal. Describing the previous concessions from Colombia as unsatisfactory and insufficient, the commission emphasized the necessity for obtaining in perpetuity the grant of a sufficient strip of territory across the isthmus for canal purposes. Promptly transmitted to the congress by Pres. Theodore Roosevelt, the new recommendation started a memorable debate in the congress known as the "battle of the routes." Out of it came the basic law for construction of the Panama canal approved June 28, 1902, known as the Spooner act.

This law authorized the president to acquire all French holdings including its Panama railroad stock at a cost not exceeding $40,000,000 to obtain from Colombia perpetual control of a strip of land for the maintenance, operation and protection of the Panama canal and railroad, and then, through the Isthmian canal commission, to construct the Panama canal. The type contemplated by the act was high-level, with Atlantic locks and dams at Bohio to form a Lake Bohio. Provision was also made that in event of failure to obtain an adequate treaty within a reasonable time, the president should proceed with construction of a Nicaragua canal.

In harmony with the act, Tomás Herrán, Colombian chargé d'affaires in Washington, after many months of arduous labour, succeeded in negotiating a most favourable treaty for his country—the Hay-Herrán treaty of Jan. 22, 1903, which was ratified by the United States senate on March 17, 1903.

Unfortunately, this treaty became involved politically in Bogotá. The Colombian senate, called into special session on June 20, 1903, for its ratification, rejected the treaty against urgent pleadings by Herrán in Washington and U.S. Minister Arthur M. Beaupré in Bogotá.

The Panama Revolution, 1903.—Panamanian leaders, fearing that after all Panama might still lose the canal to Nicaragua, determined to avert that possibility. A Panamanian agent was then dispatched to Washington to obtain promise of help for a plan of revolt. While no promise was given, the warship U.S.S. "Nashville" appeared at Colón on Nov. 2, 1903. On the following day an uprising occurred, Colombian troops were prevented from crossing the isthmus to put down the rebellion and independence was proclaimed under the leadership of Manuel Amador. It was recognized, first by the United States, second by France, and soon afterward by other countries.

Then followed negotiation of the second basic canal convention, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla treaty of Nov. 18, 1903, with Panama instead of Colombia. By this treaty, in harmony with the Spooner act, United States was granted in perpetuity exclusive use, occupation and control of the Canal Zone. Significantly the United States could exercise all sovereign powers to the entire exclusion of the exercise of such powers by Panama. That country was to receive $10,000,000 in cash and a $250,000 annuity to begin nine years after ratification of the agreement. The proclamation of this treaty on Feb. 26, 1904, sealed the choice of the Panama route.

A few days later, on March 8, 1904, President Roosevelt recognized the contributions of Admiral Walker by appointing him as the first chairman of the first Isthmian Canal commission for the construction of the Panama canal. One member, Maj. Gen. George W. Davis, U.S. army (ret.), was the first governor of the Canal Zone. John F. Wallace, a leading railroad engineer, not experienced in "frontier" work, was chosen as the first chief engineer.

The Canal Zone was formally acquired on May 4, 1904—a day subsequently celebrated annually in the zone as Acquisition day.

6. Building the Canal, 1904–14.—Work under the United States started haltingly. Because of public clamour to "make the dirt fly," the commission weakened in its stand for thorough and comprehensive preparation and started work without proper equipment or plans. Though valuable time was thus lost, the commission made important contributions. It organized the Canal Zone government, started sanitation under the supervision of William Crawford Gorgas (*q.v.*), and recruited the nucleus of an engineering and construction force.

Resigning on March 30, 1905, the Walker commission was succeeded by a new one headed by Theodore P. Shonts, a prominent railroad executive, with Wallace continuing as chief engineer. Though for a time conditions improved, Wallace, on June 26, 1905, suddenly resigned throwing the working forces into confusion.

*Battle of the Levels, 1904–06.*—Of the difficulties of this period the gravest was increasing uncertainty as to the type of canal that should be built—the high-level lock type contemplated by the Spooner act or a canal at sea level as had been suggested by Wallace in 1904.

Fortunately, President Roosevelt selected a great railroad builder, executive and explorer, John F. Stevens, as the new chief engineer. Stevens' qualifications were unique. He had read everything available on the Panama canal since the time of Philip II, discovered Marias pass in Montana, built railroads in the Rocky mountains and supervised open mining operations in Minnesota. Thus, he had observed what occurs when the delicate balances of nature are upset, understood the hazards of cutting a ship channel through mountains, and was experienced in personnel and construction problems in undeveloped terrain.

Arriving on the isthmus on July 25, 1905, at a time of chaos, he rescued the project from possible disaster. He promptly provided housing for employees, established commissaries, adopted sanitation measures,

ordered equipment and double-tracked the Panama railroad. After planning the transportation system for Culebra cut excavation and for relocation of the railroad to higher ground on the east side of the canal, moving the Atlantic locks sites from Bohio to Gatun to form Gatun lake, recruiting competent leaders and forming the organization for building the Panama canal, he found progress hampered because of delay on the decision as to the type of canal, then being considered by an International Board of Consulting Engineers, of which General Davis was chairman.

In its report of Jan. 10, 1908, this board split—the majority of eight members headed by General Davis and including five Europeans, voting for sea level; and the minority, five Americans (Alfred Noble, Henry L. Abbott, Frederic P. Stearns, Joseph Ripley and Isham Randolph), voting for the lock type.

The controlling features of the lock plan recommended by the minority were a dam at Gatun creating Gatun lake 85 ft. high as the summit level and Culebra cut. Parallel flight locks were to be provided: three-lifts at Gatun, one-lift at Pedro Miguel, and two-lifts at Sosa hill, the last two sets being separated by an intermediate Sosa lake. Though of different lock arrangement, this plan was the same type as recommended in 1901 by the Walker commission.

Testifying before congressional committees in Washington in January and June 1906, and using the De Lépinay arguments of 1879, Stevens supported the high-level plan with a conviction that no one could shake, and strongly opposed the sea-level plan recommended by the majority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers. In the end, with the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary of War Taft, and the Isthmian Canal commission, the views of Stevens prevailed against strenuous opposition concerned primarily with questions of "vulnerability." Congress, by act approved June 29, 1906, adopted the high-level lake and lock plan as proposed by the minority. This was the great decision in building the Panama canal.

The transit since 1914, in both peace and war, of thousands of vessels of various types, completely establishes the wisdom of that decision. It secured for Stevens, who was mainly responsible for bringing it about, great fame as the basic architect of the Panama canal. This fact was recognized in Oct. 1962 at the time of the opening of the Thatcher Ferry bridge by the dedication of a handsome memorial honoring the great engineer.

*Pacific Lock Location Question, 1906–08.*—Though the high-level plan, as approved by the minority of the International Board of Consulting Engineers, placed all Atlantic locks at Gatun it divided the Pacific locks into two sets. Stevens, early in 1906 before adoption by congress of the minority report, recognized the Pacific lock arrangement as faulty and recommended consolidation as a needed change. Eventually, on Aug. 3, 1906, Stevens approved a plan placing all Pacific locks in three-lifts south of Miraflores with the terminal dam and locks between two hills, Cerro Aguadulce on the west side of the sea level section of the canal and Cerro de Puente on the east side, a location later recognized by Lieut. Col. George W. Goethals as offering the best site. This arrangement would have enabled lake-level navigation from the Atlantic locks to the Pacific, with a summit level anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal.

Regrettably, Stevens was under great pressure to start active construction. Advocates of the sea-level proposal, stung by their defeat in congress, and also opponents of any canal at all, were ready to take advantage of any change in the approved program as evidence of weakness in the high-level plan. Together, these two forces represented a political and economic power that could not be ignored.

Stevens' foundation investigations, necessarily made in haste, proved unsatisfactory, and he did not dare to jeopardize the project by further delay. On Aug. 23, 1906, apparently confident that this important question would rise again, he voided his plan but retained it on file, and proceeded with the approved plan for separating the Pacific locks, which he did not personally favour.

Later, after Stevens left canal service, Maj. William L. Sibert, a member of the commission with a keen appreciation of marine needs in the design of navigational works, made more extensive explorations. Finding adequate foundations, he likewise, on Jan. 31, 1908, recommended the consolidation of all Pacific locks in three-lifts at Miraflores to provide a Pacific terminal lake, but his well-reasoned proposal was not approved and the canal was completed with two sets of Pacific locks, separated by Miraflores lake.

*Construction and Completion, 1907–14.*—With canal type decided, construction organization effected, and a greater part of the plant installed by July, 1906, real progress started. Thus, Stevens was able to assure the press in 1906 that the canal would be completed in 1914 and formally opened by Jan. 1, 1915.

On Jan. 30, 1907, after having brought design and construction to a point where work was in "full swing" and success a certainty, Stevens submitted his resignation to the president. Despite that action, however, Roosevelt, on Mar. 4, 1907, in recognition of his tremendous contributions, appointed him as chairman of the Isthmian Canal commission, making Stevens the first to hold the combined positions of chairman and chief engineer.

Stevens was succeeded by Lieutenant Colonel Goethals, an outstanding army engineer, who, with his associates, civilian as well as military, ably brought the project to completion substantially in accord with the Stevens plan. Such changes as were made, though important, were nonbasic. These included widening the bottom of Culebra cut from 200 ft. to 300 ft., increasing usable lock dimensions to a width of 110 ft. and length of 1,000 ft., with a depth to permit passage of ships drawing 40 ft. in salt water, rerouting the Panama railroad around Gold hill, relocation of locks from Sosa hill to Miraflores, and redesign of Gatun dam.

Other members of the Isthmian Canal commission on April 1, 1907, were Maj. David D. Gaillard, Major Sibert, naval civil engineer Harry H. Rousseau, Lieut. Col. William C. Gorgas, Jackson Smith and J. C. S. Blackburn. Later changes included Lieut. Col. H. F. Hodges (1980–14) to succeed Smith, Maurice H. Thatcher (1910–13) to succeed Blackburn and Richard L. Metcalfe (1913–14) to succeed Thatcher. Gaillard died on Dec. 5, 1913, without a successor.

The building of the Panama canal, one of the greatest engineering feats in the world, was indeed a monumental and unprecedented achievement. Its subsequent success, in both peace and war, entitle all who, in significant manner, participated in its planning, construction, sanitation and civil administration, to highest honour. The canal was opened to traffic on Aug. 15, 1914.

7. Principal Engineering and Construction Projects After 1914.—The Isthmian Canal commission, abolished on April 1, 1914, was succeeded by a highly centralized permanent operating organization authorized by the Panama Canal act of 1912, known simply as The Panama Canal. Though free, under the law, to choose the governor from any source, Pres. Woodrow Wilson, in recognition of the services of Colonel Goethals, appointed him as the first governor of The Panama Canal.

The canal was launched into its era of operations under Governor Goethals, who served until late 1916 after the early slide crises. Goethals chose his principal engineer assistant as his successor and established a tradition of succession, by advancement, that lasted until 1952.

*Madden Dam and Power Project, 1919–35.*—Faced with the problems of an unusually dry season, 1919–20, requiring conservation of water for lockages and maintenance of channel depths, and later by a great flood in 1923, endangering the waterway, together with growing traffic, congress authorized the first important step toward increasing canal capacity, the Madden Dam and Power project. Completed in 1935, it provided more water for lockages, controlled floods, improved navigation and supplied additional power.

*Third Locks Project, 1939–42.*—The second step toward greater capacity was for a third set of locks. Because of naval needs, in the critical period preceding World War II, congress, on administrative recommendations, authorized the Third Locks project, at a cost not to exceed $277,000,000. The proposed layout contemplated a new set of larger locks, 1,200 ft. long and 140 ft. wide, with 45 ft. navigable depth, near each of the existing locks but at some distance away with the new locks joined with existing channels by means of by-pass channels. At the Atlantic end, the project duplicated existing arrangements. At the Pacific end, however, the proposed channel, in addition to duplicating its faulty layout, contained three sharp bends of 29°, 47° and 37° in succession from north to south.

Work was started in 1940 and was pushed vigorously until suspended by the secretary of war in May, 1942, because of shortage of ships and materials more urgently needed elsewhere for war purposes. No excavation was accomplished at Pedro Miguel; that at Gatun and Miraflores was substantially completed. About $75,000,000 was expended.

*Terminal Lake—Third Locks Plan, 1942–43.*—Fortunately, suspension of work on the Third Locks project occurred while there was still time for canal officials to re-examine it in the light of needs demonstrated by war-operating experience. These studies served to emphasize that the separation of the Pacific locks and failure to provide a summit-level lake at the Pacific terminus were fundamental errors of design, with Pedro Miguel locks as the principal obstruction to optimum canal operating conditions.

Out of the studies, including an evaluation of the sea-level idea, grew what proved to be the first comprehensive proposal for the economic increase of capacity and operational improvement of the Panama canal—the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan. It proposed the physical removal of Pedro Miguel locks, consolidation of all Pacific locks near Aguadulce, elevation of the intermediate Miraflores lake water level from 54 ft. to that of Gatun lake to create a summit-level anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match, as far as possible, that in the Atlantic end. It would also include raising the summit level to its highest feasible height of approximately 92 ft., enlarging Gaillard cut and constructing a set of larger locks. Essentially, this was the same plan originated by De Lépinay, and later recommended by Stevens and Sibert.

Officially submitted and publicly presented in the Canal Zone, it aroused wide interest among engineers and maritime agencies, including the secretary of the navy, who, on Sept. 7, 1943, submitted it to the president. Soon after, in 1944, it was approved in principle by the governor of The Panama Canal and recommended to the secretary of war for thorough investigation, and later, in 1945, it was approved in general before the congress by a succeeding governor for the major modification of the existing waterway in preference to completing the original Third Lock project. A 1949 congressional investigation reported that it could be accomplished at comparatively low cost.

The Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, being an enlargement of the existing facilities

that does not call for additional land or waters, is covered by current canal treaties and does not require negotiation of a new one, a paramount diplomatic consideration.

*Sea Level Plan, 1945–47.*—The spectacular advent of the atomic bomb in 1945 injected new elements into the canal picture. At the request of Canal Zone authorities, congress enacted public law 280, 79th congress, approved Dec. 28, 1945, authorizing the governor of The Panama Canal to make a comprehensive investigation of the means for increasing its capacity and security to meet future needs for interoceanic commerce and national defense, including consideration of canals at other locations. This was the first time the terms "security" and "national defense" had been embodied in any Panama Canal statute.

The report of the inquiry with security and national defense as paramount considerations, recommended only the sea-level plan for major canal construction, initially estimated in 1947 to cost $2,483,000,000, a figure later substantially increased. Though the report covered the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan, which it did not recommend, it offered a relatively minor program for improvement of present installations as a preferred alternative to the major operational improvement of the existing waterway as recommended in 1943 by the secretary of the navy.

With the exception of the two canal terminals, the 1947 sea-level plan would provide a virtually new Panama canal of 60 ft. minimum depth in navigation lanes and a 600 ft. width between sloping sides at a depth of 40 ft. on a new alignment somewhat removed from the present channel. The plan also provides a tidal lock (200 ft. by 1,500 ft.) and a navigable pass at the Pacific end, many miles of flood control dams on both sides of the projected canal, diversion channels and spillways. Some of its features are not covered by current international conventions and would require a new treaty with Panama, with further concessions, attendant indemnity and increased annuity charges.

The report of the investigation failed to receive presidential approval. Transmitted to the congress on Dec. 1, 1947, without comment or recommendation, its submission, however, led to a recurrence of the 1902 and 1906 debates over route and type with almost identical arguments, but on the basis of the newer term, "security," rather than the old term "vulnerability."

In voluminous discussions, many leading engineers, nuclear scientists and other experts challenged the assumptions on which the principal 1947 recommendations and estimates rested. The congress took no action until 1957, when an independent inquiry into the entire subject of increased facilities for interoceanic transit was authorized and a special board of consultants appointed.

Its final report of June 1960 included estimates for the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan ($1,020,900,000) and the Sea-Level plan ($2,537,000,000) exclusive of any Panamanian indemnity. The board emphasized that the Sea-Level plan would present many constructional problems including interruption to traffic. A plan for a lake and lock canal at Nicaragua ($4,095,000,000) as an alternate route was submitted without definite recommendation. This report, otherwise inconclusive, recommended that the entire canal situation be reviewed in 1970 or earlier if warranted. The congress, on administrative request, by act approved Sept. 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), authorized further investigations to determine the feasibility and most suitable site for a canal at sea level between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Meanwhile, the 1947 report served to focus governmental attention on administrative problems of the Panama canal.

8. Reorganization and Policy Determination.—On June 30, 1948, the Panama Railroad company was reincorporated as a federal corporation and, on Feb. 28, 1949, the house of representatives authorized on investigation into the organizational and financial aspects of the Panama canal enterprise.

All recommendations growing out of this inquiry were implemented except that for transfer of responsibility for canal supervision from the secretary of the army to the secretary of commerce, which the president delayed for further study. The resulting Act of Congress, public law 841, 81st congress, approved Sept. 26, 1950, known as the Thompson act, created the Panama Canal company and the Canal Zone government. Effective July 1, 1951, the act started major administrative changes, including a break in 1952 in the traditional selection for appointment as governor. The law requires that transit tolls be established at rates to place the canal enterprise on a self-sustaining basis, a fundamental principle in canal policy with far-reaching implications for its future.

9. Panama-U.S. Relations.—Because of the previous history of Panama as a land of endemic revolution, the framers of the 1903 treaty, in order to guarantee political stability essential for future efficient operations of the waterway, insisted on its perpetuity, sovereignty and protective clauses. Subsequent events fully substantiated the wisdom of these 1903 treaty provisions, which remain largely unchanged. The canal was no sooner opened to traffic in Aug. 1914, than the United States applied another provision of this treaty, that of obtaining additional lands. During World War I, in which Panama participated, the United States took possession of several areas of land, and in 1919 acquired a group of islands. Friction over this and other issues led to an attempt in 1926 to revise the convention of 1903, but Panama refused to sign any agreement. The attempt was renewed in Oct. 1933, when Pres. Harmodio Arias conferred in Washington with the U.S. president. Their basic agreement was refined and incorporated in four treaties, signed March 2, 1936. At the insistence of Panama, the United States was relieved of the obligation to guarantee the independence of the republic and renounced the right to acquire any additional lands and waters outside the Canal Zone. By limiting the use of the zone commissaries to persons employed on the canal and the railroad, the negotiators sought to dissipate a long-standing grievance. It was agreed that Panama was to operate port facilities at Colón and Panama city, that equal opportunities between Panamanian and American employees should be observed, and that the United States should increase the annuity from $250,000 to $430,000. Agreement was also reached on constructing a transisthmian highway. The weakening of the diplomatic structure was further advanced in the 1955 Eisenhower-Remón treaty, which provided for the annual U.S. payment to Panama to be increased to $1,930,000, for equal pay for equal work to Panamanians and U.S. citizens (effective 1958), and for Panamanian concerns to be placed on an equal footing with U.S. companies in contract bidding; the U.S. obtained a 15-year lease for a military base at Rio Hato. The effect of these treaties has been the withdrawal of canal activities to the limits of the Canal Zone and the curtailment of activities within the zone.

The policy of the Canal Zone authorities in the ensuing years was to improve the living conditions of the Panamanians working in the zone and to make changes in the physical features of the canal that would benefit trade in general and Panama's well-being in particular. Among the new policies designed to improve the condition of Panamanian workers were equal wages for equal work, the establishment both of a minimum wage and a labour commission to hear disputes, and the making available of health and life insurance equally to Americans and Panamanians. Capital improvements included the enlargement of Gaillard cut to 500 ft. width and 47 ft. depth (not yet completed), the building of the Thatcher Ferry bridge across the canal, the transfer of certain real estate properties to Panama, and the purchase of new towing locomotives.

But these changes lacked the emotional appeal that was attached to the display of the Panamanian flag. In 1958 and in 1959 the Canal Zone was invaded by Panamanians intent on raising their flag there, and in the latter year their attempt was turned back with injuries. President Eisenhower reviewed the Panamanian claim with sympathy, and in 1960 agreed to the raising of the Panamanian emblem at one point in the Canal Zone as evidence of titular sovereignty (never defined). From this beginning the United States made further concessions until the two flags were displayed almost equally.

A dispute over this very concession between Panamanian and U.S. students at the Balboa high school on January 9, 1964, caused considerable deterioration in relations between the two countries. The subsequent mob assaults on the Canal Zone produced a number of deaths, injuries by the score, and great property damage, requiring the use of U.S. army units and a temporary replacement of civilian by military rule in the Zone. The U.S. embassy was evacuated, and many Americans left their homes for the sanctuary of the Canal Zone. Normal diplomatic relations were restored on April 3. In December U.S. President Lyndon Johnson proposed the negotiation of three new treaties with Panama concerning the existing canal, a new canal at sea level, and U.S. bases, and both countries appointed negotiators for such purpose. Late in 1965 the U.S. and Panama announced that they had agreed to abrogate the 1903 treaty and that the new treaty would recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

During the weeks of discussion the economy of Panama suffered. Trade between the Canal Zone and Panama declined; investment capital was less available; credit became tight and tourism almost ceased. On the other hand, the canal continued to operate without interruption. The enlargement of the Gaillard cut was not slowed down, the new towing locomotives began to arrive, and, of more immediate importance, the illumination of the locks promised to extend the hours of transit.

*See* PANAMA: *History* for further aspects of Panama-U.S. relations; *see* also references under "Panama Canal" in the Index.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—Isthmian Canal Commission, 1899–1902, *Reports*.

International Board of Consulting Engineers, 1906, *Report*.

Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal Studies, *Report on Long Range Program for . . . Panama Canal* to H. R. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries dated June 1, 1960 (H. Rept. 1960, 86th Cong.).

Governor of The Panama Canal, *Report . . . on Means of Increasing Capacity*, March 16, 1939 (H. Doc. 210, 76th Cong.).

"Report on Proposals for Elimination of Pedro Miguel Locks, Panama Canal, Jan. 17, 1944," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 8, p. 10,757 (June 21, 1956).

"Report on Isthmian Canal Studies under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, 1947," summarized in *Am. Soc. Civ. Engrs. Trans.*, vol. 14, pp. 607–796, with discussion, pp. 797–906 (1949).

Bureau of the Budget, "Panama Canal and Panama Railroad," *Report . . . on Organization and Operation*, Jan. 31, 1950 (H. Doc. 460, 81st Cong.).

Panama Canal Company—Canal Zone Government, *Annual Reports*.

U.S. Department of State, *Foreign Rela-*

*tions: The American Republics*, annual volumes.

*Report on United States Relations with Panama*, compiled by Rosita Rieck Bennett (H. Rept. 2218, 86th Cong.).

Comptroller General of the United States, *Annual Reports*.

Hon. Daniel J. Flood, "Panama Canal Zone: Constitutional Domain of the United States," and other addresses 1956–64; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 4, p. 5498 (March 26, 1958).

Hon. Thomas E. Martin, "Panama Canal: Terminal Lake Modernization Program Derived from World War II Experience," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 12, p. 16,504 (Aug. 29, 1957).

Hon. Clark W. Thompson, "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation, 1955–64," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110 (Sept. 2, 1964).

Miles P. DuVal, Jr., "The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution," *Am. Soc. Civ. Engrs. Trans.*, vol. 114, p. 558 (1949).

"Isthmian Canal Policy—An Evaluations," U.S. Nav. Inst. Proc., vol. 81, p. 263 (March 1955).

Brig. Gen. Henry L. Abbot, *Problems of the Panama Canal* (1907).

Ira E. Bennett *et al.*, *History of the Panama Canal* (Builders Ed.). (1915).

Adalphe Godin De Lépinay de Brusly, "Note on the Practical Solution for Crossing the American Isthmus," Congrés International D'Etudes Du Canal Interoceanique . . . Du 15 Au 20 Mai, 1870, *Compte Rendu du Séances*, Paris.

Imprimerie Emile Martinet, 1879, pp. 293–99.

Miles P. DuVal, Jr., *Cadiz to Cathay*, 2nd ed. (1947), *And the Mountains Will Move* (1947).

Almon R. Wright, "Defense Sites Negotiations Between the United States and Panama, 1936–1948," U.S. Department of State *Bulletin*, Aug. 11, 1952, p. 212.

Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals *et al.*, *The Panama Canal: An Engineering Treaties*, 2 vol. (1915).

Maj. Gen. William C. Gorgas, *Sanitation in Panama* (1916).

William L. Silbert and John F. Stevens, *The Construction of the Panama Canal* (1915).

D. C. Miner, *The Fight for the Panama Route: the story of the Spooner Act and the Hay-Herrán treaty* (1940).

## SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AID IS IMPORTANT FACTOR IN GROWTH OF NEW JERSEY BUSINESS

Mr. WALKER. 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, small industrial and service firms in my New Jersey congressional district account for a large part of the total number of businesses in our State. They have contributed millions of dollars to the national economy, provided jobs for thousands of workers, and have also provided products and services essential to the expanding economy of America.

As in the case of many small businesses throughout the United States, they frequently require assistance and guidance in maintaining their competitive position and, more importantly, to develop new products and services demanded by our space age.

The Small Business Administration provides several broad programs of assistance to these small firms, and it is doing an outstanding job of helping America grow and prosper by aiding deserving small firms with management guidance, financing, technical knowledge, and counseling. In many cases, SBA's assistance helps unite community resources with Federal, State, and business factors in a self-help effort inherent in our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the success story of the Pfaff & Kendall Co., of Newark. It is noteworthy because it clearly illustrates how SBA, working with the private business sector, has wisely lent taxpayers' money to expand and modernize a contributing small firms, which in turn provides additional jobs, larger payrolls, and supporting services and taxes.

I am especially pleased to mention this SBA assisted firm, a leading manufacturer of outdoor aluminum lighting standards, because they also are developing additional aluminum products that can materially improve highway safety, and thus decrease the death tolls on our roads and highways in line with the President's highway safety program.

The Pfaff & Kendall Co., of Newark, N.J., was a prewar small firm making columns and doing contract pipe threading. They entered the aluminum pole business in the late 1940's, carefully building the business to its present size with about $5 million in sales.

In 1961 the company had an option to acquire major facilities and property adjoining the plant. Normal banking and loan channels simply could not accommodate the company's money needs, and public financing was not felt to be sound at that time.

Pfaff & Kendall approached the first small business investment company—SBIC—of New Jersey. After a careful investigation, the small business investment company provided $500,000 unrestricted on a 10-year loan with warrants to buy 17 percent of Pfaff & Kendall stock.

Small business investment companies, as you know, are licensed, regulated, and sometimes financed by the Small Business Administration.

The funds supplied by the SBA-licensed small business investment company enabled this company to expand facilities, and almost double its yard and manufacturing capacity. The increased capital also made it possible to carry larger inventories and to better serve its customers more promptly. Pfaff & Kendall's business has increased by some 50 percent since 1961. Further expansion plans, incorporating new products, is expected to further increase business by another 50 percent. This company demonstrates an outstanding example of the application of good management, resourcefulness, and ingenuity.

The Small Business Administration, the first small business investment company of New Jersey, and the Pfaff & Kendall Co., of Newark, are an ever present example of what teamwork can do for our economy, for our people, and for our future. I commend each of them for a fine job.

## NEWARK STAR-LEDGER COMMENTS ON IMPROVING OUR POSTAL SYSTEM

Mr. WALKER. 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, during this session we will face the difficult and complex task of considering revision of postal rates and proposals to improve Post Office Department operations. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the views of the Newark Star-Ledger on the problem, as expressed in an editorial of April 7. The Star-Ledger recommends more realistic postal rates and a complete overhaul of the Post Office Department, with the emphasis on mechanization, as the prescription for improved postal service. This leading newspaper also finds great merit in Postmaster General O'Brien's call for a nonprofit corporation to run our mail delivery system.

Mr. O'Brien's proposal—

The editorial says—

should generate fresh thinking on how the nation's mail dilemma can be resolved.

I include in the RECORD following my remarks:

THE POSTAL DILEMMA

Neither rain nor sleet nor the gloom of night will deter the delivery of the mail, but few will deny that it is getting harder and costlier all the time.

The President, with his announcement of a proposed hike in mail rates, is seeing to it that it will cost more but with no comparable upgrading in service. It's an old story with the Post Office Department . . . more money, more employes, the same archaic methods of operations . . . and more deficits.

But there is something new with the Post Office, a revolutionary proposal by Postmaster O'Brien that the entire operation be placed in the hands of a non-profit government corporation. It may be just what the Post Office needed to jolt it out of the doldrums of the horse-and-buggy age into an automated operation.

Delivering the mail seems to be a relatively simple process, the physical transmission of a letter or package from one address to another; but it is much more complicated than that; present methods are archaic and costly.

The department has been a persistent deficit operation, a condition condoned by Congress mostly for political reasons. Its methods would be the despair of a modern business executive, because the actual cost of running the department has no valid relation to mail rates.

The President's proposed rate increase would reduce the gap between cost and rates, but it would not wipe out the annual deficits that must be picked up by taxpayers. This is particularly true of third class deliveries, the so-called junk mail that is usually thrown away without even opening; the taxpayer is paying for the privilege of receiving mail that he doesn't want in the first place.

The increase in mail rates will be helpful in reducing the postal deficit but the long range solution lies in a complete overhaul of the department, an emphasis on automation. This is not going to be achieved with the present administrative structure; it would be more desirable to have the department removed from direct legislative influence and placed under the management of a board of directors and a professional executive.

This is in line with Postmaster O'Brien's proposal, a finding based on experience in the administration of the department. Mr. O'Brien has frankly told Congress that his agency is in a "race with catastrophe." It is a candid admission that should generate fresh thinking on how the nation's mail dilemma can be resolved.

## FORESTER MILTON M. BRYAN, STRESSES THE WISE AND BALANCED USE OF RESOURCES AT FORESTRY FIELD DAY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. annually holds a Forestry Field Day in a southeastern State. Several years ago many Members of Congress boarded a special train and attended such a forestry field demonstration near Richmond, Va.

This year a special train left Raleigh, N.C., at 8:00 a.m. April 13. On board were Gov. Dan K. Moore, members of the State legislature, the council of State, and some 200 leading industrialists from 25 States throughout the Nation. Another 500 people—landowners, students, and timber operators—were already assembled at the pine woodland near Hoffman, N.C.

Governor Moore, State supervisor of vocational agricultural education, and the State forester gave remarks on forestry in North Carolina. Milton M. Bryan represented the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. His remarks, at a time when many individuals are demanding more restrictive uses of our Nation's forest resources, merit attention and thoughtful consideration:

REMARKS AT HOFFMAN, N.C., BY MILTON M. BRYAN, FOREST SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AT THE COOPERATIVE FIELD FORESTRY PROGRAM OF THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD CO., NEAR HOFFMAN, N.C., APRIL 13, 1967

Working forests are producing forests that affect our economy and touch the lives of us all. From them comes much of the raw material on which many of the industries represented here today depend. They also provide a great variety of other products and services for our Nation.

Woodlands in industrial holdings, National and State Forests, and the small family forests so prevalent in eastern United States are all working forests. More than 70 percent of all timber producing lands is in private ownership. The Seaboard Air Line Railroad Company's forestry field days and sustained efforts to promote multiple use of woodlands are thus a most appropriate and significant contribution.

In the next two hours you will see some exciting examples of wise use and productive management of forest resources in presentations by skilled foresters. But, as we consider the tremendous importance of commercial uses of the forest, let us be sure also to keep in mind the great pressures of an expanding population to use the lands for other purposes than the production of forest products.

Many well-intentioned and articulate individuals are demanding that certain forests in which they are interested be set aside for special uses—such as to serve recreational opportunities or maintain scenic values. I believe we need to be concerned about the fact that the term "conservation," which really means a wise and balanced use of resources, is often interpreted in the narrower sense of "preservation" which excludes timber cutting, wildlife harvest, managed watersheds and forage for livestock. Conservation can and should go hand-in-hand with the multiple uses that make a forest a more profitable and productive resource for all concerned.

The Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly stressed that the forested areas of our country, which coincide to a major degree with the economically depressed areas, possess a great latent potential ready for development and use. In these resources we have an unusual opportunity to protect and improve the economic strength of the Nation so that poverty in localized areas can be alleviated and the production of raw materials needed by industry can be sustained. A built-in-bonus in utilizing this potential is the opportunity to enhance natural beauty and to expand recreational activities.

This broad concept of conservation is practical. As you will see here today, it is being accomplished in North Carolina. In this State, an outstanding State Forestry organization is receiving solid support from the Governor, an informed legislature, a progressive wood-using industry, and many forest land owners.

As leaders in industry, you can do much personally to promote effective management and use of the forest resources in your home States. For example, many State Foresters cannot attract or hold the top flight personnel they must have—simply because of an inadequate salary structure.

Look into the situation when you return home. Find out if your State Forester and his organization are receiving the support in both money and personnel they need to do the job that you know must be done. See if the term "conservation" is being presented to your people in a way that makes sense and that will really generate public support for wise use of resources.

Effective action now is the key to building a sustained supply of the benefits and products of the forest which are needed in larger amounts each year by the people of your State and the Nation.

These are significant challenges for all of us.

## CRIME CONTROL: A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week, the 18th and 19th of April, I sponsored an exhibit in the Rayburn Building entitled "Crime Control: A Look Into the Future." I wish now to express my thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, for your cooperation in making this exhibit possible, and to the Clerk of the House, Mr. Jennings; to Ben Guthrie, of the Clerk's office; to the property custodian, Ed Kellerher; to David Faust, of the superintendent's office; to Tom Campbell, of the catering office; and to the Capitol Police, for their kind and effective assistance.

I believe that the exhibit made a worthwhile contribution toward establishing a Federal research program for crime prevention and detection; and I was gratified that a large number of my colleagues were able to drop by the exhibit and take note of the potential that research offers in the fight against crime.

## CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER PROPOSES LEGISLATION TO GUARANTEE EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—REGARDLESS OF SEX OR AGE

Mr. WALKER. 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 9207 and a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 536. My bill is designed to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to declare a national policy with respect to the right of Americans to employment without regard to sex or age. The resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution to assure equal rights for both men and women.

Fortunately, there has been in the 20th century substantial improvement in the status of women—the 19th amendment ratified less than 50 years ago fostered hope that a general revision of laws and practices to end discrimination against women would follow. But this hope has not been fully realized. The fact is that discrimination against women still exists.

In many States a woman cannot handle or own separate property in the same manner as her husband. Moreover in some States women cannot pursue a profession or engage in business as freely as men can. Inheritance rights of widows differ from those of widowers in several States. Women are often classified separately for purposes of jury duty. Some States have restrictive work laws, which purport to protect women, but in fact result in discrimination in the employment of women. It is time, past time, we correct this undesirable discrimination due to sex, and guarantee under the Constitution equal rights without regard to sex. Proposals for amendments similar to House Joint Resolution 526 have been introduced and favorably reported by the committees in the 81st, 82d, 83d, 86th, and 87th Congresses.

Congress has wasted much valuable time by inaction. I would like to see the 90th Congress go on record as having enacted legislation proposing a long overdue amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing equal rights regardless of sex under both Federal and State law.

My bill, H.R. 9007, would, when passed, record that the 90th Congress declared a national policy with respect to the right of Americans to employment without regard to sex or age. This bill, as my joint resolution, proposes to eliminate discrimination due to sex, but in this instance, discrimination particularly in regard to employment. Much of what I said regarding the joint resolution also pertains to this bill, so, rather than be repetitive, I shall devote my time to the problems of employment discrimination due to age.

Nobody would support a national policy of "discriminating" against older workers where there is no reason for it. But this very practice is developing in private employment which more and more is getting to the point of excluding persons of 40 or 50, let alone 60, from new employment.

We have learned that a person of 65 years of age is still capable of rendering a valuable contribution to his society. An ever increasing body of information reveals the considerable extent to which age as an invariable cause of significantly diminished work capacity has been exaggerated. The reservoir of competence and responsibility in the senior citizens of this country is a vast natural asset which is not fully employed. There are today over 17 million Americans over 65—many who could contribute valuable services to their country. In 1964, approximately half of all private job openings were barred to applicants over 55; a quarter to those over 45; and almost all to those over 65.

In 1966, there were at all times about three-quarters of a million unemployed workers 45 years and over. Over three-quarters of a billion dollars in unemployment insurance was paid out in 1964 to workers 45 and over. Moreover, older workers bear a disproportionate share of long-term unemployment and more than half of the Nation's poor families are headed by persons 45 and over.

This bill is not designed to give any person more than he or she is worth but to assure every person the opportunity to work and contribute to the economy and the progress of our Nation, to the full extent of his capacities.

We are living in a sharply competitive world and we need the skill and productivity of all people. A man capable of rendering an honest day's work should have the opportunity to do it. Ability, physical and mental endeavors should determine employability, not the calendar. Age should not arbitrarily be the criterion of capacity. An older American should not be treated as a second-class citizen in terms of job opportunities.

## AMERICAN HOMEMAKER OF TOMORROW

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STUCKEY] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, this month 50 young ladies traveled to Williamsburg, Va., from every corner of the United States to compete in the Betty Crocker Search for the American Homemaker of Tomorrow. These young women had already competed with 581,000 other high school seniors. And, they were the winners from their home States.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Betty Crocker award is to assist our schools in inspiring in the young women of our Nation a deeper awareness and understanding of the place of the American home in our society and economy, and Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fine program, because we all know that today's student homemakers are the mothers of tomorrow's children. And with the complex problems that are facing our young people—the increasing juvenile delinquency and crime rate; classrooms becoming more crowded every day, qualified teachers too few to go around—we all know the evergrowing importance of the home and its influence on our youth.

Miss Sharon Diane Smith of Cook County High School in Adel, Ga., was our State's winner, and I am proud of Miss Smith. She has brought honor to the young women of Georgia's Eighth Congressional District.

When Miss Smith was in Washington last week before going on to Williamsburg and the national contest, she came and visited me in my office, and this young woman, with her vitality, sparkle, and self-assuredness made me confident that tomorrow's children are in good hands.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all of our young homemakers who participated in this contest, and to thank Sharon Diane Smith for representing Georgia and the Eighth Congressional District so well.

## THE THIRD SEDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, tonight in south Florida a communitywide Third Seder is being held by the Israel Histadrut Committee and the Greater Miami Committee for Medical Services in Israel. It marks the beginning of a month-long celebration of the State of Israel's 19th anniversary of independence.

The Third Seder was initiated in America 35 years ago by the late Isaac Hamlin. This year it will mark a memorial to the 6 million Jewish victims of the Hitler regime and it will recognize the 24th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

The guest speaker will be U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. Awards will be presented to Leo Mindlin, retiring executive editor of the Jewish Floridian, who will receive the first annual Isaac Hamlin Memorial Award, and to Mr. and Mrs. Morris Newmark, who will receive the Israel-Histadrut Pioneers Award for their generosity. Announcement will be made of the completion of the Greater Miami Amal Vocational High School in Ramleh, Israel.

This occasion is certainly a tribute to freedom and independence—a memorial to those who died and those who rebelled against tyranny, a celebration of the independence of the Jewish State, and the foundation of a place of education, the core of freedom.

## NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the over 900,000 boys and girls who are daily protecting approximately 19 million school children in this country are deserving of special recognition, I believe. For that reason, I am introducing a joint resolution designating the second week of each May as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

Most, if not all of my colleagues, are aware, I am sure, of these youngsters who give their time in order to protect their fellow students at street crossings and on school buses.

Although the patrol idea was tried for brief periods in various parts of the Nation as early as 1916, it was not until 1922 that the idea really took hold. At that time the American Automobile Association, with the assistance of the Chicago Motor Club, began the patrols on a nationwide scale.

Since 1922, the traffic death rate of school-age children has dropped nearly one-half, while the death rate of all other age groups has doubled. A significant achievement, obtained at least in part by the work of these young patrols.

Since today so many of our youngsters attend school by way of school bus service, the patrols have been extended successfully into this area of protecting their fellow students.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following seven duties outlined for the patrol member who is assigned to sit at the front of the schoolbus:

FRONT BUS PATROL MEMBER'S DUTIES

1. When the bus stops to pick up waiting pupils, he leaves his regularly assigned seat in the front of the bus, dismounts and takes his position beside and facing the step so that he may, if necessary, aid children entering the bus. If it is necessary for children to cross the roadway to get to the bus, he shall look both ways for approaching ve-

hicles, and upon signal from the bus driver, who has also been watching traffic from all directions, that it is safe for children to cross, the Patrol member shall signal for them to do so. He boards the bus last.

2. Upon arrival at school, he is first off the bus, taking his station beside and facing the bus step and lending assistance, if necessary, to dismounting pupils.

3. When school is dismissed, with the assistance of the REAR Patrol member, he shall see that pupils enter the bus in an orderly manner and without delay, forming pupils in line if necessary. (It is the duty of non-bus School Safety Patrol members to keep non-bus riding pupils away from the bus loading and maneuvering area.) When the bus door opens, the FRONT Patrol member shall, from his position beside and facing the step, lend assistance, if necessary, to children entering the bus.

4. When the bus has stopped to discharge pupils, he shall check on children leaving, standing in front of them out of the way of the door opening apparatus. He shall alight first, and assist, when necessary, dismounting pupils.

5. If children must cross the roadway, he shall take a position, five steps in front of the bus and even with the left front fender, which will enable him to see clearly the driver's signal to cross. Children should remain behind the Patrol member until both he and the bus driver have looked both ways to make certain that all approaching traffic has stopped. *Upon signal from the bus driver that it is safe to cross*, the Patrol member then motions for the children to do so.

6. When the children have reached the other side of the roadway, he boards the bus and takes his regular seat.

7. When the bus stops at a railroad grade crossing he may alight, walk to the tracks, look both ways and then give the signal for the bus to proceed if no train is in sight. Such duties on the part of a Bus Patrol member shall in no way lessen the responsibility of the driver to stop and look both ways and to assure himself that no train is coming before starting across the tracks.

## FORESTRY SCIENCES LABORATORY ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, an appropriation of $700,000 is needed now to construct the Forestry Sciences Laboratory at Albuquerque, N. Mex. Funds for planning a laboratory for forestry research at Albuquerque were included in the fiscal year 1965 appropriation for the Forest Service, and the plans and specifications for the building are complete.

Forest Service scientists have been located at Albuquerque, partly in rented space and partly in space provided by the University of New Mexico. The university has urgent need for its rooms. Laboratories and specialized facilities required for present research programs cannot be developed in the rented quarters. To ease this situation for both parties, the university leased a site on the campus to the Forest Service for construction of a research laboratory.

The research to be housed in the proposed laboratory includes studies both of insects and diseases affecting southwestern forests and of methods for rehabilitating depleted watershed and range lands. Field studies need to be backed up by laboratory research using the latest techniques and specialized equipment. For example, growth chambers providing controlled environments are needed in many investigations. These special facilities would be provided by the proposed construction.

Forests and woodlands, covering about 26 percent of the area of New Mexico and Arizona, are subject to destructive outbreaks of bark beetles. The annual loss during the past 10 years has approximated $1 million. Defoliating insects cause additional loss. Studies of the physiology and life history of the insects responsible are basic to the development of safe and effective controls. Losses from diseases also are substantial, and the causes must be isolated and studied as the first step toward control.

In some areas of the Southwest, grazing of livestock and game has aggravated natural erosion problems. The results are depleted grazing capacity and heavy sedimentation of stream channels. Efforts to improve the range and to put protective cover on unstable soils show the need for research to develop a substantial fund of knowledge. This research is essential to maintain and improve the fundamental soundness of land use in the arid Southwest.

I regret that the subcommittee failed to include funds for this budgeted and most worthy project.

## CINCO DE MAYO: AN EXAMPLE FOR THE WORLD

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the 5th day of May is truly one of the most proud and memorable days in the history of this hemisphere. On this day in 1862 a foreign army was defeated on Mexican soil. The invaders were French troops seeking to pave the way for the liberation and regeneration of Mexico. Their orders were to secure the country and await the arrival and imposition of a monarchial rule under Archduke Maximilian, younger brother of the Hapsburg Emperor of Austria.

The French believed they came as liberators of an oppressed people. Napoleon III of France had been wrongly counseled by Mexican dissidents that a French army would be welcomed promptly by the people of Mexico. The invaders landed on the Mexican coast at Vera Cruz; meeting little resistance, they proceeded inland toward the capitol at Mexico City.

The self-styled liberators advanced upon Puebla, where, the French commander had been assured, the priests and their parishioners would welcome them with "clouds of incense," and the population would "fling wreaths of flowers about their necks." They were sadly mistaken. Instead, they were met by an army of ex-guerrillas led by amateur generals armed with outdated weapons which the British had captured from the first Napoleon at Waterloo and subsequently sold to the Mexican Government.

The French general, confident of a swift and glorious victory over a "ragtag," undisciplined band, ordered his troops to attack the center of the Mexican fortification—the steep slopes of the Cerro de Guadalupe. He succeeded in adding a new national holiday to the Mexican calendar. On May 5, 1862, the French Army, with the loss of more than a thousand men, was driven back to Orizaba and the coast.

But the French were already too deeply committed to withdraw from Mexico. Napoleon's choice was to escalate, rather than to lose face. He deployed over thirty thousand more troops, plus an additional number of cannon, and eventually managed to overwhelm the bankrupt, hard-pressed forces of the government and impose their rule upon the nation. The liberal government of Benito Juarez was slowly driven across the border into this country. Guerrilla warfare against the "liberators" never ceased and, in fact, large sections of the country were never fully pacified by the monarchy.

During this tragic period, the United States was deep in the throes of the Civil War, making support of the Mexican Government impossible, even against such a clear transgression of the spirit and letter of the Monroe Doctrine.

The much harrassed French and their cohorts were driven out of Mexico in 1867. On June 19 of that year, Emperor Maximilian, a sad and misinformed victim of an unsuccessful attempt to subjugate a proud and brave people, died before a firing squad on the Hill of Bells.

The message which was written into history that day at Puebla is of great significance to all the world. The defenders of Puebla and the people of Mexico stand out as one of the great champions of freedom, self-determination, and independence.

It is a tribute to these people that they were not led astray by those among them who sought to deliver their country unto the hands of a foreign invader. Their perseverance and silence had betrayed a burning ardor in their hearts for freedom and justice. An ardor which was to erupt 43 years later into a demand for fundamental transformation of the Mexican society.

Mr. Speaker, as one scans through the many chapters of Mexican history, he cannot but be instilled with a deep pride and admiration for the great Mexican people and their Republic. They have overcome countless obstacles and continued on to forge a new society for themselves, and the example they hold forth to the world is enviable to all.

We in the Southwestern United States are extremely proud of the many Mexicans who chose to settle in this country.

Throughout the Southwest we are continually exposed to the rich Latin culture, architecture, and language. And, may I stress, Mr. Speaker, the legacy that these people brought with them from Mexico—a strong will, determination, and courage which made possible the stand and victory at Puebla on Cinco de Mayo in 1862, has given this society the best that a people can offer.

## SUCCESS IN SOUTHWEST SCHOOLS

Mr. WALKER. 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 New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion recently of the schools in Southwest Washington, particularly the new trischool elementary system. In some cases, I believe, there has been more heat than light. Thus, I was pleased to read recently the very straightforward and objective report in the Washington Star on the Southwest schools.

As a member of the District of Columbia Committee here in Congress I am concerned about education in the District. As the father of five school-age children, I have a personal interest in Southwest schools. Next year our youngest child will attend kindergarten at Amidon. Currently, I have three children at Jefferson Junior High and one at Western High.

Like all parents, Mrs. Fraser and I are concerned about our children's education. Before moving into Southwest Washington from the suburbs we visited Jefferson and Western and were, frankly, pleasantly surprised. We talked to counselors and principals and observed the students. After some months in these schools we find they compare favorably with the public schools they attended in Montgomery County, Md., and in Minneapolis, Minn., my home district.

This does not mean that our schools in Washington, Montgomery County, or Minneapolis, do not need more financial help. They do—all of them. But we also need to have confidence in our public schools. They need our support and our encouragement, not blanket criticism and condemnation. Improving education for all children ought to be our goal.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert the Star's article with this goal in mind. It illustrates the improvements already taking place as a result of education bills passed by Congress. I hope it will encourage Members to vote needed appropriations for District of Columbia schools and other education bills. We need this money to bring all schools in the District and in the Nation up to the level of the best Southwest schools and we need to go on from there.

Education is our best national—and local—investment; to neglect it is to impoverish future generations.

The article follows:

STRONG START OF THREE MERGED SCHOOLS IS QUIETING COMPLAINTS

(By John Stacks)

Six months ago many parents in Southwest Washington were swearing at the city's school superintendent, condemning the board of education and threatening to yank their children out of the area's elementary schools.

Their anger was provoked by the board's plan to merge the three schools in the Southwest.

The huge urban renewal effort in Southwest had left school populations in relatively isolated sections. The new high-rise luxury apartments and smart town houses were clustered in such a way that children from the upper-income housing all went to Amidon.

Amidon also had slightly more than half its student body coming to school from garden-type public housing. Syphax and Bowen schools served exclusively low-income areas, including a giant high-rise public housing project at 1200 Delaware Ave.

The plan for the merger called for two grades at each school—first and second at Syphax, third and fourth at Amidon and fifth and sixth at Bowen. Each school also houses its own kindergarten classes.

Opposition to the merger was strong. It included, along with parents of Amidon children, Supt. Carl F. Hansen, who obviously feared for the future of Amidon, the cradle of his well-known program in basic education.

But strong pressure was coming from another group of new Southwest parents who disliked the educational differences between Amidon and her sister schools and who also apparently were concerned about a rising resentment against the luxury home and apartment dwellers that seemed to be building up in the poorer sections of their community.

These parents wanted the merger and were backed by parents in the poorer areas of Southwest, who were organized by antipoverty workers.

Vocal opposition to the plan has now subsided. Mrs. Elaine Jenkins, community coordinator for the three schools, reports she has had no complaints in the last month. Complaints from parents before that were largely minor and mechanical and easily taken care of, she said.

While it has been reported that racial integration was the aim of the merger, it was in fact socio-economic integration and the elimination of obvious differences in educational quality that were the aims of the school board.

Thus the final success of the tri-school plan will hinge on its ability to keep and attract middle-income families, both Negro and white, and to raise the quality of education in all three schools.

While it is too early to pronounce the merger plan a complete success, the early indications are that in its first semester of operation the merger is off to a very strong start.

Some Amidon children did leave the area before the merger was accomplished, but school officials maintain the rate of transfer to other schools was no greater than normal and that the tranfers were balanced by new registrations.

Since the January merger there has been no change, officials insist, in the overall socio-economic balance in the three schools. The ratio of poor children to others remains about 90 percent to 10 percent in the 2,000-pupil system. The very smallness of the latter portion makes it all the more remarkable that the ratio has not changed substantially.

In the period from January to mid-April, Amidon Elementary School lost 23 pupils, 12 Negro and 11 white. Only one of these children went to a private school. Officials calculate that only one of the Negro transfers was living in the upper-income housing and that most of the white transfers involved moves out of the Washington area associated with fathers being assigned new duties with the government.

Transfers into Amidon since January give the school a net loss of two white and a gain of eight Negro children.

Nineteen children, all Negroes, left the Bowen School. Transfers into the school left it with a net gain of two white children and a loss of 14 Negro children.

Twenty-eight children left Syphax elementary but incoming transfers left the school with a gain of one white child and a loss of nine Negro children.

The net change in all three schools leaves the overall proportion of white and Negro children nearly unchanged. The ratio of public housing to upper-income housing children is also unchanged.

At this point, at least the merger has been remarkably successful in its ability to hold children. More significant results will be seen in September, however. About 30 parents are known to be applying to private schools, and others will undoubtedly leave the area. But new high-rise housing is opening in the Southwest and so other children will move in. The economic balance when school opens in the fall will be the first hard indicator of the plan's attractiveness to middle-income families.

School officials are moving ahead with plans to improve the education children in the Southwest will receive. Each school now has full-time specialists in reading, art, music, language and physical education. Most schools in the city must share such special services on a one-time a week basis.

Teachers, always the decisive factor in successful learning, are now participating in an imaginative program operated by Arena Stage in which their ability to perform—literally—in front of a class is being improved. So-called theatre games are being taught so that teachers can use role-playing and student dramatizations as methods of teaching material.

The National Teacher Corps has placed four full-time teachers and four part-time teachers in the Bowen school. All schools are now qualified under Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Act for special federal funds.

On May 1, a series of twice-a-week "special interest" classes will be scheduled in the afternoon that will permit children to select their own subject matter.

These special classes also will permit much more interchange between the socio-economic groups than is now occurring. When the merger was accomplished, classes were moved intact with their teachers. Thus, at the moment, children formerly at Amidon are still in classes with the children they knew at Amidon, and the children from Bowen and Syphax are still not mixed with the Amidon children in classrooms.

After-school activities and such special activities as school safety patrols are organized with an eye toward bolstering maximum contact between the two groups. The principals in the three schools report no serious incidents between children of the different groups and they continue to believe that, left alone, the children will get along well.

At the regular meeting of the District Board of Education last week, two parents from Southwest came to congratulate the board members and the school administration on the early success of the merger.

And they suggested that the administration and the board begin planning now for classroom organization for the fall. Some tri-school officials believe that strict reading group classes should be followed, even though this will have the effect of keeping most of the Amidon children together.

One of the school principals, William Boyd of Bowen, favors following Supt. Hansen's suggested plan of grouping children

by achievement only in reading, and allowing other classes to consist of children from all achievement levels.

Still others in the system favor extensive use of team teaching and the elimination of grades and tracks as they now are used in the elementary system.

When parents this week asked for decisions on the organization plans, Supt. Hansen replied with a request that the parents give him their suggestions.

Both parents and school officials seem determined to avoid what could be a destructive fight over organization. If Hansen's Amidon plan and the track system are pitted against other forms of organization, a largely symbolic argument would follow that would have the effect of making the tri-school plan a test of political strength rather than a significant rational experiment in education.

Flexible discussion of grouping plans may well produce a combination of ideas designed to best serve all the children in the merged schools.

There is now apprehension on the part of the three school principals that the children transferred from their schools to one of the others in the subsystem may be getting shortchanged in their new schools.

Mrs. Virginia Miller, principal at Amidon, reports more behavior problems in her school since the merger. She refused to comment on the quality of her new, merged teaching staff and plainly wonders about the success of former Amidon pupils in other schools.

Boyd, on the other hand, wonders about his children now at Amidon. He has devoted himself to the problems of disadvantaged children and is concerned that the care he was giving may not be available in the other schools.

Interestingly, the concern for the children runs in other directions, concern for the Amidon child now in what was always a low-income school and concern for the disadvantaged child who is now in Amidon.

This two-way concern is probably healthy. Those in charge of the merged schools recognize it and point out that it indicates involvement of both economic ends of the neighborhood in the future of the plan.

Another community-wide concern has been the assignment of tri-school graduates to junior high school. In the past, Amidon children went to Jefferson Junior High while Bowen and Syphax children went to Randall Junior High.

In effect, the junior high assignments were extensions of the differences between Amidon and her two sister schools, so this week school officials announced that all tri-school children would be permitted to go to Jefferson.

Another high school official also indicated he is attempting to get funds and staff to make Randall a copy of the highly successful Jefferson program so that both the secondary schools in Southwest will be comparable.

As was the case before the merger, the success of the tri-school plan hinges on parental confidence. At this point confidence appears high and most parents and school officials are optimistic. And the school administration seems to be making every effort to insure future confidence and success in the Southwest experiment.

## POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General O'Brien's "daring" proposal to transfer the responsibility for operating our postal service to a nonprofit government corporation warrants full consideration. That is the conclusion reached by the Lewiston Daily Sun, as expressed in a recent editorial. It is the same conclusion that hundreds of newspapers and millions of private citizens across the land—and many Members of Congress—have reached. With permission granted I insert the Daily Sun's editorial in the RECORD:

DARING POST OFFICE PLAN

The surprise plan of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien to put the Post Office Department on a professional, businesslike basis, while abolishing one of the juiciest political plums in the federal system, his own job, is as daring as it is novel. That he takes a realistic view of the operation is obvious, however, in his stipulation that the huge department, which reaches into every city and town in the United States, should be operated as a non-profit government corporation. The department has run at a deficit for years.

Traditionally, the postmaster general has been chosen in recognition of his service to the elected President. While able men have held the position, their knowledge and experience in the handling of the U.S. Mails have been incidental. Meanwhile, the department has grown to huge proportions, as the volume of mail has mounted steadily.

As the Post Office business has mushroomed, so have the postal deficits. Rate increases—and another is under study by Congress at this time—have failed to keep the department out of the red.

O'Brien has been determined to modernize the department and introduce businesslike methods in it. That is no easy task in a federal agency which has existed in substantially the same form since 1829 and in which tradition has carried more weight than business judgment.

In proposing the setting up of a corporation, along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to take over the operation of the Post Office Department, O'Brien is seeking a changeover of mammoth proportions. If approved, it would mean that the department would be freed from policy decisions by act of Congress, and released from much of the political pressure it now is under.

Putting the postal service on a businesslike basis is such a desirable objective that it warrants giving the daring O'Brien proposal full consideration.

## NASA AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with a very grave question which goes to the heart of the democratic process—whether an agency of our Government has the unqualified right to withhold from the public and Members of Congress information which is crucial to a congressional investigation of a vitally important matter.

If Federal agencies have this right, then the elected representatives of the people cannot perform their function of making policy and watching over the expenditures of public funds to insure that they are not squandered and that the recipients of public funds fulfill their commitments. Certainly there is no right to conceal information to avoid embarrassment or to cover up inefficiency and negligence. The matters on which I will comment today constitute a crucial case in the long fight for freedom of information.

The House Science and Astronautics Committee, of which I am a member, has been investigating the circumstances which led to the Apollo fire on January 27, 1967, which claimed the lives of three brave astronauts.

Apparently because of failures by NASA and its contractor, North American Aviation, their lives were unnecessarily sacrificed.

During the course of the hearings it was revealed that on December 19, 1965, 13 months before the Apollo fire, Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, Apollo Program Director, sent a covering letter along with a report to North American Aviation, the principal Apollo contractor. It became clear that the Phillips report critically discussed the performance of North American Aviation. It also became clear that the report has a vitally important bearing on the management competence of North American Aviation and the supervisory competence of NASA, both of which are now in question.

Because of the crucial importance of the Phillips report to our investigation, I requested that it be made available in its entirety to the Science and Astronautics Committee and that NASA and North American Aviation be examined concerning its contents. The public, which pays for the second most expensive governmental program, is entitled to know the facts.

In spite of the obvious relevance and importance of the Phillips report, NASA has refused to produce it. It has not refused because the divulgence of its contents would impair national security. It has not refused because it was a classified document. And it has not refused because the administration claimed "executive privilege" which can only be asserted by the President. In fact, there is no rationale for the suppression of the report. All that NASA would say was that NASA always complied with Congress' "real needs."

I continued to request the report both privately and publicly. Then on Saturday, April 15, 1967, in response to continuing pressure to release the Phillips report, Mr. Webb sent a letter to the subcommittee chairman with an attached memorandum referred to as a summary. The so-called summary is no substitute for the full report. Mr. Webb describes it as being in essence the same as the testimony before the Senate Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences on April 13.

I have now seen a copy of the Phillips report. It is now clear to me why NASA refused to divulge its contents. The reason is simple. It is not that the report would damage the national interest or security. It is not that the space program would be jeopardized. It is simply that the truth concerning NASA's failure properly to supervise Apollo operations and incredible mismanagement on the part of NASA's major Apollo contractor is highly embarrassing.

In a democracy no agency should be

permitted to withhold critical information for its own protection. On the contrary, the public which, at a tremendous cost, is financing NASA's efforts in space, has a right to know how its money is being spent. The $25 billion for the moon program is nothing compared to the costs that will ensue later as NASA's future plans unfold. These plans are in some way inconsistent with the recommendations of the scientific community. These plans are in some ways very exciting and remarkable. To be sure, the costs involved are astronomical. Yet the public has not been allowed to review these plans and to approve of future expenditures.

The Phillips report does not discuss these future plans. But it does give the American people some basis for evaluating the performance of those who will be shaping these plans at vast public expense.

In its effort to hide the facts NASA tried to convince the Congress that, although the Phillips report might have been critical, all the deficiencies mentioned in the report were cleared up long before the Apollo fire. The facts are to the contrary.

An April 5, 1967, the Apollo Review Board made its findings. These findings were made 16 months after the Phillips report was sent to North American Aviation. The similarity between the two sets of findings shows that NASA knew of management's incompetence a full 13 months before the tragic fire. The only reasonable and objective conclusion is that North American Aviation did not clear up the deficiencies pointed out in the Phillips report and that NASA did not exercise proper supervision thereafter.

The covering letter dated December 19, 1965, from Gen. Samuel C. Phillips to Mr. J. L. Atwood, president of North American Aviation, states:

I am definitely not satisfied with the progress and outlook of either program (S–II and CSM) . . . Even with due consideration of hopeful signs, I could not find a substantive basis for confidence in future performance.

According to the Phillips report:

The review was conducted as a result of the continual failure of NAA to achieve the progress required to support the objective of the Apollo Program.

The following abbreviated items from the Phillips report of December 19, 1965, and their close correlation with many findings of the Apollo Review Board may be of interest:

Phillips report: "At the start of the CSM and S–II programs, key milestones were agreed upon, performance requirements established and cost plans developed. These were essentially commitments made by NAA to NASA. As the program progressed NASA has been forced to accept slippages in key milestone accomplishments, degradation in hardware performance, and increasing costs."

Apollo Review Board: ". . . during this period (October 7 to December 20, 1966) the Apollo Program Director made a decision to conduct a Recertification Review to be conducted during the month of December 1966. This action was deemed necessary in view of the large number of action items resulting from the initial review, with many remaining open. The selected date of December 21, 1966, for this second review was influenced by a slippage in the launch schedule caused by the delay in completion of the Environmental Control Sub-system . . . to correct a previously-identified deficiency . . ."

Phillips report: "Inadequate procedures and controls in bonding and welding, as well as inadequate master tooling, have delayed fabrication. In addition there are still major development problems to be resolved. SPS engine life, RCS performance, stress corrosion, and failure of oxidizer tanks has resulted in degradation of the Block I spacecraft as well as forced postponement of the resolution of the Block II spacecraft configuration."

Apollo Review Board: "The purpose of the First Article Configuration Inspection (FACI) is to establish the Configuration Baseline for the spacecraft. It is accomplished by establishing the relationship of the spacecraft as described by released engineering documentation (drawings, specifications) to the spacecraft as manufactured, assembled, and tested. The FACI checkpoint has been implemented for Block II spacecraft only. It was not implemented for S/C 012 . . ."

Phillips report: "NAA performance on both programs (S–II & CSM) is characterized by continued failure to meet committed schedule dates with required technical performance and within costs. There is no evidence of current improvement in NAA's management of these programs of the magnitude required to give confidence that NAA performance will improve at the rate required to meet established Apollo program objectives."

Apollo Review Board: "At the time of shipment of the spacecraft to KSC, the contractor submitted an incomplete list of open items. A revision of the said list significantly and substantially enlarged the list of open items. The true status of the spacecraft was not identified by the contractor."

Phillips report: "With the first unmanned flight spacecraft finally delivered to KSC, there are still significant problems remaining for both block I and block II CSM's. Technical problems with electrical power capacity, service propulsion, structural integrity, weight growth, etc., have yet to be resolved. Test stand activation and undersupport of GSC still retard schedule progress. Delayed and compromised ground and qualification test programs give us serious concern that fully qualified flight vehicles will not be available to support the lunar landing program."

Apollo Review Board: "Unsatisfactory Report. Category: Spacecraft. System: EPS. U.R. No.: A–054. Contractor Part Name: Cable Harness Assembly (Crew Compartment). Date reported: 10–11–66. Supplier: NAA. Mission: Apollo. Serial No.: 012. Unsatisfactory Condition: This Unsatisfactory Report documents a recurring problem concerning bent pins in S/C electrical connectors, which if not corrected, could seriously impair the checkout schedules and/or jeopardize subsequent Apollo Missions.

"Review of Pre-FRR (Flight Readiness Review) report completed by NAA on January 27, 1967: 'During the Combined Systems Test at Downey, several caution and warning light indications could not be verified. Troubleshooting isolated the problem to an open circuit within terminal block assembly No. I behind the Main Display Console. An x-ray examination . . . revealed seven pins not properly inserted. The pin insertions in the remaining 31 similar TB assemblies installed in the S/C were examined. This examination revealed nine additional discrepant terminal block assemblies.' "

Phillips report: "Effective planning and control from a program standpoint does not exist. . . . The program managers do not define, monitor, or control the interfaces between the various organizations supporting their program."

Apollo Review Board: "300 Materials do not meet the (flammability test) criteria established . . . 650 Materials have no status as to acceptability. Due to the type of information . . . used by NAA to compile the material usage list, exact location and amount used is not available in the majority of the cases. Such information is obtainable only by drawing review. This activity is not planned by NAA. In addition, subcontractor compliance has not been either imposed or obtained in all cases. Due to this lack of information, an engineering decision cannot be made on whether a serious problem does or does not exist nor can an assessment be made on the effect on the reliability from a toxicity and flammability standpoint."

Phillips report: "The condition of hardware shipped from the factory, with thousands of hours of work to complete, is unsatisfactory to NASA. S&ID must complete all hardware at the factory and further implement, without delay, an accurate system to certify configuration of delivered hardware, properly related to the DD 250."

Apollo Review Board: "Two revisions were made to the original Command Module DD Form 250. The first (original) DD 250 did not reflect the true status of the Command Module in that it did not include all of the actual part shortages nor did it list the equipment removed to facilitate shipment. To correct the status of the Command Module, the second CM DD 250 was written. After shipment, additional discrepancies were discovered in the 'as shipped' hardware configuration status . . . The third CM DD 250 was written to correct the status of the Command Module . . . items requiring Downey action which were not completed at NAA-Downey were transferred to KSC on the DD 250."

Phillips report: "NAA quality is not up to NASA required standards. This is evidenced by the large number of 'correction' E.O.'s and manufacturing discrepancies. This deficiency is further compounded by the large number of discrepancies that escape NAA inspectors but are detected by NASA inspectors. NAA must take immediate and effective action to improve the quality of workmanship and to tighten their own inspection. Performance goals for demonstrating high quality must be established, and trend data must be maintained and given serious attention by management to correct this unsatisfactory condition."

Apollo Review Board: ". . . As a result of review of open work, it was found that a large number of engineering changes (had to be) incorporated into the S/C at KSC. Many of these changes resulted from non-fit or non-function problems . . . The large number of changes made it difficult to establish the vehicle configuration."

Phillips report: "Poor workmanship is evidenced by the continual high rates of rejection and MRB actions which result in rework that would not be necessary if the workmanship had been good. . . . A practical system of measuring work accomplished vs. work planned must be implemented and used to gauge and to improve the effectiveness of the labor force."

Apollo Review Board. Review of test findings, August 19, 1966: "Failure of ECS Measurements. The water-glycol pump package pressure measurements was found defective . . . The transducer for water-glycol pump inlet pressure measurement was not replaced and NAA's request for waiver was granted. CO2 Partial Pressure Gage. When power was turned on, the gage went to full scale deflection and triggered the caution and warning system. Additional testing was accomplished prior to shipment and gage operation was determined to be satisfactory although Automatic Checkout Equipment readouts did not correspond. The master caution and warning light triggered with no visible indication on the individual display

when the glycol evaporator steam backpressure was operated. The problem was found to be a switch which was removed and replaced. A retest with the new switch was not performed and was transferred as open work to KSC . . . Use of Velcro and other materials in the CM was not considered desirable and was unsatisfactory for flight. Investigation of the CM crew compartment was performed with identification of undesirable materials listed prior to shipment of the spacecraft."

Phillips report: "Work task management—General orders, task authorizations, product plans, etc., are broad and almost meaningless from a standpoint of defining end products. Detailed definitions of work tasks are available at the 'doing level'; however, these 'work plans' are not reviewed, approved, or controlled by the program managers. There is no effective reporting system to management that evaluates performance against plans. Plans are changed to reflect performance. Trends and performance indices reporting is almost nonexistent."

Apollo Review Board: "The purpose of a CDR (Critical Design Review) is to formally review the design of a spacecraft when the design is essentially complete and is intended to precede the release of engineering drawings for manufacture. This review for S/C 012 . . . was accomplished after the S/C had been released for manufacturing.

"Shakedown inspection is . . . to detect and record hardware discrepancies . . . On investigation, it was learned that there were shakedown inspections performed prior to major test and milestones. However, these inspections were performed without definitive inspection criteria.

"Inspection procedures just prior to C/M hatch installation were reviewed . . . White Room space and weight loading limitations prevented having an Inspector witness these functions . . .

"Analysis revealed that constraints lists are signed only by NASA/NAA Operations and Engineering with no NASA or NAA Quality control signature indicating approval of the constraints lists.

"Panel 6 investigated the requirements for retesting of components or subsystems after rework. APOP–T–502, Discrepancy Recording System, covers the retest requirement, but there is no requirement to keep the discrepancy records open until the retest has been verified. The records are closed out with a statement that the retest will be done in a subsequent test. This can then be deleted by on-the-spot deviations in a subsequent test.

"In an attempt to obtain a complete subsystem history from the records, considerable difficulty was experienced. This was due to the fact that the records are not maintained by subsystem."

Phillips report: "Incentivization of the S–II program should be delayed until NASA is assured that the S–II program is under control and a responsible proposal is received from the contractor. Decision on a follow-on incentive contract for the CSM, beyond the present contract period, will be based on contractor performance."

Apollo Review Board: "The overall communication system was unsatisfactory . . . Deficiencies in design, manufacture, installation, rework and quality control existed in the electrical wiring . . . These deficiencies created an unnecessarily hazardous condition and their continuation would imperil any future Apollo operations . . . There were 113 significant Engineering Orders not accomplished at the time Command Module 012 was delivered to NASA . . . Problems of program management . . . and with the contractor have led to insufficient response to changing program requirements."

Mr. Speaker, the danger of an agency arrogating to itself the power to suppress important facts is clear. It is time for NASA to face Congress and the public. NASA's refusal to let the public know what failures General Phillips found and to compare these failures with the continued failures which led up to the Apollo fire deprives the public and the Congress of the means to pass judgment upon NASA's operations. NASA should have made the full report public in the first instance. It can still do so.

In the past NASA has pursued a policy of openness in conducting the space program. That is consistent with our society and with the original NASA act which provides that—

> Information obtained or developed by the Administrator in the performance of his functions shall be made available for public inspection. . . .

And that nothing in the NASA act "shall authorize the withholding of information by the Administrator from the duly authorized committees of the Congress."

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 60 minutes, on April 27, with respect to beef imports.

Mr. HALL, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, May 2, on the subject of "Death Tax on Youth Leadership Training."

Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN), for 60 minutes, on May 2; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RYAN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. RANDALL, for 1 hour, on May 8.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington to revise and extend her remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include tables.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey to include extraneous matter made in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEITH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEE.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. EILBERG.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 27, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

696. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 7, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on Wilson Harbor, N.Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted September 26, 1963 (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

697. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the management of aircraft parts reserved for maintenance activities at depots in the continental United States, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

698. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the recordation of mining claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

699. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for the operation of Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport by the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

700. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a carrier to refund a portion of the freight charges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

701. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the use of funds to provide additional research laboratory space at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., pursuant to the provisions of 79 Stat. 192, 193; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, and other laws relating to housing and urban development, to correct certain obsolete references (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1216. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for use by the

Secretary of Defense for acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 215). 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. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 9161. A bill to amend the section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 9163. A bill to authorize the waiver of recovery of certain payments made by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9164. A bill to provide for identification by the Comptroller General of individuals who fail to comply with certain prescribed procedures, to require approval of certain accounting systems by the Comptroller General, to require reporting by the Bureau of the Budget of action on recommendations made by the Comptroller General, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Government Operations.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 9165. 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. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 9166. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9167. A bill to prescribe the geographical limits of the naval districts and to provide that the commandants thereof shall be officers not below the grade of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9168. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate U.S. citizenship requirements with respect to employment of personnel by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 9169. A bill making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9170. A bill to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to provide relief against discriminatory employment and housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, to extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9173. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9174. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9175. A bill to exclude U.S. Route No. 22 from Haafsville to Easton, Pa., from being on the Interstate System and to provide for the designation of an alternative route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 9176. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 9177. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9178. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 9179. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to make available, through a new program of mortgage insurance, additional financing for the construction of needed nonprofit hospital facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 9180. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9181. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9182. 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. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9183. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9184. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to establish in the Public Health Service the position of Chief Veterinary Officer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9185. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 9186. A bill to provide for computation of disability retirement pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9187. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income compensation of enlisted members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 9188. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9189. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to authorize quality grants for schools of veterinary medicine and scholarships for students of veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9190. 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.

H.R. 9191. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9192. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 9193. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase from $200 million to $500 million the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9194. A bill to amend section 201 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in order to require the Secretary of Agriculture in certain cases to make complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9195. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide for increase in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9196. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to revise the rates of postage on third-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9197. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9198. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9199. A bill to amend section 58 of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9200. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9201. A bill to establish the annual Federal payment authorization for the District of Columbia, and providing a method for computing the annual borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9202. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability in-

surance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 9203. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9204. A bill to amend the section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9205. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9206. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9207. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to declare a national policy with respect to the right of Americans to employment without regard to sex or age; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 9208. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 9209. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 9210. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9211. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9212. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a comprehensive program in the field of weather modification and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9213. A bill to amend the repayment contract with the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9214. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 9215. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer to tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9216. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9217. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the wife or husband of an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits may (if otherwise qualified) become entitled to wife's or husband's insurance benefits without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9218. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9219. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9220. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, so as to make certain benefits available to veterans who have served for 90 days or more in the Armed Forces during peacetime; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 9221. A bill to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9222. A bill to reconstitute the Federal National Mortgage Association as an independent corporate instrumentality of the United States, to enable it to deal in conventional mortgages, and to provide otherwise for its further development as a secondary market facility; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 9223. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9224. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 9225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9226. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9227. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 9228. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9229. A bill to establish a permanent Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 9230. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9231. A bill to give the President authority to alleviate or to remove the threat to navigation, safety, marine resources, or the coastal economy posed by certain releases of fluids or other substances carried in oceangoing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9232. A bill to provide the Coast Guard with authority to conduct research and development for the purpose of dealing with the release of harmful fluids carried in vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9233. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to encourage correspondence with the U.S. Armed Forces in overseas combat areas by providing for the transportation of first-class letter mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9234. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9235. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9236. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 9237. A bill to provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where U.S. Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the Pan American Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9238. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9239. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9240. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9241. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain veterans conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 9242. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase from $100 to $200 a month the amount which may be earned without loss of annuity by an individual whose entitlement is based on disability; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9243. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the transportation of mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9244. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deduction from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9245. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9246. 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. BEVILL:

H.R. 9247. 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. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9248. 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. BOW:

H.R. 9249. 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. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 9250. 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. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 9251. 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. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 9252. 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. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9253. 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. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 9254. 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. CRAMER:

H.R. 9255. 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. DOW:

H.R. 9256. 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. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9257. 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. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 9258. 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. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9259. 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. GUBSER:

H.R. 9260. 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. HARRISON:

H.R. 9261. 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. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9262. 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. KARSTEN:

H.R. 9263. 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. KARTH:

H.R. 9264. 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. KING of California:

H.R. 9265. 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. KING of New York:

H.R. 9266. 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. MEEDS:

H.R. 9267. 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. MESKILL:

H.R. 9268. 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. MILLS:

H.R. 9269. 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. MINSHALL:

H.R. 9270. 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. MIZE:

H.R. 9271. 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. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 9272. 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. NELSEN:

H.R. 9273. 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. NIX:

H.R. 9274. 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. PETTIS:

H.R. 9275. 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. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9276. 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. POOL:

H.R. 9277. 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. QUILLEN:

H.R. 9278. 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. REIFEL:

H.R. 9279. 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. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9280. 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. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9281. 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. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 9282. 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. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 9283. 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. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9284. 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. SISK:

H.R. 9285. 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. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9286. 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. VIGORITO:

H.R. 9287. 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. WALKER:

H.R. 9288. 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. WINN:

H.R. 9289. 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. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9290. 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. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9291. 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. RANDALL:

H.R. 9292. 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. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9293. 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. TAFT:

H.R. 9294. 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. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9295. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to extend to employees retired on account of disability prior to October 1, 1956, the minimum annuity base established for those retired after that date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9296. A bill to equalize civil service retirement annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9297. A bill to amend section 8338, title 5, United States Code, to correct inequities applicable to those employees or members separated from service with title to deferred annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9298. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9300. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9301. A bill to designate a portion of the San Francisco-Stockton ship channel as the John F. Baldwin Ship Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9302. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9303. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under

such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9304. A bill to establish a self-supporting Federal reinsurance program to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9305. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, which established the National Bureau of Standards to authorize a fire research and safety program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 9306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for the ransom of a kidnaped person; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 9307. A bill to establish a self-supporting Federal program to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9308. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income exemption of $1,200 for an individual who is a student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9310. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9311. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9312. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 9313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for tuition expenses of the taxpayer or his spouse or a dependent at an institution of higher education, and an additional credit for gifts or contributions made to any institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9314. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER (by request):

H.R. 9315. A bill to provide for a study and investigation with respect to the adoption by the United States of a reformed calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 9316. 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. GUDE:

H.J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to establish a commission to conduct a study of the adequacy of the financial resources available for the operation of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the third week in May of each year as National Credit Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.J. Res. 535. 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. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 536. 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. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 537. Joint resolution requesting the Department of Defense to use butter in its rations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the application of the minimum wage and overtime compensation standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to foreign producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H. Con. Res. 326. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Res. 452. Resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to furnish Members of the House of Representatives with copies of amendments offered for consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Res. 453. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate and study collective bargaining practices in the motor carrier industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 454. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the subcommittee print entitled "Bank Stock Ownership and Control"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 455. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the subcommittee print entitled "The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant and Communist Economic Reforms"; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

159. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to families with two or more members serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

160. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the enactment of legislation authorizing a disability "freeze" under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

161. By Mr. ZION: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make a feasibility study of a navigable Wabash Waterway joining the Ohio River with Lakes Erie and Michigan in accordance with the recommendations of the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission as contained in the commission's report entitled "Cross-Wabash Valley Waterway"; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9317. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Duren L. Spivey, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 9318. A bill for the relief of Maria Ferrigno, and her son, Carlo Ferrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9319. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Loiacono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9320. A bill for the relief of Minobu Miki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9321. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Olin G. Smith against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9322. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Iacona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9323. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Rusotto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9324. A bill for the relief of Jose Joaquim Rezendes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 9325. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Transportation to cause the vessel *Cap'n Frank*, owned by Ernest R. Darling, of South Portland, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9326. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Ruchwarger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9327. A bill for the relief of Chai Koon Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9328. A bill for the relief of Genoveffa Siano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9329. A bill for the relief of Michael Waithe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

71. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ginowan City Council, Ginowan, Okinawa, relative to the reversion of Okinawa to Japan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

# SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, we would make our hearts, cleansed by Thy forgiving grace, a temple of Thy presence, knowing that only to the pure does Thou grant the vision of Thy face.

In this hallowed moment, we bring to the altar of prayer our inmost selves, cluttered and confused where the good