months behind in receiving reimbursement under medicare—but in the confusion, his Social Security retirement benefits were cut off and his wife started receiving widow's benefits.

Social Security is the major source of income for about one-half of the beneficiaries over 65. A delay of a month—or even a week—is a serious blow to those who have nowhere else to turn.

I have joined with several other Senators in calling for a Senate investigation to dig out the causes of such delays and to find ways for improving the administration of Social Security and medicare programs.

WHY TAX SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS?

When the Administration submitted its Social Security program to Congress, it included a proposal to tax Social Security and railroad retirement benefits. Such a move would penalize retirees by imposing double taxation on their efforts to build a retirement income. For this reason, I have joined Senator Everett Dirksen and others in sponsoring a resolution to declare that "Social Security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes."

Irene Parsons Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 16, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we are very familiar with the phrase that "actions speak louder than words," and, regardless of how many words are issued on the equality of the sexes in employment, it takes firm action to see that these are implemented. Under the present administration these words have been transformed into actions, and we now have many high-ranking positions in the executive branch being administered successfully by women.

One of the most outstanding examples of women in Government is Miss Irene Parsons, the Assistant Administrator for Personnel of the Veterans' Administration. She has become a living example that efficiency and achievement are not limited to men.

Much recognition has been given to Miss Parsons for her outstanding Government work, but the old adage that a "prophet is not without honor save in his own country" went by the wayside on June 4 when Miss Parsons' alma mater extended outstanding recognition of her contributions by presenting her with an honorary doctor of laws degree.

In presenting the doctorate, Chancellor James S. Ferguson, of the university, had this to say:

Irene Parsons, the recognition of your administrative abilities, your superior achievements, and your outstanding service to the government of the United States has brought honor to North Carolina, your native state, and to the University of Greensboro, your Alma Mater. Your appointment by President Johnson in 1965 to the position of Assistant Administrator of the Veterans Administration—the highest personnel post in federal government held by a woman—acknowledged a unique record of accomplishment during an eighteen-year-long association with the federal government's third largest agency. Your consciousness of the equal rights of women and minority groups in matters of employment opportunity has been influential and has brought honor to you and to your agency. For distinction in government service, for a career accomplishment which is unique among women, and for an influential belief in equality of job opportunity, Miss Parsons, by vote of the Faculty and that of the Trustees of the University of North Carolina, I confer upon you the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws with all its rights and privileges.

Miss Parsons' contributions to Government serve as an incentive to all women throughout this country, proving that devotion to duty and preparation for service through study and experience are the prime prerequisites for accomplishment and success.

Miss Parsons has achieved many "firsts" in her career. She was the first woman to receive such a high personnel appointment directly from the President. On August 5, 1965, in a White House ceremony, President Johnson appointed Miss Parsons to her present position. It was the highest position ever held by a woman in the Veterans' Administration and the highest personnel position held by a woman in Government. The Veterans' Administration is the third largest Government agency, having 170,000 employes, 60,000 of which are women.

This appointment became a challenge to Miss Parsons. She attacked the problems of this high office with vigor and determination. The results of her administrative abilities, recognized prior to her appointment, verified the confidence exhibited by the President in her appointment. She has implemented procedures and has made the VA personnel operation one of the most successful in Government.

Her subsequent successes have served as the basis for proof that accomplishment is not restricted to any one sex. Her list of activities and accomplishments are numerous, proving that for those who aspire to success the door is open in America.

Miss Parson's appointment came about when the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs William J. Driver submitted her name to the President following a request for the names of outstanding career employees for consideration in the staffing of Presidential appointments.

Miss Parsons is a native of North Wilkesboro, N.C., and graduated from the University of North Carolina. She received a master of science degree in public administration from George Washington University in Washington, D.C. During World War II, she served with the Coast Guard, attaining the rank of lieutenant. She was employed by the Veterans' Administration in 1946, and progressively was given increasingly responsible positions. She has received many awards and commendations for the outstanding quality and effectiveness of her work, including the Federal Woman's Award as one of the outstanding women in Government in 1966. She is recognized as a strong influence for efficiency and economy in Government. Her personal efforts to advance equal employment opportunity have been cited as contributing greatly to the Veterans' Administration's exceptional accomplishments in these programs.

Miss Parsons is a member of the executive committee of the President's Study Group on Careers for Women, which was established by President Johnson on February 28, 1966.

It gives me great pleasure to commend this outstanding American woman for her achievements, and to congratulate her on receiving the doctor of laws degree of which she is so deserving from the University of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ.—Galatians 6: 2.

Eternal God, our Father, before the work of a new day begins we would be still in Thy presence and receive the benediction of Thy spirit. May the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight O Lord—our strength and our Redeemer. Cleansed by Thy forgiving love, made stronger by Thy spirit, and becoming wise with Thy wisdom we would face the unfinished tasks committed to our care this day.

These are times which call for greater courage, higher wisdom, broader sympathy, and deeper faith. May they increasingly become ours as we wait upon Thee. In all our decisions and in all our doing may we keep our hearts confident, our spirits courageous, our minds clear, and our hands clean.

Together may we move forward to a greater day when men shall live together in good will and each one be ready to bear another's burden. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 16, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1649. An act authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, to the bill H.R. 5424 entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard."

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON TODAY ON THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us here in this House should applaud the President's statement this morning on the Middle East. While many of us, if speaking for ourselves, would have expressed the same points more bluntly, we must recognize the nature of the task which a President confronts in making such a speech. President Johnson's tone was restrained, and his words were carefully chosen in the highest tradition of diplomacy and statesmanship. Premier Kosygin's speech, by contrast, was straight propaganda and invective, with no balance whatsoever. At the same time, President Johnson made unmistakably clear a series of basic and important points. I hope that his words will be weighed most carefully, as they deserve to be, by the delegates assembled at the special session of the United Nations General Assembly.

In particular, I hope the General Assembly will perceive the logic of the President's statement that the best way to achieve a permanent settlement is through direct negotiations among the parties immediately involved. In article 33 of the United Nations Charter, "negotiation" is the very first method mentioned by which the parties to a dispute endangering international peace and security are obligated to seek a solution. In earlier resolutions dealing with the Arab-Israel dispute, both the Security Council and the General Assembly urged the governments concerned through negotiations to reach a settlement of their differences. I have in mind, for example, resolutions of the Security Council on November 17, 1948, and August 11, 1949, and of the General Assembly on January 26, 1952.

The underlying problem lies in the stubborn refusal of the Arab States to accept Israel's existence and right to exist, a refusal which carries with it the implication of the Arabs' oft-stated determination to destroy Israel by force. For the U.N. to fail to insist on direct negotiations would be tacitly to accept the validity of the Arabs' position, even though that position is contrary to the U.N. Charter itself and more specifically to many prior decisions of the General Assembly itself.

BRITISH MORALITY

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for a demonstration of unadulterated gall it would be hard to equal the party that was given at the British Embassy in Washington on Saturday afternoon, June 17, for wounded American veterans of the war in Vietnam.

Scores of ships, flying the British flag, have delivered thousands of tons of supplies to the Communists of North Vietnam to help keep them in the business of killing and wounding Americans. With one hand in Southeast Asia the British rake in blood-money profits and with the other, in Washington, they dish out tea and crumpets to some of the victims of their betrayal.

Mr. Speaker, is there no morality left in this world?

FBI UNIFORM CRIME REPORTS

Mr. POFF. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, some say that crime is not really higher but only seems so because crime reporting is better. Perhaps crime reporting is better today than it was a generation ago. But surely crime reporting is not measurably better today than it was a year ago. Accordingly, a comparison of crime statistics within that time frame is a reasonably reliable indicator of the growth in crime.

The latest FBI Uniform Crime Reports compare crime in the first 3 months of 1966 with that in the first 3 months in 1967. That comparison shows an increase of 20 percent in the seven major crimes. These seven include four crimes of violence against the person and three property crimes. Personal crimes increased more than property crime. The largest increase, 42 percent, was in the crime of robbery as reported in cities with populations ranging between 250,000 and 500,000.

With respect to all seven crimes, cities with a population of 100,000 or more registered a total increase of 20 percent. However, it is a mistake to assume that crime growth is only a city problem. Rural areas reported an increase of only four percentage points less, and the crime growth rate of 22 percent in suburban communities was even higher than that in cities.

Neither is there any remarkable difference in the reports by geographical region. The northeast, north-central, southern, and western regions ranged between 18 and 21 percent. But the District of Columbia sustained its inglorious record. Crime in the Nation's Capital jumped nearly 42 percent, or more than twice the national rate. In the first 3 months of this year 8,957 major crimes were committed here. That amounts to more than 99 crimes per day, four each hour, one every 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, these figures and the facts they dramatize are disgraceful. The good name of America is at stake. Society needs new laws, better laws, stronger laws, laws which make crime unattractive and unprofitable. Congress must act.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MASTERS' LIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 162) to grant the masters of certain U.S. vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages and for certain disbursements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that the opposition of the Department of Commerce, as printed in the committee report, which would thereby make consideration of this measure not within the rules of the House adopted at the beginning of this year, for the Consent Calendar, has been obviated by an amendment of the committee?

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my colleague, chairman of the official objectors on this side.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman, the Commerce Department expressed their opposition that any master covered by this bill should be one who had an interest directly or indirectly in a vessel. To meet this objection, the committee included an amendment in the bill to provide that except a person who has a financial interest valued at 5 percent or more of the corporation, they would not be classified as a master of a vessel. In other words, we would not hold it against any master of a vessel if he had a very minor interest as an incentive to operate a vessel. Otherwise he would be an owner.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the opinion of my distinguished colleague, who is also a ranking minority member on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I understand this does establish a system of priorities, so to speak, for liens involving, first the seamen's wages, and then tort liens, and then contracts, including preferred mortgages, and then we come down to this area; and if I understand the response of the gentleman from Washington, this is not like something which is exposed to a disease and having a "touch of the infection" may blossom into a full-blown case, if it is under 5 percent it therefore does come within the requirements and the House's adopted rules.

But can the gentleman tell me that if in this circumstance and with the committee amendment, the Department of Commerce has in fact withdrawn its objection?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not think the Commerce Department sent over any additional views based upon the amendment which the committee adopted in order to satisfy the objections of the Department. However, I am sure while the amendment does not meet the objection 100 percent, it goes 95 percent in that direction.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the further response. I do understand that it is common practice for the masters of some of the fishing vessels, or our own trawlers, or other coastal freighters, or other types sailing out of ports such as that in the gentleman's district or that of the distinguished chairman of the committee, to own a partial interest in a vessel and receive a percentage, in addition to their salary as supported in this lien for the particular cargo transported, in addition to their percentage of the stock held in the vessel. Is that correct?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say traditionally masters of vessels have enjoyed a certain percentage of profits of a voyage, going back through the long years of operating ships on the sea.

I believe now that is probably less and less common, but as an incentive we think probably it would be a very wholesome thing to have masters have an interest in the profits of a voyage or in the profits of a fishing venture of some kind. Therefore, we wanted to encourage that, so we did allow that under-5-percent interest, to allow a master to have a lien for his wages along with the other members of the crew.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, being a great believer in incentive, and after this explanation, and having absolutely no desire to damage partial ownership or participation incentive, I will withdraw my reservation of objection, unless the distinguished chairman wishes me to yield to him.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The bill would merely give to the master of the ship the same rights of the seaman to put a lien against the ship.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the master of a vessel documented, registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States shall have the same lien for his wages against such vessel and the same priority as any other seaman serving on such vessel.

(b) Sections 4546 and 4547 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 603 and 604) shall not apply in any proceeding brought by a master for the enforcement of the lien granted by this section.

(c) Section 4535 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 600) is amended by striking out "seaman" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "master or seaman".

(d) Section 12 of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (38 Stat. 1164; 46 U.S.C. 601), is amended (1) by striking out "seaman or apprentice" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "master, seaman, or apprentice", and (2) by striking out in the first proviso thereof "any seaman" and inserting in lieu thereof "any master or seaman".

(e) A master shall have the same lien and the same priority for disbursements or liabilities properly made or incurred by him for or on account of the vessel as he has, under the provisions of this section, for his wages.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, following line 15, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, section 4535 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and section 12 of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (38 Stat. 1164; 46 U.S.C. 601), the term 'master' shall include every person having command of any vessel documented, registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, except a person who has a financial interest valued at 5 per centum or more either of the corporation, partnership, or association which owns the vessel against which the lien is claimed, or of the market value of the vessel against which the lien is claimed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LOWERING THE RETIREMENT AGE FOR FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 168) to amend the act of June 20, 1918, relating to the retirement age requirements of certain personnel of the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are entering on consideration of a series of three or four bills that have to with retiring personnel of the Lighthouse Service or their beneficiaries, a subject that is dear to this Congress and to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. As I understand it, these bills are for the purpose of reducing age requirements for these people who have no other social security benefits or income, whose spouses, or who, themselves, in many instances, have served our Nation well. They are a decreasing number and they need these benefits. They are dependent entirely upon the "Robin Hoodism" of Congress to recirculate the taxpayers' money. Is that about a correct analysis of these next bills that are coming up?

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

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I would think so; this would apply to approximately 400 people.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, although I am not sure we should always use the taxpayers' funds thusly, in the interest of equity and justice to those who served so well, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have a couple of questions to ask. These are noncontributory annuitants, are they not?

Mr. GARMATZ. The gentleman from Iowa is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Are we here setting some kind of precedent in dealing with noncontributory annuitants?

Mr. GARMATZ. No; we are not setting any kind of precedent with this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. What other noncontributory annuitants are retired on this basis?

Mr. GARMATZ. The Panama Canal employees.

Mr. GROSS. All Panama Canal employees?

Mr. GARMATZ. Only the construction workers on the Panama Canal are retired on this basis.

Mr. GROSS. When did this become an issue? I mean, they have been going into the Lighthouse Service through the Coast Guard since 1939. We have had this situation since 1939. Why has this issue not been brought up before, if they are entitled to more favorable retirement?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I should like to inform the gentleman that this matter has come up before. In the past the House has increased the amount of the pensions for these few people remaining from the original Lighthouse Service. At the time they were employed their salaries were extremely low and the amounts of their pensions are very low. Congress in its wisdom in the past has seen that, due to inflation and other increases in the cost of living, some adjustment has been made in their very modest pensions.

Mr. GROSS. I say to my friend from Washington, the fact that they were low-paid employees is something they knew when they entered the Service. And they knew it was a noncontributory retirement they would have. These things they knew when they went into the Service. I do not believe that is a good argument in behalf of this bill.

Mr. PELLY. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is true that the entire pension system is based on knowledge that individuals have when they go in. They know they are going to receive certain payments of annuities. On the other hand, they do not know that, often due to unwise policies of spending, the Government itself causes inflation, which in turn is something beyond their control. This is a way to rectify that, the same as we probably will try to rectify the situation for the social security recipients later this year, resulting from cost of living increases, something for which they are not to blame.

Mr. GROSS. Fortunately, there are only comparatively few, some 480, in comparison with the total throughout the Government.

I wish to be very sure that in this bill, as well as the two bills which are to come, dealing with this same general

subject, we are not in some way opening a Pandora's box.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the gentleman he can be assured that this will phase out in 10 years. There are only a very few of these people left. It does require 30 years of service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 168

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1918, as amended (33 U.S.C. 763), is amended by striking out: "(1) shall have reached the age of sixty years," and inserting in lieu thereof: "(1) shall have reached the age of fifty-five years,".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

INCREASING AMOUNT OF BENEFITS PAYABLE TO WIDOWS OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 169) to increase the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service, and thereafter to provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits payable to such widows and to such former employees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 169

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective as of October 1, 1966, the first section and section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide benefits for widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes', approved June 20, 1918, as amended", approved August 19, 1950 (33 U.S.C. 771, and 772), are each amended by striking out "$75 per month" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100 per month".

SEC. 2. Each annuity payable under the Act entitled "An Act to provide benefits for widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes', approved June 20, 1918, as amended", approved August 19, 1950 (33 U.S.C. 771–775), and each annuity payable under section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1918 (33 U.S.C. 763), shall be increased by the same percentage, adjusted to the nearest dollar, and on the same effective date, as each increase hereafter allowed under the cost-of-living annuity adjustment provisions of section 18(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2268(a)).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "as of October 1, 1966,", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "on the first day of the month following enactment of this bill,".

On page 2, lines 17 and 18 strike out "18(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2268(b)).", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "8340(b) of title 5, United States Code."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

PROVIDING ANNUITY BENEFITS TO WIDOWS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3351) to amend the act of August 19, 1950, to provide annuity benefits for an additional number of widows of employees of the Lighthouse Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3351

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771), is amended by striking out "(other than a former employee whose position was classified in one of the grades of the professional and scientific service of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or a comparable grade of the Classification Act of 1949, or who performed duties of a position comparable to a position so classified after the enactment of law requiring the classification of such positions)".

(b) Section 2 of such Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 772), is amended by striking out "(other than an employee whose position was classified in one of the grades of the professional and scientific service of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or a comparable grade of the Classification Act of 1949, or who performed duties of a position comparable to a position so classified after the enactment of law requiring the classification of such positions)".

SEC. 2. No payment shall be made by reason of the amendments made by this Act for any period prior to the first day of the first month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

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

INCREASING RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1006) to provide an increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1006

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the annual rate of retired pay of each person retired prior to January 1, 1965, under section 6 of the Act of June 20, 1918, as amended and supplemented, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act, by 10 per centum, or $150 per annum, whichever is the greater. No increase in retired pay under this section shall exceed $500 per annum.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That effective on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the annual rate of retired pay of a person retired under section 6 of the Act of June 20, 1918 (33 U.S.C. 763), shall be increased by 11.3 per centum if such person retired prior to January 1, 1966, or by 4.1 per centum if such person retired after December 31, 1965, but before January 1, 1967."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDING THE ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1955, TO AUTHORIZE LONGER TERM LEASES OF INDIAN LANDS ON THE SAN CARLOS APACHE RESERVATION IN ARIZONA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4920) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the San Carlos Apache Reservation in Arizona.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4920

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended (25 U.S.C. 415), is hereby further amended by inserting the words "the San Carlos Apache Reservation," after the words, "the Fort Mojave Reservation,".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "amend" and insert "amended".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING USE OF INCOME FROM CERTAIN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8372) to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for State charitable, education, penal, and reformatory institutions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8372

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the division of Dakota into two States and to enable the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wash-

ington to form constitutions and State governments and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to make donations of public lands to such States", approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Rentals on leased land, proceeds from the sale of timber and other crops, interest on deferred payments on land sold, interest on funds arising from these lands, and all other actual income, shall be available for the acquisition and construction of facilities, including the retirement of bonds authorized by law for such purposes, and for the maintenance and support of such schools and institutions."

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8372 which we are considering today is similar to my bill, H.R. 4898. On April 11, the Subcommittee on Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on my bill and at which time I stated that the proposed amendment to the enabling act creating Washington as a State is twofold. First, it makes clear that moneys derived from the proceeds of the sale of timber and other crops from granted lands may be used by the State for the same purposes that the State may presently use rentals, interest, and other actual income derived from the lands. Second, it makes clear that timber proceeds, rentals, interest, and other actual income may be used for the acquisition and construction of facilities, including the retirement of bonds authorized by State law for such purposes, for these State schools and institutions which are the beneficiaries of the enabling act land grants.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Washington seeks this amendment to section 11 of our State's enabling act because its new State constitutional provision which was approved by the voters last November creates a common school construction fund under which the proceeds from the sale of timber and other crops, rentals, interest, and all other actual income derived from its common school land grant will be used to finance the acquisition and construction of common school facilities, in addition to being expended for current support of its common schools. While the Department of Interior believes that the proposed amendment is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that without it the State of Washington cannot sell its bonds because the financial houses state that the bonds might be illegal. The bill we are considering will resolve any doubts about the legality of school construction bonds. I urge passage of H.R. 8372.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 617) to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions, an identical bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 617

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the division of Dakota into two States and to enable the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to form constitutions and State governments and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to make donations of public lands to such States", approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Rentals on leased land, proceeds from the sale of timber and other crops, interest on deferred payments on land sold, interest on funds arising from these lands, and all other actual income, shall be available for the acquisition and construction of facilities, including the retirement of bonds authorized by law for such purposes, and for the maintenance and support of such schools and institutions."

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 8372) was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS OF THE OTTAWA TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2532) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2532

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of April 30, 1965, to pay a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 303, and the interest thereon, after deduction of litigation expenses and estimated costs of distribution, shall be distributed per capita to all persons whose names appear on the final roll of the Ottawa Tribe prepared pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 963).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall distribute a share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee, or in such manner as is deemed by the Secretary to be in the enrollee's best interest. The Secretary shall distribute the per capita share of a deceased enrollee to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive. Sums payable to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid to the persons whom the Secretary determines will best protect their interests. In the event that the sum of money reserved by the Secretary to pay the costs of distributing the individual shares exceeds the amount actually necessary to accomplish this purpose, such funds shall remain to the credit of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma to be disposed of for the benefit of the members of the tribe at the direction of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 11, after "heirs", strike out "of" and insert "or".

On page 2, line 14, after "interests,", insert the following sentence: "Any per capita shares unclaimed for a period of two years from the date of the administrative directive to make the payment shall be turned over to The Ottawa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, incorporated under the laws of the State of Oklahoma, to be used for purposes set forth in its Articles of Incorporation, filed July 14, 1959."

On page 2, lines 18, 19, and 20, after "Oklahoma", strike out "to be disposed of for the benefit of the members of the tribe at the discretion of the Secretary." and insert: "until all claims filed against the United States by the tribe have been settled and the last judgment distributed per capita, at which time any sums remaining shall be turned over to The Ottawa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 853) to extend the life of the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what progress has been made by this Commission and have a little more information than is given in the report before we allow it to pass by unanimous consent. For that purpose I yield to the distinguished chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE].

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Commission and therefore I am not too familiar with just what has been done in the past, but I know when the bill came to us from the Senate it was stated—and I think the record so shows—that the Commission was set up during the last session of Congress, in 1966, and it was given 1 year to make a study and report back to the Congress with recommendations by the Commission. However, the Commission did not begin functioning, I believe, until late January or sometime in January of this year, 1967. Therefore, of course, it was delayed for a full 3 months. It needs additional time to complete the year's

study which the original act gave it authority to operate in. This bill just extends it for 3 additional months, which will still be within the 1 year that the original act provided for.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the response of the gentleman. Of course, the reason why it did not begin to work on time is that only six of the 12 Commissioners were appointed in the first 3 months.

Mr. ASHMORE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know the appointing authority for these Commissioners?

Mr. ASHMORE. I know the Speaker of the House had the authority to appoint some of them and the President of the Senate and maybe the President. I believe that was the procedure, but I am not certain of it.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman respond further and advise the House as to whether or not there is any urgency, that is, this week versus 2 weeks from now, for the passage of this legislation?

Mr. ASHMORE. So far as I know, there would not be.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, until such time as the sponsor of the bill is available, or more information can be obtained by the official family of objectors, I am constrained to ask unanimous consent that this be put over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING—APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL CONFEREES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint two additional conferees to attend the conference on the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will yield, the bill is on redistricting—congressional redistricting.

Mr. GROSS. Congressional what?

Mr. CELLER. Redistricting.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following additional conferees: Messrs. ROGERS of Colorado and MATHIAS of Maryland.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of this action on the part of the House.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6111) to provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6111

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately following chapter 41, a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER 42.—FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

"Sec.
"620. Federal Judicial Center.
"621. Board.
"622. Duties and powers of the Board.
"623. Administrator and staff.
"624. Compensation of the Administrator.
"625. Retirement of the Administrator.
"626. Survivorship benefits of the widow and dependent children of the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center.
"627. Appropriations and Accounting.

"§ 620. Federal Judicial Center

"There is established in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts a Federal Judicial Center for the purpose of seeking knowledge of the best methods of judicial administration through scientific study so that it may be possible to administer justice in the Federal courts with maximum effectiveness and minimum waste. The Center shall have the following functions:

"(1) To stimulate, coordinate, and conduct research and studies in all areas of Federal judicial administration.

"(2) To stimulate, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel in the judicial branch of Government, including but not limited to, judges, referees, court clerks, probation officers, and United States commissioners.

"(3) To provide staff, research, and planning assistance to the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees.

"§621. Board

"The activities of the Center shall be supervised by a Board to be composed of the Chief Justice of the United States, two judges of the United States courts of appeals, three judges of the United States district courts, and the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

"Each of the judges of the United States courts of appeals and the United States district courts shall be elected as members of the Board by a vote of the members of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

"The judges of the courts of appeals first named to the Board shall continue in office for terms of two and four years, respectively, from the date of the enactment of this chapter, the term of each to be designated by the Chief Justice following election by the Judicial Conference.

"The judges of the United States district courts first named to the Board shall continue in office for terms of two, three, and four years, respectively, from the date of the enactment of this chapter, the term of each to be designated by the Chief Justice following election by the Judicial Conference.

"Each successor of the first judge-members of the Board shall be elected for a term of four years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected, except that any judge elected to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was elected shall be elected only for the unexpired term of such predecessor. No judge-member shall be eligible to reelection as a member of the Board.

"Members of the Board shall serve without additional compensation.

"The Chief Justice of the United States shall be the Chairman of the Board.

"Regular meetings of the Board shall be held quarterly. Special meetings of the Board may be held from time to time upon the call of the Chairman or upon the request of any three members.

"§ 622. Duties and powers of the Board

"(a) The Board shall take all necessary and appropriate steps to accomplish the purposes and perform the functions stated in this chapter, including but not limited to the following. The Board shall:

"(1) develop programs of research, training, continuing education, and administration in all areas of Federal judicial administration;

"(2) make recommendations to the Judicial Conference of the United States and to other appropriate agencies and officials for improvements in all such areas;

"(3) study and determine ways in which automatic data processing and systems procedures may be used in Federal judicial administration;

"(4) consider and recommend measures for the improvement of judicial administration and shall suggest appropriate studies for this purpose to be undertaken by both public and private agencies;

"(5) submit to the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, at least two weeks prior thereto, a report of the activities of the Center along with the Administrator's recommendations, which report, data and recommendations shall be public documents;

"(6) submit to Congress copies of the report and the recommendations submitted to the Judicial Conference of the United States;

"(7) submit to the Congress reports of the results of the studies and determinations made by the Board under subsection (3) of this section. The first report shall cover the Board's activities during the first eighteen months following the date of the enactment of this chapter and each succeeding report shall cover such activities during each succeeding twelve-month period thereafter. Each report shall be submitted no later than thirty days following the close of the period for which the report is submitted.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out any function of the Board authorized by this chapter, the Board may accept donated funds and services, both public and private, and the use of such funds to pay the salaries of the officers or employees of the Center shall not be subject to the provisions of section 209 of title 18, United States Code.

"(c) The Board is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Board and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Board, upon request made by the Chairman. The Board shall utilize insofar as possible the services or facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, and, without regard to section 10 of the Act of March 2, 1861, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), of any appropriate State or other public agency. The Board may, without regard to section 10 of the Act of March 2, 1861, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), utilize the services or facilities of any private agency, organization, group, or individual, in accordance with agreements between the head of such agency, organization, or group, or such individual, and the Board. Payment, if any, for such services or facilities shall be made in such amounts as may be provided in such agreement.

"§ 623. Administrator and staff

"(a) The Board shall appoint and affix the

duties of an Administrator of the Center who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"(b) The Administrator shall supervise the activities of persons employed in the Center and shall perform such other duties assigned to him by the Board.

"(c) The Board shall appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as it deems advisable, subject to the provisions of title 5 governing appointments in competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

"(d) The Board may procure personal services as is authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3109), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

"(e) The Administrator is authorized to incur travel and other miscellaneous expenses incident to the operation of the Center.

"(f) The Board may contract with governmental private agencies for research projects and for other purposes, and to that end may delegate such authority to the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center as the Board deems necessary or appropriate in the negotiation for or the execution of such contracts.

"§ 624. Compensation of the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center

"The compensation of any Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center shall be the same as that of a judge of a United States District Court, and his appointment and salary shall not be subject to the civil service laws or Classification Act of 1949, as amended; *Provided*, however, That any Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center who is a justice or judge of the United States who has not attained the age of seventy years but who has retired from regular active service pursuant to section 371(b) of this title shall serve without additional compensation.

"§ 625. Retirement of the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center

"(a) Any Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center who elects to be subject to the provisions of this section thereby waives his right to coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Such election shall be made by filing a written notice with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts within six months after the date on which the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center takes office.

"(b) Any Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center who attains the age of seventy years shall be retired from that office.

"(c) Any Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center who retires, after having served at least fifteen years and after having attained the age of sixty-five years, shall receive an annuity for life equal to 80 per centum of the salary of the office.

"(d) Any Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center who has served at least ten years, but who is not eligible to receive an annuity under subsection (c), may elect to retire and receive an annuity for life equal to that proportion of 80 per centum of the salary of the office which the number of years of his service bears to fifteen, reduced by one-quarter of 1 per centum for each full month, if any, he is under the age of sixty-five at the time of separation from service.

"(e) Any Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center who becomes permanently disabled from performing the duties of his office shall be retired and shall receive an annuity for life equal to 80 per centum of the salary of the office if he has served at least fifteen years, or equal to that proportion of 80 per centum of such salary which the aggregate number of years of his service bears to fifteen if he has served less than fifteen years, but in no event less than 50 per centum of such salary.

"(f) For the purpose of this section, 'service' means service, whether or not continuous, as Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center, and any service not to exceed five years as a judge of the United States, a Senator or Representative in Congress, or a civilian official appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(g) The annuities provided by this section of this title shall be paid by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

"§ 626. Survivorship benefits of the widow and dependent children of the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center

"The provisions of section 376 of this title are hereby extended to include the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center. Each reference therein to a judge of the United States or to judicial service shall be deemed to include the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center.

"Subsections (b), (c), (g), (i), and (n) of section 376 of this title are amended to insert after the phrase 'retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371(a) of this title' the words 'or under section 625 of this title'.

"§ 627. Appropriations and accounting

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act such sums as may be necessary to supplement funds and services accepted by the Board. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall provide accounting, disbursing, auditing, and other fiscal services for the Federal Judicial Center."

SEC. 2. The table of contents to "Part III.—COURT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES" of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"41. Administrative Office of United States Courts ---------- 601"

a new chapter reference as follows:

"42. Federal Judicial Center-------- 620".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, if adopted, will establish within the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts a Federal Judicial Center for the improvement of the administration of justice.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 6111 will establish in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts a Federal Judicial Center to foster improvements in the administration of justice. The Center will, first, stimulate, coordinate, and conduct research and studies in all areas of Federal judicial administration; second, stimulate, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel in the judicial system; and third, provide staff, research, and planning assistance to the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees.

STATEMENT

The President, in his February 6, 1967, message to the Congress on the National Crime Commission report, recommended that a Federal Judicial Center be established to assist in the development of solutions to administrative problems of the judiciary and to bring about more efficient administration of justice.

The President said:

The mere addition of judges to the courts will not bring about the efficient administration of justice that simple justice demands. Better judicial administration requires better research, better training, and continuing education programs.

The President's recommendation had its origin in the experience of the Judicial Conference over the last 10 years with the practical administrative problems that confront Federal judges.

In an effort to find solutions for these problems, the Judicial Conference, on an ad hoc basis, has established some 15 committees concerned with programs of research, continuing education or training. None of these committees, however, has been adequately staffed or supported, and solutions have not been found to the administrative problems of the judiciary.

In September 1966, a Special Committee on Continuing Education, Research, Training, and Administration, was formed by the Judicial Conference to review and evaluate all 24 of the research programs then in existence. In the course of its studies, the Special Committee developed the concept of a Federal Judicial Center for the purpose of seeking knowledge of the best methods of judicial administration.

The Attorney General on March 16, 1967, testified in support of legislation to create a Federal Judicial Center for the purposes set forth in H.R. 5385. In his testimony, the Attorney General stated:

We must learn why the delay and docket congestion in our Federal courts is getting worse each day and what we can do to reverse this trend. We must establish and maintain programs for continuing education and for training for the personnel in the judicial system and insure that such education and training is made available in a timely and meaningful way. Thirty to thirty-five new judges are appointed every year—70 last year—in the Federal judiciary and numerous commissioners, referees, court clerks, and probation officers. All need training and an opportunity to participate in a continuing education program.

The Special Committee of the Judicial Conference submitted its final report at the March 30–31, 1967, meeting. The Special Committee reported the following conclusions:

(1) The establishment of a Federal Judicial Center in the judicial branch of the Government is desirable to attain the dispensation of justice in the Federal courts with maximum effectiveness and minimum waste;

(2) The attainment of this objective will be aided by a thorough scientific study of the methods of judicial administration and by programs of continuing education of judges and training of court personnel; and

(3) The activities of the Federal Judicial Center should be under the direction and control of an autonomous board composed of the Chief Justice, the Director of the Administrative Office and five judges (two circuit judges and three district judges) elected by the Judicial Conference. The Chief of the Federal Judicial Center must be responsible to the board and not to the Director of the Administrative Office.

The Special Committee attached to its report its estimate of the operating costs

of the proposed Federal Judicial Center. A total cost of $537,923 per annum is estimated, of which a total of $137,923 is for personnel and related support costs.

The bill is endorsed by the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, and the Federal Probation Officers Association.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The Judiciary Committee amended the bill by substituting entirely new language. The committee's amendment contains a number of revisions which are designed to accomplish the following objectives:

First. Incorporate wherever practicable the revisions and language improvements that had been recommended by the Special Committee on Continuing Education, Research, Training, and Administration, and approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its March 30, 1967, meeting.

Second. Authorize the Board of the Federal Judicial Center specifically to study and determine ways in which automatic data processing and systems procedures may be used in Federal judicial administration.

Third. Improve the administrative procedures of the Federal Judicial Center by requiring the Board to appoint, and fix the compensation of, all personnel employed in the Center.

Fourth. Provide survivorship benefits for the widow and dependent children of the Administrator of the Federal Judicial Center by amendment of the provisions of section 376, "Annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of judges," of title 28, United States Code.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is noncontroversial. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would it also be of great comfort to bondsmen along with the others the gentleman named?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, no, there is nothing in the bill that would help or give any comfort to a bondsman. There is no mention of bondsman in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, I imagine those who will derive the greatest amount of comfort from this new-fangled judicial center will be the Director, at $30,000 a year, an assistant, at $20,000 a year, and another assistant at $20,000 a year.

I imagine they will get the most comfort out of this, will they not?

Mr. CELLER. No; I do not like to use the word "comfort" in that sense. I believe the laborer is worthy of his hire. The director of an establishment of this sort would have to exhibit considerable expertise, and we would need a man of considerable judicial knowledge.

If we want a good man we have to pay for him. This man would receive the same salary as the U.S. district judges do.

Also, to be sure the establishment would be free from political influence, the Board makes the appointment.

As I mentioned, that Board is composed mainly of judges. The Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, two judges of the courts of appeal, and three district judges, and the Director of the Administration Office. So that I do not believe there would be any—shall I say—political contamination, as far as the appointee is concerned. His job would be an important job, highly important. If we want to have our court calendars freed from being clogged as they are now, and if we want justice to be fairly swift, we shall have to have up-to-date methods.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say it would seem to me the Federal courts ought to soon be completely cleared with all of the judges that have been appointed, some 150 of them in the last 2 or 3 years.

What has happened to the Federal judges who have been added to the courts?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman may not have heard it, but I did indicate that the President of the United States said that the mere addition of judges to the courts will not bring about the more efficient administration of justice that justice demands. Better judicial administration requires better research, better training, and continued educational progress. It is for the purpose of giving this training and to give this spurt, as it were, to progress in the administration of justice, that the American Bar Association and the Judicial Conference, Federal Bar Association, and the Attorney General made recommendations for the passage of this bill.

The Attorney General, it might be interesting for the gentleman from Iowa to hear this, said:

> In essence, improvements in the administration of justice require better research, more training and continuing education programs covering all aspects of the judicial functions.
>
> The Judicial Conference is well aware of their growing problems and has taken firm steps in the right direction. It has, at one time or another, recommended or established on an ad hoc basis numerous programs of research and education. These programs have not, however, been sufficiently staffed or supported to accomplish the awesome tasks they have faced. They have lacked the permanence and resources which are needed to provide the continuity of effort and the coordination of endeavor to master the complex demands which are now being made upon our judicial system.
>
> We must learn why the delay and docket congestion in our Federal courts is getting worse each day and what we can do to reverse this trend. We must establish and maintain programs for continuing education and for training for the personnel in the judicial system and insure that such education and training is made available in a timely and meaningful way. Thirty to thirty-five new judges are appointed every year—70 last year—in the Federal judiciary and numerous commissioners, referees, court clerks, and probation officers. All need training and an opportunity to participate in a continuing education program.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Which Attorney General was this? Not that it makes a whole lot of difference because both of the last two were real liberal with the taxpayers' money, and neither of them seemed to recognize the critical crime situation in this country—but which Attorney General does this happen to be?

Mr. CELLER. I do not agree with the characterization the gentleman has attributed to the Attorney General. But this one happens to be a very good and distinguished Attorney General—the present occupant of this Office—and I doff my hat to him.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman does. I have never met him on the street so I have not had the opportunity to doff my hat and I do not know whether I would so salute him, if I did. I can cross that bridge when I get to it.

But did the gentleman say that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court will appoint these $30,000 and $20,000 payrollers?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, he participates.

Mr. GROSS. Will he be in charge?

Mr. CELLER. He participates with the rest of the Board that is established and there are five judges, three district judges, and two appellate judges.

Mr. GROSS. I assume the Chief Justice could be counted on to do so, if he were not off on a taxpayers' junket to South America or to Europe—would that be somewhere near correct?

Mr. CELLER. I cannot answer adequately questions that involve language of that sort. I do not agree with the gentleman so far as the use of these terms "junkets" and other similar epithets are concerned.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 6111.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has briefly yet accurately described the terms and the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary by unanimous vote and was reported out of the full Committee on the Judiciary by unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems confronting the American legal system is the phenomenal growth of caseloads in the courts throughout the land.

From 1941 to 1966 civil cases filed in our U.S. district courts increased 84 percent—from 50,500 to 71,000—and pending civil cases have increased a staggering 169 percent—from 29,000 to 79,000.

During this time Congress has responded to this astounding increase in caseload by providing an additional 144 Federal district judges—from 197 to 341—an increase of 73 percent.

In addition to the overwhelming caseload burden on the courts, we have seen, in recent years, the new phenomenon of the complex, protracted case. Some of these cases extend over periods up to 9 months in trial, take years to resolve appeals and reach upward of 70,000 pages of record.

Also complicating the problem is the development of multidistrict litigation, such as we saw in the electrical equipment antitrust litigation. In that case there were over 25,000 separate claims in 35 different judicial districts. This emergency situation was handled only

through setting up a special staff in the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts and temporarily convening a special coordinating committee of judges.

Up to the present such proliferatingly burdensome problems are handled by temporary, hastily improvised ad hoc solutions. The necessity for some permanent machinery just to deal with these problems, not to mention many other urgent needs, to assist the Federal judiciary, is crystal clear.

Solution of these problems is not easy and will not occur overnight. But we must begin. The Federal Judicial Center, to be established by the legislation now before us is such a beginning.

In addition to the problems I have just mentioned, the Judicial Center will also concern itself with information gathering and coordination. A major deficiency in the present judicial administration is the lack of digested and interpreted statistics and studies of the various problems facing different judges. Our judicial manpower is inefficiently used in numerous individual courtrooms where effort is often duplicated if no common lesson or experience can be drawn from the system, and made available to other judges who may be struggling with similar problems.

The Center would also provide permanet staffing and other resources to assist the Judicial Conference and its committees. The programs of continuing education and scientific research in judicial administration need permanent status.

The Federal Judicial Center, an agency of the judicial branch of Government, will be directed by an autonomous board of judges. This concept of judicial administration is uniquely designed and constructed to solve some of the most pressing problems facing the American legal system.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly recommend passage of H.R. 6111, a bill to create a Federal Judicial Center.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question.

Mr. GROSS. I am not clear as to how this Judicial Center would overcome the things that the gentleman has just mentioned.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Of course, this new Judicial Center, when authorized by law and properly manned, and with electrical data processing equipment which I hope it will have, will be able to search out the delays in some of the courts, will be able to balance the caseload, and will see that our Federal judicial system operates as efficiently as many of the State and local judicial systems operate.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think the creation of this expensive Judicial Center would cure the situation in Oklahoma, where the work of the Federal courts has been sadly held up by the fact that three Federal judges are fighting, calling each other names? Would the Judicial Center be able to do something about that situation?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It would be my opinion that they would immediately become interested in the situation down there, which is not good, and would see either that the judges of those courts took over and completed a caseload, or that there would be judges assigned there from other districts to carry the ever-increasing caseload in that part of the country.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for one more question.

Mr. GROSS. Since the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is going to appoint these Judicial Center payrollers—and well paid, incidentally—do you suppose that they could prevail upon this same Chief Justice Warren to dispose of the writ that has laid before the Supreme Court for months and months and months in connection with the Oklahoma situation?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope and my expectation that the Chief Justice of the United States would appoint the caliber of men to this council that would be able to and would do that which could properly and necessarily be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] who did yeoman's service in preparing this bill for introduction and the work thereon thereafter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] for his very generous remarks and for this opportunity to express my unqualified support for this legislation. I think we should point out that the bill does not emanate from the Office of the Attorney General but it emanates from the courts themselves, where they are experiencing the problems of court congestion. Court congestion cannot be cured merely by appointing more judges. We have determined that.

Some time ago we provided for the Administrative Office of the Courts, and it was hoped that that office would serve to provide for better utilization of judicial time and talent, and for clearing up congested dockets.

However, that legislation, which was enacted, I believe, about 20 years ago, is certainly inadequate for today's problems that we are encountering in the Federal courts.

A great many State courts have already undertaken to utilize automatic data processing and other modern systems and techniques for helping to fully utilize their judicial talent and to expedite the administration of justice. It seems to me only appropriate that the Federal court system should also utilize such modern devices and techniques.

It is not just a question of more judges, but of more fully utilizing the time and talent of the judges we already have. Therefore, it seems to me a judicial center, which would provide information, which would provide research, and which would provide an opportunity for the comprehensive studies by the board which is created in this legislation, would certainly provide for a better balance, a better division of the work and the caseload among the various judges of the court. It would provide information from which the Congress could determine for itself just what the extent of the problem is and how it can be solved.

May I say that this legislation provides that a report be filed with the Congress. More specifically, 18 months after the enactment of this legislation, the Congress for the first time be given statistics and facts with respect to the potential uses of automatic data processing in our courts and every 12 months thereafter, the Center will be required to provide all additional information to the Congress.

For the first time this legislation will repose responsibility in a board composed of judges of the courts, responsibility for determining how the business of the courts is being conducted, the manner in which the administration of justice is being carried out in the Federal court system.

This is vital legislation, it seems to me, if we are going to improve the administration of justice in the Federal court system. Certainly it is something we need desperately, particularly in the large metropolitan centers where we have this great backlog of cases and congestion in the courts. What we are doing here is recommending for our Federal court system some business administration practices which have been found so useful in private industry and in the private economy, and which have been demonstrated in many of the other court systems around the land. So that we are here adopting something that has been tried and tested, the efficacy of which has already been demonstrated.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for a question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman speaks of data processing and the use of computers. If this Judicial Center is going into data processing and computers, the cost is far more than this bill indicates. Is this what might be called a foot in the door?

Another question: Does the gentleman propose to staff a center in some building or to construct a building? Where is this center to be located?

Mr. McCLORY. I would not call this a foot in the door. I would call this a demonstration on the part of the Congress of its concern for the case backlog or court congestion in the Federal judicial system. For the first time we would authorize a study of this subject and authorize the courts to utilize this material.

May I say the United States Code has been put on computer tapes. This has been done through private funds, through private sources, in a private university. This bill would authorize receipts of private funds to help in such a project. There is merely a general authorization to study and consider the possible utilization of these systems.

I am confident that when we review the number of cases and the types of cases that tend to clog our courts, the administrative practices with regard to selection of juries, the material with regard to the time which is consumed in

trial of cases and such other court administrative data, then this Judicial Center will be in a position to recommend efficient and modern-day procedures and practices with regard to administering the courts.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman still has not answered my question as to where this Judicial Center is going to be located. Is it going to be over there among the lovelorn in that palace across the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. McCLORY. If the gentleman will terminate his question, the Judicial Center will be located in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, which already is established, I believe, in the Supreme Court Building. This Judicial Center will be located in the same Office. This supplements what was done, I believe, about 20 years ago. I am not sure when the Administrative Office of the Court was established, but it was a long time ago, and this brings the whole system up to date.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, in the creation of a so-called Judicial Center, simply provides another layer of administrative and spending fat on the Judicial Conference and other functionaries who are now hired to wet-nurse the Federal judiciary. It appears that the deeper this country plunges into debt, and the higher the pay of officials of this Government, the more personnel it takes to tell the hierarchy what to do and how to do it.

Mr. Speaker, time after time in recent weeks we have heard certain Members of the House of Representatives tell us that the effective way to stop spending and increasing the debt is to refuse to authorize new programs and projects, especially where no emergency is involved.

The establishment of this new Judicial Center is not, by any stretch of the imagination, called for as an emergency and it will be interesting to read the roll of those who support it.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. I note on page 8 of the report the reference to the fact that we have gone from 197 judges in 1941 to 341 in 1966. Is it the gentleman's understanding that perhaps the passage of this bill will reduce the number of judges, or at least slow down the increase in the number of Federal judges hereafter?

Mr. McCLORY. I would say very definitely, in answer to the gentleman's question, it would slow down the increase of appointments and would provide much better utilization and more efficient utilization of the time and talents and services of existing Federal judges.

Mr. DOLE. Also, there is some comment made about the Federal Judicial Center getting into the problem of jury selection. Do I correctly understand that they would set down guidelines for jury selection around the country?

Mr. McCLORY. No, I would not say that. I would say it would serve to provide information with regard to jury selection and with regard to the number of juries and perhaps other detailed information with regard to the administration of Federal juries.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in joining the committee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the distinguished ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], in urging the passage of this important legislation, I should like to focus the attention of my colleagues on sections 622 (a) (3) and (7) of H.R. 6111. In brief, these provisions require that the newly created Federal Judicial Center specifically include within its studies of the means and methods of accomplishing judicial improvement the following:

A review and determination of the ways in which automatic data processing and systems procedures may be used in the Federal court system; and

Submit an initial report in 18 months and annual reports thereafter on the findings derived from this study.

To date we have not found the solution to the administrative problems of the judiciary. Nor have we yet employed modern scientific methods of management to the problem of judicial administration in the Federal court system. I believe we can all find hope for solving many of these problems in the potentials which automatic data processing and systems procedures hold for Federal judicial administration.

Mr. Speaker, the potentials of automatic data processing for the Federal court system are documented in a very recent study undertaken for the President's Crime Commission. This study catalogs some of the areas in which the Federal courts can effectively employ these time-saving and cost-saving systems. I quote the following from that study:

> Most courts could benefit substantially from the introduction of more modern methods and machinery into their court clerk's offices. Many tasks of the courts can be helpfully mechanized and even computerized. Computers and improved manual and mechanical techniques can schedule proceedings to obtain better use of judge and courtroom time and to prevent attorney conflicts and fruitless appearances. They can prepare court docket records, indexes, notices, and reports. They can be used to monitor criminal prosecutions, check on procedural delay, review pretrial detention, and to assign counsel. They can monitor arrest warrant status to ensure that when persons come to police or court attention, it is known whether other warrants are outstanding against them, and if so, whether these warrants are currently in force. Computers can help with the selection, time accounting, and compensation of jurors.

These provisions of H.R. 6111 will result in the Federal Judicial Center commencing this important aspect of its study immediately. If the Federal courts need new tools, the Federal Judicial Center must develop them and the Congress must authorize them.

Mr. Speaker, effective and efficient judicial administration is at the foundation of justice. H.R. 6111, in its totality, is a necessary and timely step toward improving the Federal system of criminal and civil justice. Again, I join my colleagues of the committee in urging its enactment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislative proposal was recommended by the President in his crime message of February 6, 1967, to assist in the development of solutions to administrative problems of the judiciary and to bring about the kind of self-analysis, research, and planning necessary for a more effective judicial system.

H.R. 6111 is a nonpartisan piece of legislation with bipartisan support, because it represents a reasonable, necessary approach to an ever-present problem.

Although the Congress has increased the number of judgeships in the U.S. district courts from 197 in 1941 to 341 in 1966, an increase of 73 percent, delay and docket congestion is greater than ever before.

Those who have studied the problem in the Congress, in the courts, and among the members of the bar, now realize that the mere addition of judges will not do the job. It is essential that we have better judicial administration, and to obtain this we must have research, training, and continuing education.

H.R. 6111 is directed to this essential objective. It will establish in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts a Federal Judicial Center which will first stimulate, coordinate, and conduct research and studies in all areas of Federal judicial administration; second, stimulate, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel in the judicial system; and third, provide staff, research, and planning assistance to the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees.

Over the years, the Judicial Conference has attacked the problems of judicial administration on a piecemeal basis. As a problem arose, it was the subject of consideration by a special committee. Continuity was lacking and staffing and financial support were inadequate. In short, the system, as it has operated, has not been able to meet the problem.

The activities of the Center will be supervised by a board consisting of the Chief Justice of the United States, two court of appeals judges, three district court judges, and the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The Board will make periodic reports to the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Congress.

Day-to-day operations of the Center will be supervised by an Administrator, who will hire the staff and direct its activities.

The legislation has the support of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the Federal Probation Officers Association, and experts in the field of judicial administration. It was extremely well received by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I recommend the prompt passage of H.R. 6111.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6111, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 97, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—230

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Bell
Berry
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Dellenback
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Ewards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Friedel
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
MacGregor
Machen
Mailliard
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poff
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rosenthal
Roth
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Watts
Whalen
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young

NAYS—97

Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Baring
Bennett
Bevill
Bow
Bray
Brinkley
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Carter
Clancy
Colmer
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Edwards, La.
Eshleman
Everett
Fisher
Flynt
Fountain
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Goodling
Gross
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hardy
Harrison
Hébert
Henderson
Hull
Hunt
Ichord
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
McClure
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Michel
Mize
Montgomery
Morris, N. Mex.
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Poage
Price, Tex.
Quillen
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Snyder
Taft
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Waggonner
Walker
Watson
Whitten
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Zion

NOT VOTING—106

Abbitt
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Belcher
Blanton
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Cederberg
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Curtis
Delaney
Denney
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dulski
Esch
Fino
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gettys
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Irwin
Johnson, Pa.
Karth
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Leggett
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Mathias, Md.
May
Meskill
Minshall
Moore
Moorhead
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Pirnie
Pool
Purcell
Resnick
Reuss
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Sandman
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Smith, Okla.
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Utt
Watkins
Whalley
White
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Yates
Younger
Zablocki
Zwach

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

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

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Dent with Mrs. May.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Tiernan with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Denny.

Mr. White with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Morton.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Yates.

Mr. Purcell with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Olsen.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. MIZE, and Mr. CLANCY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10730) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10730

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 "Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967".

COMMUNITY PLANNING, SERVICES, AND TRAINING

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 301 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021) is amended by striking out "four" and inserting in lieu thereof "six".

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended (1) by striking out "and" before "$8,000,000" and (2) by striking "and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law," and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,550,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the three succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law".

(b) Section 302(c) is amended by striking

out "June 30, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974".

COST OF STATE PLAN ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. Section 304 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023) is amended by striking out "10 per centum or $15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 per centum or $25,000".

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND TRAINING PROJECTS

SEC. 4. Section 603 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3053) is amended (1) in the first sentence by striking out "four" and inserting in lieu thereof "six", and (2) in the second sentence by striking out "and" before "$3,000,000" and by striking out "and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the three succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 5. (a)(1) Paragraph (2) of section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002) is amended by inserting, "unless the context otherwise requires," after "means".

(2) Paragraph (4) of such section 102 is amended by striking out "The term 'nonprofit institution or organization' means an institution or organization which is owned and operated by" and inserting in lieu thereof "The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any agency, institution, or organization means an agency, institution, or organization which is, or is owned and operated by,".

(b) Clause (b) of section 401 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3031) is amended by striking out "activity".

(c) Section 601 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3051) is amended (1) by inserting "regular full-time" before "employ" in subsection (a)(1); (2) by striking out "who appointed them" in subsection (c); and (3) by striking out "$75" in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "$100".

(d) Section 601 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3051) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) The Commissioner is authorized to furnish to the Advisory Committee such technical assistance, and to make available to it such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data available to him, as the Committee may require to carry out its functions."

(e) Section 602(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3052) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and to provide staff and other technical assistance to the President's Council on Aging".

(f) Section 602 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3052) is amended by striking out "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary"; by striking out "Secretary concerned" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary", and by striking out "their respective functions" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "his functions".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the original legislation extending the Older Americans Act of 1965 through introduction of my bill H.R. 4261 last January 31, I urge favorable consideration of the bill brought before the House today by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education.

I commend the subcommittee for its work on the bill now before us, H.R. 10730, the first it has reported and brought to the floor.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge DANIELS, has done an outstanding job and the bill should be supported by every Member of the House. He has conducted his hearings with dispatch and thoroughness.

It is always gratifying to be able to bring to the floor a measure as important as this one, yet at the same time so noncontroversial that we can do it under suspension of the rules. I know of no opposition.

We all recall that for several years the late John Fogarty sponsored a bill known as the Older Americans Act. It was not until 1965 that he, with help on the opposite side of the aisle from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and others, brought this legislation to the floor with bipartisan support.

At that time, the Committee on Education and Labor authorized funds for only a 2-year period.

The bill which is before us today calls for an extension of the provisions. The program has been amended slightly. There is to be an authorization for $10,550,000 for title III and $6,450,000 for titles IV and V.

I believe we all know that very little has been done until the last few years for our older Americans.

It was the purpose of the act to stress the need for assistance to the older citizens of this country.

The bill set up an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, headed by a Commissioner, to be appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate. The Commissioner has coequal status with the other Commissioners in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, such as the Commissioner of Social Security.

For the first time emphasis was placed on coordinating the work of the various departments of Government which were trying to solve some of the problems of our older Americans.

Those problems are numerous, whether they be a lack of income, health, housing, education, or whatever else the problems may be.

It is most interesting that we take note of the fact that there are some 18 million Americans over 65 years of age in this country today. More than 12 million of these have at least one chronic condition, such as high blood pressure, arthritis, diabetes, heart disease or mental disorder. More than half of those with a chronic ailment have some limitation on their activities. More than 800,000 older people are in institutions. About 1,250,000 elderly people are invalids.

My home State of Kentucky is one of the States taking advantage of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Fourteen project grants have been made for senior centers. These are located in Taylor County, McLean County, in Boston, Ky., at Hazard, in Washington County, Daviess County, at Lexington, and in Caldwell, Ohio, and Franklin Counties. Four projects are in Louisville.

We have need for others, and I am hopeful that in the coming months we can have centers established in Prestonsburg, Pikeville, Ashland, Morehead, Flemingsburg, and other points in my congressional district, where there is considerable need to bring older people into touch with available services.

I have pointed out the great need for health alone. I shall not undertake to discuss the bill, because the gentleman from New Jersey has done such an outstanding job, and I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I should just like to say to the gentleman presenting this bill that this is a continuation of legislation which the gentleman from Rhode Island and I sponsored in 1965.

There is a question in my mind regarding the emphasis which is given to this bill as far as the State committees are concerned. Many of these State committees have done an excellent job. Others have been merely paper organizations and have not followed through with a perfecting program in their States. What kind of an incentive is there here for those States that have had merely paper organizations to go forward in the next year?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that there is an incentive. Forty-three out of the 50 States are taking advantage of the program at the present time. The bulk of the funds, the $10,550,000, is allocated to the States on the basis of a formula that takes into consideration the ratio of the State's population of 65 and over to the 65 and over population of the entire Nation.

The States are coming up with worthwhile programs such as senior citizen centers which provide for recreation, counseling, and referral, some health services, adult education, training, and many other programs. The plan is very broad.

Mr. LAIRD. As the gentleman from Kentucky knows, the American Association of Retired Persons has been very interested in this legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. They are.

Mr. LAIRD. They have interested me and other Congressmen in this matter. This association has perhaps done more than any other association in the United States to face up to and understand these problems.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. They have gone further in the area of jobs. Their whole job index is something that I think should be called to the attention of many people, because employers all over the United

States now can go directly to the American Association for Retired Persons and get some of the best personnel for short periods of time that they could get from any employment agency in the United States. All of this has been supported by private funds and contributions of retired persons. There have been no Government funds contributed to this program. As this bill is being considered here I think we should call the attention of as many people as possible to the great work that the American Association for Retired Persons has done.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin on the contribution that the American Association of Retired Persons has done for elderly people. It has been a great job.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] as much time as he desires.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 10730, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions. This bill received the unanimous approval of the full Committee on Education and Labor.

The proposed amendments will give new impetus and strength to the work of the Administration on Aging and the programs authorized by Congress in 1965. When Congress enacted the Older Americans Act of 1965, it found and declared that it was the joint and several responsibility of the Government of the United States and of the several States and their political subdivisions to assist our older people to achieve the full and free enjoyment of life in retirement and the later years.

In America today, there are some 19 million persons age 65 or more—a number equal to the combined population of 20 States. By 1975, those 65 and over will number about 21 million, approximately 27 percent more than were in this age group at the time of the 1960 census.

Medical and scientific advances have contributed to a longer life expectancy. The American born in 1900 could expect to reach his 47th birthday and the American born today can expect to reach 70 years of age. These figures present a national challenge.

The problems of our older citizens are many and varied and it is proposed through this legislation, to meet and resolve these problems, to provide new and meaningful opportunities and services for older people and to train needed personnel in the field.

On July 14, 1965, the Older Americans Act established the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to give a central focus to coordination, planning, development, demonstration, and research regarding the needs and interests of our older population.

The Administration on Aging became operational on October 1, 1965. It is headed by a Commissioner on Aging, appointed by the President and directly responsible to the Secretary. During these first 20 months of the agency's operation, major attention has been devoted to setting up, organizing, and staffing the new Administration on Aging, and to defining goals and objectives on behalf of older Americans. Substantial effort has also been devoted to implementing the three grant programs established by the Older Americans Act.

Under the title III grant program, appropriations of $5 million in 1966 and $6 million in 1967, were made available to the States for carrying out State and community programs. To date, 43 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are actively implementing the program. Some 432 community programs have been started, another 150 are pending, and others are under active development. The kinds of activities supported include community planning, programs for older people in senior centers, services in senior housing projects, and employment and health referral services. These grants to the States for community projects support the States in their responsibilities to meet and stimulate community action.

Title IV of the Older Americans Act, authorizes direct financial support through grants and contracts to private and public nonprofit organizations for demonstration and research projects in the field. The projects currently funded represent the development of a range of new and improved services and information which identify new ways of involving older people in community services, employment, and leisure time activities in both urban and rural areas of the Nation.

Under title V, grants are provided to persons engaged in or preparing for employment in the field of aging. These grants are expanding and encouraging programs for both long- and short-term training for persons in the field of aging to meet the manpower shortages in this field.

The Select Subcommittee on Education conducted 4 days of hearings on the proposed Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967.

Among those providing expert testimony were the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner; Commissioner William D. Bechill, of the Administration on Aging; and representatives of such major organizations as the National Association of State Units on Aging, the National Council on the Aging, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the American Association of Retired Persons, the National Farmers Union, and the United Steelworkers of America. All testified in support of the general purposes of the legislation and the substantial progress that had been made during the initial period of implementation of the act.

Several key issues brought out in the testimony were of major concern to the committee and provisions to deal with some of them are included in H.R. 10730.

The first of these was the amount of money available for State plan administration to State commissions on aging, and other State agencies administering the title III grant program for community planning, services, and training.

Based on testimony received from representatives of the State agencies administering title III, an amendment is provided to strengthen State planning and administration. Under its provisions, the maximum amount available to the State for administration of its State plan from its total allotment is increased to 15 percent or $25,000—whichever is greater.

We believe this provision will enable the States to improve their overall administration to, first, provide additional consultation and technical assistance to community project grantees receiving title III funds; and, second, to carry out more effectively their responsibility for coordination and stimulation of more comprehensive programs for their older citizens on the State and local levels.

The second provision would strengthen the work of the statutory Advisory Committee on Older Americans by authorizing the Commissioner to furnish the committee such technical assistance, and to make available to it such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data available to him, as the committee may require to carry out its functions.

Still another provision added by the committee authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide staff and other technical assistance to the President's Council on Aging. The Administration on Aging uses this Council as a mechanism through which to carry out coordination activities. Since it is composed of the heads of various Federal agencies which have programs affecting older people, it provides a forum for the exchange of information and ideas about aging and aging programs.

This provision is designed to assist the Commissioner in expediting the very complex and important task of coordinating the agency with other agencies.

The committee while supporting the extension of the program through June 30, 1972, deemed it advisable to have future authorization amounts subject to such sums as the Congress would authorize by law in 1969, 1970, 1971, and 1972, on an annual basis. This represents a significant change from the original bill which would have provided an "open end" authorization for the period covering the fiscal years 1969 through 1972.

The proposed 1967 amendments to the Older Americans Act would extend the grant provisions authorized under titles III, IV, and V, of the act through fiscal year 1972.

The amendments would authorize appropriations for the State grants program—title III—of $10,550,000 for fiscal year 1968. This authorization will enable the continued support of the projects that will have been funded by the close of fiscal year 1967, and will permit the States to fund about 240 to 300 additional community projects in fiscal year 1968.

The amendments would also authorize $6,400,000 for fiscal year 1968 for the research, demonstration, and training grant programs—titles IV and V. This authorization will provide for the continuation of about 49 projects. It will also fund some 70 to 80 new projects, including a major new demonstration program of food and nutritional services in senior citizen centers.

Such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law would be appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and the 3 succeeding years.

The past 20 months have been a period of tooling up and initial implementation of vital new legislation. Many plans have been developed and much action has been generated. Yet, a great deal remains to be done. We must move forward in needed programs to enable our older citizens to achieve both a better standard of life and a more active, useful, and meaningful role in our society. The proposed amendments will assure the continuation of worthwhile programs and will permit net programs and activities to be developed.

I urge all the Members of the House to support this bill, H.R. 10730. The unanimous approval of this bill will be a tribute to two late and distinguished Members of Congress, Congressman John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, and Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, under whose leadership the Older Americans Act was passed.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make some legislative record, and I understood the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to say that there will be annually a line-item type of authorization, as well as an appropriation, after the increased sums for the current fiscal year 1968 in consideration are in effect. This on page 5 of the committee's report is a little vague, whereas on page 4 in the next to the ultimate paragraph it says they will make authorizations on each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

Mr. DANIELS. As this bill was originally introduced, it sought an appropriation of $10,550,000 for fiscal year 1968, and such sums as may be necessary to carry on the programs for the fiscal year 1969 through fiscal year 1972. The committee deemed it advisable to make this a 1-year authorization, and to request the Commissioner to come back before the select subcommittee with a report of its activities and also to request, if you will, sums of money to carry on the program.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the response of the gentleman, and I interpret it as requiring as stated, "whatever the Congress may hereinafter authorize by law," that this means on an annual basis, and I compliment the committee in this respect.

Mr. DANIELS. That is correct.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10730. Passage of this bill will assure that we will be able to continue through 1972 the very specific work for and with older people which has been started under the Older Americans Act. This program was a lifelong goal of our late colleague John A. Fogarty. Those of us who shared his vision and worked with him for the passage of the Older Americans Act are gratified at the progress made in the first 20 months of its operation.

Through the Federal allotments under title III, 45 States and jurisdictions are now actively engaged in stimulating and developing projects for older people in the communities where they live. Because of this act, many communities now have comprehensive plans of action and services for their older citizens. Because of this act, older people are finding part-time and full-time employment; are contributing their skills and talents to various community services and have greater opportunity to participate in the life of their communities.

I am impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the scope of the research and demonstration projects started to date under title IV of the act. When completed, these projects will tell us a great deal about the best ways to meet some of the needs of older people. They are already showing the extent to which older people themselves can develop and operate services. They are already demonstrating that activities and services can be provided for older people who are homebound or socially isolated. They are beginning to show us how those older people living in isolation can be brought back into the mainstream of community life.

The funds appropriated under title V have been wisely allotted to projects aimed at educating personnel for many kinds of positions. Some of those trained will meet the serious shortage of adequately trained people in the important field of retirement housing. Others will be administrators of senior centers, and homes for the aged. Still others will be trained in planning and organizing community programs.

I am convinced that the creation of an Administration on Aging, concerned solely with the needs of older people, has given a visibility to the needs and problems of this age group which was never before possible. Its role as a clearinghouse for information on problems of older people and as a source of technical assistance and consultation is firmly established. I am sure its effectiveness will be strengthened by the provisions of the bill we are discussing today, which improves the 1965 act in several ways.

Mr. Speaker, now that we are completing action on this important measure to extend the basic legislative authority of the Administration on Aging, I am hopeful that the Congress can proceed to consider H.R. 2596—my bill to create an older Americans community service program. To be administered by AOA, and to make use of all the State agencies on aging, such legislation is a logical extension of the measure we are considering today.

Creation of a nationwide Senior Service Corps would enable our senior citizens to give of their still largely untapped talents to vital services in their communities. The possibilities are unlimited. Older people have much to contribute as companions to children and to other older people, as helpers in libraries, nursing homes, or hospitals, and in many other capacities. Their contribution to the community will be equaled only by the benefit of the service to the individual volunteer. Experience such as that already so ably demonstrated by the foster grandparent program has shown that participation in worthwhile work can restore meaning to the life of a retired person and bring to him the satisfaction of again being an active member of his community.

Forty of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle have joined me in introducing bills identical or similar to H.R. 2596. I hope this body will plan serious consideration of these bills before the end of the 90th Congress.

Meanwhile, I am proud to support this legislation before the Congress today. Congressman DOMINICK DANIELS, the able chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education which considered this bill, has effectively and efficiently steered these amendments through committee, and to the floor, and I want to commend him on a job well done. The legislation we pass today is another step toward giving wider opportunity and attention to the needs of our older citizens and building the resources by which such opportunities can be furthered in our local communities.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, for many of the more than 18 million persons who are 65 and over, meeting the problems of daily existence can present some seemingly insurmountable problems. Health, so vital to a rewarding life, is now more expensive to maintain. Senior citizens go to the hospital more frequently and stay longer than their younger neighbors. Income is reduced. More than half of our older couples have incomes under $3,000 and 3 out of 5 older persons living alone or with nonrelatives have incomes under $1,500. There is ample evidence of discrimination in employment on the basis of age. The opportunities for companionship are reduced, as many of our citizens are isolated at home because of poor health and lack of money. Cut off, also, is the wide opportunity for the older individual to contribute to the community and to use the skills developed over a lifetime.

These problems are of concern not only to the approximately one in every 11 who is currently in the 65-and-over age bracket but also to the many younger people with aged parents to support; to the middle aged who find employment opportunities closing to them, and to those who are about to step over the threshold into the new and often uneasy world of retirement.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 offered our Nation the tools with which to begin the attack on these problems. As the President stated when signing this act:

> It clearly affirms our Nation's high sense of responsibility toward the well-being of older citizens.

Our States and local governments and individual citizens have accepted this responsibility.

In my own district, for example, the

Berkeley Multipurpose Senior Center was established under a grant made by the California State Commission on Aging to the city of Berkeley.

The center is centrally located and readily accessible to those who wish to drop in to take part in its recreational activities or who are in need of counseling on how to meet a problem of health or where to go to obtain help in solving a home problem. It offers a chance for service to the community to those whose skills and knowledge otherwise might have gone unused. And it offers a chance of "reengagements" in the life of Berkeley.

Centers, such as this, and other programs of research and aid have been started through the passage of the Older Americans Act.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today places before us the responsibility of again affirming the Nation's concern for our older citizens. I urge the adoption of this bill so that this work may continue.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in support of this measure, and commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on bringing this matter before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to give unanimous approval today to an important piece of legislation, H.R. 10730, the Older Americans Amendments of 1967, which deserves our unreserved support if we are to meet our commitments to the Nation's elderly citizens pledged with passage of the Older Americans Act of 1965 in the 89th Congress.

The urgency of this legislation, which continues and expands the 1965 act, is underscored by the accelerating numbers of elderly in our society. By 1970 there will be 20 million Americans over 65, and by 1975 an anticipated 25 million. This, of course, is a direct result of medical advances which have pushed our average life expectancy to 70 years of age, a 50-percent increase since the turn of the century.

But there can be no doubt that as the elderly increase proportionately in our population, their social and material well-being does not keep pace, and it could be truly said in 1965 when we passed Public Law 89–73 that the aged were the forgotten element of our national life. President Johnson revealed in his January 23 message to the Congress that there are still 5.3 million older Americans with yearly incomes below the poverty level and that only one out of five has any job at all. Over 2 million senior citizens are on welfare, and nearly 40 percent of the single people have total assets of less than $1,000.

In our attempts to meet the pressing needs of our aged, we have enacted housing programs, provided sweeping medical assistance, and are now contemplating extension of social security benefits as well as tax reform for the elderly. And so in many ways we are looking to the material and physical well-being of our citizens.

But the older Americans legislation is aimed at the real heart of the plight of these people, many of whom live alone, neglected, feeling cast out from the main currents of our society at the height of its affluence. The 1965 act was designed with the broadest scope to make retirement years ones in which health, honor, and dignity would predominate. We had in mind civic and cultural and recreational opportunities for the elderly, the expansion of local community social services, the application of research knowledge for the sustenance of health and happiness, and the greatest freedom, independence, and initiative that could be extended to the elderly in planning and organizing their own lives. We looked to providing full restorative services for those in institutional care, the elimination of discrimination because of age in employment, and the opportunity for the best physical and mental health possible for retired citizens.

With the Older Americans Act we established a new Administration on Aging to focus on the social welfare of the aged, with a view to integrating them once again into the community so that their retirement years could be richer, more meaningful. The Administration on Aging is charged with conducting research and demonstration programs, providing a clearinghouse for information, administering grants under the Act, providing technical assistance and consultation to local governments in their efforts to assist the aged, stimulating more effective use of existing resources for the elderly, and preparing, publishing, and disseminating educational materials on the welfare of the aged.

The act was aimed at establishing effective coordination between the Federal Government, State, and local governments, and participating public and nonprofit private agencies. Each State had to submit a plan outlining its program for the elderly, which was then to be administered through a single agency designated by the Governor of each State. It is gratifying to note that 45 State plans have been approved in 2 short years in 43 States and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, while another six jurisdictions have designated administering agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I am further proud to report that my State of Hawaii, under the vigorous leadership of Gov. John A. Burns, was one of the first groups of five States to have its plan approved under this act. The Hawaii Commission on Aging, ably directed by Mr. Charles W. Amor, has taken over responsibility for the support of community projects important to health, income, employment, education, and housing of older persons. Each of the four major islands of Hawaii has its own Committee on Aging to help communities develop local programs, such as senior centers to provide social, educational, and recreational services for older people and to give older people the opportunity to serve others, surely one of the most rewarding roles available to Americans of any age in this decade.

In February of this year the Honolulu Committee on Aging announced the initiation of an Information and Referral Service that exemplifies the highest goals of the Older Americans Act. Under this plan the committee, aided by district aides in their sixties and seventies and consultants from the University of Hawaii, is making an effort to determine the needs and problems by interviewing older persons themselves, with future plans to develop a comprehensive program of activities for older persons based on the gathered data. The project is jointly funded by the Federal, State, and county governments, in a demonstration of concerted coordinated action at the level where the needs of the elderly can be most accurately uncovered, and I regard it as a fine example of the results to be gained through the impetus given to the welfare of the elderly by our enactment of the 1965 legislation.

The amendments we are considering today, H.R. 10730, will extend and broaden the promising beginnings made over the past 2 years by increasing the authorization for title III to $10,550,000 in fiscal 1968 and such sums as Congress may authorize for the succeeding 4 years.

Title III of the Older Americans Act provided grants for community planning, services, and training, with $5 million authorized in fiscal 1966 and $8 million in 1967 for first, community planning and coordination of programs; second, demonstration programs and activities; third, training of special personnel to work with the elderly; and fourth, establishment of programs in recreational and other leisure time activities; establishment of informational, health, welfare, counseling, and referral service for older persons; and assistance to such persons in providing volunteer community or civic services.

Further, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10730 will boost the authorization for titles IV and V of the Older Americans Act to $6.4 million in fiscal 1968 and such sums as Congress may authorize for 4 subsequent years.

Title IV of the act encompasses research and development projects. Under this title grants are made to public or nonprofit agencies to study and identify factors which are beneficial or detrimental to wholesome lives for the elderly, to develop or demonstrate new approaches or techniques which can contribute to meaningful lives, and to develop or demonstrate methods for coordination of community services for older persons. Title V provides grants or contracts for training of individuals to be employed in the programs brought into existence by the act. In 1966 there were $1.5 million authorized for titles IV and V, and $3 million in 1967.

It is hoped that the increased funding will not only enable the continuation of existing programs in full force but will also permit the approval of up to 300 new worthy programs, many of which have been rejected recently because of inadequacy of appropriations. One of the important new emphases of the total program will be the establishment of pilot nutrition projects to meet the often-neglected dietary needs of the elderly. Dining provisions in senior centers are envisioned, home-delivered meals for

those unable to go out, and also cooperative cafeterias established and operated by and for senior citizens in a social agency or nonprofit institution. This would mount a frontal approach not only on the discovered nutritional deficiencies of these people, but also may well provide meaningful activity on their part in the management of the projects and provide social occasions for the elderly to meet in senior centers and share their meals.

Here again, the Hawaii Commission on Aging has demonstrated its alertness in a status report forwarded to me by Director Charles Amor on June 5, 1967. I quote from Mr. Amor's letter:

The Makua Alii, a federally financed public housing for the elderly, is now under construction and is scheduled for completion in June, 1968. A senior center funded in part by the City and County of Honolulu will be built on the first floor to house recreational, social and educational activities. It will cater to the needs of the residents of the 210 units at the facility as well as the elderly in the surrounding community.

Space has been made available to provide at least one nutritious meal for the participants of the center. It is envisioned that a consumer education program or the provision of informational programs about balanced diet, maintaining well-being and other related activities will accompany the meal. Hopefully, more than a meal will be provided to meet the psychological and social needs of elderly persons. It is anticipated that a non-profit sponsor will operate the food service under a Title IV grant if such funds are made available by this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of progressive activity we hoped for when we passed the Older Americans Act of 1965. Commissioner William Bechill of the Administration on Aging revealed other areas in which the 1967 amendments will allow for more intensive exploration, including mobility and transportation, provision and utilization of social services, communication and counseling, including information and referral services, new roles in employment and voluntary services which utilize the skills and energies of older people, living arrangements and housing, and leisure time activities and recreation. Many additional professional and subprofessional personnel are needed, and the Administration has a comprehensive approach for the education of needed specialists to implement this and other legislation aimed at improving the overall welfare of the elderly.

The program is before us, and the outlook for our senior citizens has at last been lifted above the horizon of despair, negelect and loneliness which has too long been their lot. I urge the immediate passage of H.R. 10730 to continue to enlarge the vistas of the elderly and to demonstrate that their presence and active participation in the life of their communities is still warmly desired by us all.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Flordia.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman in the well for the leadership he has provided in developing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 10730, which is the same as my bill designed to strengthen and extend the Older Americans Act of 1965. This bill is a further step in meeting our responsibility to improve the lives of our Nation's older people. We have a commitment to these individuals. Older Americans must be able to enjoy the same opportunity for security, dignity, and satisfactions that is enjoyed by other Americans. The bill which we have before us today is an essential instrument in providing this opportunity.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 represented a significant new hope that every older American would be able to live out the later years in dignity and honor. Since the passage of this act just a little less than 2 years ago, considerable progress has been made in providing practical programs of action for our older citizens at the community level. This progress has only begun. It must be continued and reinforced. H.R. 10730 makes this possible.

The Older Americans Act established the Administration on Aging as an operating agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to give a central focus for planning, development, demonstration, and research regarding the needs and interests of our older population. The act also authorized grants to the States to help them establish and expand programs for the elderly in the communities. It authorized funds for research, demonstration, and training, and established an Advisory Committee on Older Americans to bring the expertise of private citizens to bear on the problems of aging.

The bill we are considering today would extend the grant provisions of the Older Americans Act through 1972. It would strengthen the grant programs even further by authorizing appropriation levels for fiscal year 1968, of $10,550,000 for grants to the States and $6,400,000 for research, demonstration, and training direct project grants.

The bill would also raise the amount of a State's allotment under title III of the Older Americans Act available for administrative costs to 15 percent or $25,000. This would greatly strengthen the ability of the State agencies to administer and supervise effective programs on the community level. Other provisions would strengthen the positions of the Advisory Committee on Older Americans and the President's Council on Aging.

Extending the provisions of the act and increasing the funding levels will provide for the continuation of already existing projects; permit the States to fund about 250 new community projects in 1968; and permit many new research, demonstration, and training projects to be launched.

The new funding levels for the research and demonstration grant program would permit a major new demonstration program in the area of nutritional services.

Under the proposed program, pilot demonstration projects would seek to find new ways of providing nutritious meals and companionship for older people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reemphasize my conviction that the Older Americans Act of 1965 was a major step forward in meeting our national obligation to give greater purpose and meaning to the lives of our older citizens. I therefore lend my support to this legislation which ensures the continuation of the efforts which were begun in 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] has expired.

The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has expired.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 10730, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967, of which I am one of the original cosponsors.

Americans born today, Mr. Speaker, can expect to reach 70 years of age compared to those born in 1900 who had a life expectancy of 47 years.

The number of Americans over 65 today, some 19 million, is equal to the combined populations of 20 States, and it is clear that by 1975 their numbers will increase to 21.2 million.

The special needs of our senior citizens represent a national challenge.

The Congress first recognized this clear need in 1965 with the unanimous passage of the Older Americans Act which declared that it is the responsibility of government at all levels to assist these citizens to achieve full and free enjoyment of their later years.

The act focused on three basic areas. First, it created the Administration on Aging to serve as a coordinating unit within the Federal Government in all matters of concern to senior citizens.

More needs to be done, Mr. Speaker, to coordinate the proliferation of Federal programs serving senior citizens. Some 18 or 19 agencies affect senior citizens through a variety of concerns, including the foster grandparents program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the job training programs available through the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the many forms of assistance offered by the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and the Social Security Administration.

Second, among its other responsibilities, the Administration on Aging carries out three grant programs authorized by the act.

The most important of these is title III which provides funds to the States for community planning, services, and training in accordance with a State plan that is administered by a State agency whose sole responsibility is to administer this plan and whose concern is improving the lives of senior citizens.

Some 51 States and territories now have such agencies and some 43 State

plans have been approved, with 432 community programs now underway and an additional 150 pending. It is expected that community programs under this title will total between 800 and 1,000 by the end of this fiscal year.

The third major concern of the Older Americans Act are the grant programs authorized by title IV—to provide direct grants to conduct research into problems of the aged and to develop new techniques for meeting those problems—and title V—to support specialized training programs for persons working with the aged.

By the end of 1966, 39 grants had been made to institutions in 25 States under these titles.

The bill before us today would extend the grant provisions of this act through 1972.

Further, authorizations for fiscal year 1968 are made in the amounts of $10,550,000 for grants to States and $6,400,000 for research, demonstration, and training direct project grants as well as such sums as may be necessary for the next 4 fiscal years. The increased funding is expected to support 240 to 300 new programs by the States and an additional 70 to 80 new research and training projects. One such research program that is contemplated by the Administration on Aging is the development of nutritional services that meet the needs of senior citizens.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reaffirm my support of this legislation.

The story behind this legislation is that it was first introduced by our late, departed friend, our former colleague, John Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

The legislation languished in committee for 5 or 6 years. Then I was fortunate enough to become chairman of the subcommittee that is now handling this bill—from which position I have moved—and we were able to overcome the opposition—which was an internal opposition within the departments and not within the committee.

I want to commend the gentleman who is now addressing us as being one of those who worked hard with us in 1964, 1965, and 1966 in order to get this legislation through.

This has truly been a bipartisan effort and there has never been any opposition on the part of the minority or by any member of the majority.

I am happy to see our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], again devoting his time and energy to see to it that our older folks in this country get some kind of legislation which will help to guarantee them some peace of mind in their later years.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his support of this vital legislation, which is clearly bipartisan in character.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the legislation would raise State plan administration funds under title III from 10 percent or $15,000 to 15 percent or $25,000, whichever is greater. We believe this will substantially improve, coordinate, and strengthen State administration.

In the 2 years this legislation has been in force considerable progress has been made in reaching senior citizens who can benefit most from these programs in their home communities. There is one area, however, that I believe needs to be pinpointed today. One of the 10 objectives of title I of the Older Americans Act is to provide the "opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age."

Secretary Gardner said, in response to a question I asked of him in committee—

> I believe that we are just seeing in this program the bare beginning of the thinking about revising the role of the older person in our society so that they are not forced into dependence and into forced isolation.

In clear testimony before the committee, in which the point and the thrust of the legislation in this area—in its broadest sense—was stressed, Secretary Gardner further said:

> You asked whether we are doing everything possible. The answer is absolutely no. The fact is, we are barely beginning, in my opinion. I share Mr. Scherle's feeling about arbitrary retirement because of age, about our whole national approach of putting people on the shelf in innumerable ways when they reach a certain chronological age.
>
> To get beyond that, we are going to have to take such a range of measures that one hardly knows where to start . . . I feel very strongly that this has to get into retirement practices, educational programs, and a whole range of other things.

I feel that it is basic that the implementation of this legislation makes it clear to the senior citizens of America that we are interested in making it possible for the full range of their talents and abilities to be utilized. This is important, and I hope that "the Administration on Aging will give greater leadership and priority to this vital objective of the act," as we stated in the report accompanying this bill. Many of our ablest citizens are in their senior years, and they have yet to make some of their most valuable contributions in meaningful jobs and in service to their country.

In my judgment, we must—and we are not now fully—doing everything possible as a nation to forget the word "aged," to recognize that chronological age has very little to do with the capacity to make a useful, indeed frequently a more important, contribution in many areas.

To cite one example, a group in my district, called the Senior Personnel Employment Committee, has, in the last 10 years, placed 1,155 persons over 60 in satisfying employment, and they have interviewed a total of 3,000 people who would be interested in obtaining such employment. The administrator of a convalescent home that hired a matron for the home through SPEC said of her employee:

> No one, not even Grace, takes time to ponder the fact that she will soon be 72, for we have never had a more capable employee.

The manager of a hardware store said of his accountant, hired through SPEC:

> He is entering his third year of service with us and we hope he will stay on and on.

I would hope that we will see more efforts of this type in other communities and, as well, on a national level through the leadership and coordination that the Administration on Aging is able to provide under this objective of the act, in concert with localities, States, and private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE].

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speaker, and I certainly support this legislation. I agree that too many people have become in many instances too obsessed with so many other problems in this country that they forget the problems of the aged are still with us and need a great deal of attention. This Nation cannot fulfill its obligations to those who built this America without recognizing that now in their older years, they need assistance. The program before us today would go a long way toward helping some of the problems of our senior citizens.

Mr. SCHERLE. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuation and extension of the Older Americans Act. In doing so, I wish to point out that my State of Iowa has the largest percentage of older people in its population of any State in the Union; 12.6 percent of Iowa's citizens are 65 years of age or older.

May I begin by saying that the Older Americans Act established in the 89th Congress was a fine project. It seems to me that over the last several years, going back at least as far as the Eisenhower administration, there has been a growing awareness that one of the most significant byproducts of our medical research, science, and technology has become an ever-increasing group of older Americans or senior citizens. It seems only fitting that a society which works so hard at extending lifespans and improving life's quality, should also accept the responsibility of seeing that this "new life" can be a meaningful and fulfilling period.

Gentlemen, I call your attention to the stated purposes of the older Americans Act of 1967. They set forth the Government's commitment to the aged, with respect to such areas as income, physical and mental health, housing, institutional care, employment, recreational activity, community services, and so forth.

First, with respect to these goals may I say—how I wish this work did not require a Government program. We should, as individuals, churches and community service organizations, businesses, et cetera, have been able to ward off the need for a Federal statute in this area. However, we have failed to do just that. In our places stands the Federal Government. The Older Americans Act has much potential. For example, in my home district, we have two neighborhood centers underway with title III support. The center in Council Bluffs, Iowa, will provide information on social security

and other income maintenance programs, will work to increase employment opportunities for older people, will provide social and psychiatric consultation, and develop recreation, education, and activity programs.

This program and the many others in my State and throughout America will do much to make more meaningful the lives of our elder Americans.

While I personally feel that some of the stated goals of the Older Americans Act will be illusive, if not unobtainable, there is no reason that they should not be pursued. For this reason I stand before you today and urge the adoption of H.R. 10730, to strengthen and extend this act.

My colleagues, our approach to the problems of the aged must be two-pronged. On the one hand we launch programs to do things for older Americans. So we have the Older Americans Act of 1965. We cannot, however, stop here, with high-sounding purpose or we shall surely have failed our elderly. We must take prompt action to eliminate the anti-elderly policies presently on the statute books. The solution to this aspect of the problem is very much within our power. It seems to me that we would be remiss if we were to end the day today without reference to some of these points.

First, let us remember that many of our elderly do not need a Federal program at all. They are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves, and would prefer to continue doing so. In our eagerness to help, let us be careful not to extend our protective influence to places where it is not wanted.

Second, there are many who would and could go it alone, if the Government would remove some of what appear to be unjustifiable shackles imposed by existing policy. In this regard:

Let us curtail Government activity which unleashes a merciless inflation, thus destroying the life savings of our elderly. From 1958 through 1964, inflation cost social security recipients roughly $1.4 billion in purchasing power.

Let us provide for an automatic upward adjustment in social security benefits so that our conduct does not take food out of these people's mouths.

Let us increase the minimum social security benefits so that fewer people will find it necessary to look toward the Government for additional assistance.

Let us drastically increase or do away with the earnings limitation in the social security program. How can we as policymakers justify any program which has as its principal effect that of discouraging our citizens from working and earning to the maximum of their abilities. It is said that to eliminate the earnings limitation would cost the Government $2 billion annually. Well, we will soon be, if we are not already, paying out a lot more than this to counter the effects of programs which have the effect of squeezing our elderly out of the work force.

Let us remove our mandatory retirement clauses, wherever this is feasible, and encourage every man who wants to continue working, to do just that.

Let us give recognition to the fact that those who reach 65 and want to continue working, should be able to defer receipt of their social security payments, and on the basis of continued contributions, receive an increased payment when they finally do retire.

Let us cease this talk of making social security income subject to Federal tax and of repealing the present double personal income tax exemption.

Let us liberalize the tax treatment of expenditures made by children on behalf of their dependent parents. After all, if there is one policy in this area which the Government should promote, should not it be care of the elderly by their own kin?

And, finally, may I say that if the Older Americans Act is going to be successful, it should be permitted to stand on its own two feet, free from the taint it might acquire from close association with certain other Federal programs whose origins were not quite so noble and whose successes to date have been less than laudatory. Let us not have the older Americans program consumed by the war on poverty.

In conclusion, my colleagues, in speaking for this act and voting for it, I do not feel my job is done, and I sincerely hope that none of you feel that yours is either. Thank you.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER], who has made important contributions to this legislation.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise from this side of the aisle to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], who did such an outstanding job, and to the gentleman from Rhode Island, the late Mr. Fogarty, and to the distinguished gentleman from my State [Mr. LAIRD], for their initial leadership on this bill.

I urge passage of H.R. 10730 to amend and extend the Older Americans Act. This act was originally passed with strong bipartisan support. I am proud to join with my colleagues from New York and Iowa in urging all Members of this House to join in passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Older Americans Act, in the short 20 months of its operation, has touched the lives of thousands of older people throughout this country. Because of it, they have found social contacts to ease their loneliness; opportunity for service to restore their sense of usefulness; and creative pursuits which add meaning to their lives.

I would like to tell this body just a few of the ways the Older Americans Act has benefited the older people in the State of Wisconsin. In the Sixth District, the cities of Plymouth and Fond du Lac, Campbellsport, and Rosendale, have established senior activity centers. North Fond du Lac will soon open a drop-in center funded by this act. These centers not only provide recreational and educational programs, but they refer and help older people to find the many other health, welfare, and employment services available to them. Similar centers have been established in five or six other cities and towns in my State.

In the city of Milwaukee, funds from the Older Americans Act are assisting the public library in an unusual project. This project will provide library services to older people in housing projects, homes for the aging, retirement hotels, and other such places. A bookmobile will be used. Shut-ins will receive book collections and volunteers and part-time assistants will give personal attention and service to those older people who visit the library. Mr. Speaker, this project illustrates how the Older Americans Act serves to coordinate the resources of existing programs and to focus them on the specific needs of older people.

Title III funds under the act have helped to establish homemaker services in one Wisconsin city, and in Ladysmith, Wis., a market outlet for handicraft items has been established and older people are being employed to give information to tourists and to take part in the management and direction of historical society displays.

The need for the Older Americans Act is great. Statistics from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate that in America today there are some 19 million persons age 65 or over—a number equal to the combined population of 20 States. By 1975, those 65 and over will number about 21.2 million, about 27 percent more than in 1960.

This legislation will continue the type of aid that is necessary if we are to deal effectively with the problems of the aged. Those problems are many and varied: low income; poor housing; inadequate access to medical, health, and other community facilities; and a separation from the rest of our mobile, work-oriented, youth-centered society.

The Older Americans Act amendments we are acting on today will take another important step toward creating a more equitable situation for our older citizens. It allows the individual States to set their own priorities and determine their own needs for programs under this act.

While I rise as the youngest Member of the minority side in support of the Older Americans Act, I do so in the belief that this legislation has made meaningful gains in our efforts to help those older Americans who most need our help.

One of the most significant factors which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] hit upon in questioning the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] was one of the weaknesses uncovered during the testimony in regard to this program.

This legislation was strengthened by increasing the amount which is available for administration to the States. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is correct that some States have not done as effective a job in handling their program and the increase in the amount of money for administration, I hope, will work to encourage better State programs. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Wisconsin Commission on Aging is doing an effective job and has developed an excellent State plan for utilizing the Older Americans Act.

In addition, another point we discovered in the committee testimony on this legislation was the fact that, as is true with regard to so many of our problems

in the Federal Government, one of the things which is most likely to be necessary is coordination among all of the agencies involved with the aged.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Gardner—as I recall the testimony—named about nine or 10 agencies which he could quickly recall which were involved in programs for the aged, but when he was asked as to whether this was all he admitted there were perhaps 17 or 18 agencies which were involved in programs which related to the aged.

This kind of multifaceted approach does lead in my judgment, to a weakness in terms of effectively coordinating our efforts.

Under an amendment which I offered to the bill in the committee, the legislation will provide sufficient staff and other assistance for the President's Council on Aging. The Council was established by Executive order to try to coordinate the work of all the agencies at the Federal level which are involved in this effort and I am hopeful this amendment will be helpful to the Council to do a better job as well as giving statutory direction to the Commission on Aging to do what they have been doing only by agreement.

The work done under the Older Americans Act has made a significant contribution. We must, I feel, continue this program if we are to continue to work toward solving the problems of our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of the Older Americans Act to the older people of Wisconsin are being duplicated in the 44 other States and jurisdictions where allotted funds have been put to work. I urge the passage of the amendments to the act which will increase the effectiveness of these programs for our older citizens.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, in urging support of this bill I would particularly like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DANIELS] for his leadership and his bipartisan spirit at all times, and equally to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] who have worked diligently and effectively to bring out a meaningful bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation will complement the efforts of many Republicans to move forward in terms of liberalizing and improving social security benefits. It will help to highlight our concern for our senior citizens. It will underscore our commitment to do much more in terms of community opportunities for these Americans who too often are faced either with discrimination in hiring or with retirement problems which do not recognize their major potential for important contributions in business, in the community, and in many other areas of service.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the strongest bipartisan support of this bill, which is in the clear interest of some 20 million senior Americans.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman's comments, because I am in support of this legislation, with regard to job discrimination. I also testified at the last session relating to this bill, as many of us did, and I pointed out that the Federal Government itself is one of the worst perpetrators of job discrimination that there is. Someone over the age of 45 might as well not make application for a job, because being over 45 years of age they are traditionally turned down.

If we are going to start somewhere trying to do something about job discrimination, the starting point is with the Federal Government itself and should be followed up through the Older Americans Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10730—Older Americans Act amendments. As a cosponsor of this legislation as well as the original bill which created this program, I am pleased to have the privilege to urge adoption of these amendments.

This legislation has been of great benefit to our older citizens in the year and a half that it has been in effect. By passage of these amendments we can make an even more meaningful contribution to aiding our senior citizens. The opportunities which this bill will provide to our local citizens have brought great changes in the lives of many formerly lonely and neglected people.

This act represents a significant commitment by the Congress to assist States and local communities to provide comprehensive programs for our Nation's nearly 19 million older people.

As the Members of this House know, I had for many years sponsored legislation which was designed to provide new opportunities for older Americans. In 1963, I introduced several measures which would have established programs of education, recruiting, and training for community service, counseling, and a variety of other programs to enrich the lives of our elderly citizens. I also introduced legislation to provide for the construction and operation of senior citizen centers to serve as a focal point within the community for programs on behalf of the aged. In the 89th Congress, I continued to support and sponsor programs of expanded opportunities for all older people. I am happy to say that many of the ideas contained in my bills were later incorporated into a bill sponsored by our late colleague from Rhode Island, John Fogarty, the bill which subsequently became the Older Americans Act on July 14, 1965.

We in Florida have for many years been deeply interested in programs for older people. Since 1960, the older population of Florida has increased by 34.4 percent to an estimated 743,000 persons aged 65 and over in July of 1966. This tremendous rate of growth of the older population in the State is next to the highest rate of growth found anywhere in the United States. Older people comprise 12.5 percent of Florida's total population. Only Iowa has a larger percentage of its population aged 65 and above. However, because our older population is growing nearly seven times the rate of growth of that State's older population—Iowa—Florida expects to have, by the next census, the largest concentration of older Americans in the United States. Part of the reason for the phenomenal growth rate of older people in Florida has been that we have undertaken for many years to develop the services and programs older Americans need and want in their retired years. The immigration of large numbers of older people into the State continues, in part, because we believe that older Americans can continue to make a substantial contribution to our neighborhoods and communities.

This positive philosophy about aging, as I like to call it, is the central theme of the Older Americans Act of 1965. In States and communities across the Nation, where programs for older people were just beginning, the Older Americans Act has provided new resources to enable community leaders to assess the needs of their older population and to develop new services aimed at meeting these needs. In other States and communities, such as in Florida, where many programs for the elderly were already underway, the Older Americans Act has made possible the expansion of these programs to reach thousands of new people.

Mr. Speaker, these funds are needed to continue the efforts of communities across the country to develop new and meaningful programs for older Americans. The programs authorized by the Older Americans Act are producing useful and practical results, and most important, these programs are reaching older people in the neighborhoods in which they live and where these programs can do the most good.

The Older Americans Act has also pointed up the need to develop other new programs to provide new opportunities for the elderly. I believe that we must go beyond these grant programs already authorized in the act to provide additional resources to strengthen our commitment to those who have helped to build our country and could be a positive resource to the future greatness of our American Nation.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10730, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967. I have supported this legislation from its inception.

In 1965, Congress enacted legislation designed to better the lives of the then 18 million older people living in our Nation.

Those aged 65 or over now number 19 million.

This will rise to 21.2 million by 1975.

But life in America passes them by.

There has been justified criticism that ours is too much a youth-oriented, fast-paced society.

Today's dynamism has brought tragic irony.

Older Americans who contributed to the very dynamism by which we live to-

day, who contributed to our progress, are, simply by virtue of having lived longer than those who dominate society, denied the advantages of the world they may have helped create.

Regardless of their economic status—and many of them are poor—they have very particularized needs.

Age often brings physical disability, a certain isolation—and loneliness.

Older Americans need employment, for if given the chance they can be productive.

They need meaningful activity and continued variety.

They need housing geared to their age requirements.

They need special services to help overcome difficulties imposed by curtailed incomes and restrictive physical problems.

They need community services to provide social assistance.

They need independence, self-assurance, and dignity.

H.R. 10730, with its amendments to the Older Americans Act, and its authorizations of $16,950,000, can help. The time has come to review the act of 1965, to extend authorizations, and to make any changes needed in order best to fulfill our responsibility to this segment of our constituencies.

Here, I would like to mention the fine and dedicated performance of my esteemed colleague, DOMINICK DANIELS, in perfecting H.R. 10730.

Once more, I recommend passage of this legislation now before us.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of the legislation under consideration by the House to extend the provisions of the 1965 Older Americans Act until 1972. The present law establishes the Administration on Aging to coordinate Federal activities in this vital area. Since its inauguration, the agency has proved its usefulness by providing local communities with grants for personnel training, research activity, and demonstration projects in order to improve their services to the elderly.

In my own State of Iowa, four grants have been made for county programs and multipurpose centers under title III. In addition, Drake University has been awarded a $96,000 grant for retirement planning under title IV.

This bill is of special concern to me because Iowa has a larger percentage of senior citizens than any other in the Nation. One out of eight Iowans is over 65—over 52,000 residents in the Second District alone. But the entire Nation is challenged by the magnitude and gravity of the problem. A tenth of our population belongs to this age group and shoulders a heavy financial burden. The median income for older families is less than half that of families with a younger head. At the same time, the elderly bear health costs 2½ times as great as those of younger persons and spend twice as much time in the hospital. Certainly the social security amendments known as medicare represent a significant advance and the bill before us now continues the effort to ease the difficulties of our senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation promises a dignified and responsible way of life to Americans of retirement age. It provides for efficient community services to assist older people in managing and planning their own lives. By offering a high standard of health care, we can encourage the continuation of productive activity and meaningful contributions by the elderly.

It is the particular advantage of the Older Americans Act that it recognizes the value of local initiative in community planning and developing projects. State agencies administer and supervise the appropriations.

The 1967 amendments will strengthen the Administration on Aging by extending its authority and increasing its appropriations. With adequate funding, we will enable the agency to fulfill the expectations that it has already aroused by its energetic and impressive beginnings.

This act is a proud example of the creative partnership of Federal and State Government working together on a critical problem. I urge the Congress to extend its provisions until 1972 so that the Administration on Aging can continue its important and urgent programs.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to add my support to H.R. 10730—the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967.

Today, there are over 1,600,000 men and women over 65 living in California. These people have contributed throughout their lifetimes to building the present greatness of California and our Nation. The Older Americans Act is important to them as it is to all the older people of America.

One of the important purposes of the act is to promote services for our older citizens in their home communities. Only services available where the older person lives have any practical value for him. We have a good example of this type of program in one of the communities in my district.

Under a title III grant made by the California Commission on Aging, the Paradise Recreation and Park Department, the Paradise Senior Citizens Association, and other community groups—by working together—have been able to establish a multipurpse senior center for Paradise's older residents who comprise a very high proportion of that community's total population. Forty-five percent of Paradise's total population is age 55 and over.

Some of the services included at the center are information and referral services, volunteer leadership training, nutritional services, and a wide variety of constructive educational and social activities. For example, courses in preretirement and postretirement activities are being given in cooperation with the local adult education program. A course for the older driver has been offered since the automobile is the main type of transportation available in the community. A community committee on aging has been started as part of the project. The long-range aim of the program is for community leaders and older citizens to work together in building a well-coordinated program in Paradise.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great program, with its roots in the community, providing opportunities and services where they do the most good—on a person's own home grounds.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10730—to continue and extend the Older Americans Act.

This program has been underway less than a year in my State, but significant programs are underway and more are planned. It has had real meaning for our older citizens. Strengthening and extending the act will mean continued progress in serving older people, and in helping them to continue to use their skills and wisdom which have contributed so much to the progress of America.

In Maine, this program has emphasized the establishment and expansion of multipurpose activity centers for older people—facilities where opportunities exist for recreation, education, counseling, and referral. Seven new center programs are functioning. A project in Augusta, which made unique use of educational television, provided much-needed information to older people and will be used as the basis for further development of future programs to assist retired people.

Another title III program in Alfred will make use of older volunteers trained under title V to involve older people in creating programs at the local community level.

Maine's program for our older citizens includes—

Training older people for jobs, and providing employment referral services.

Setting up workshops where older people can make, exhibit, and sell arts and crafts items.

Developing services for the homebound, and setting up central information and referral centers where older people can find help or offer it to others.

In Maine, we are emphasizing use of the abilities and experience of older people in order to bring them—in President Johnson's words—into "the mainstream of community life."

We are a State of independent people. And the desire for independence continues and grows with the years. We are anxious to make it possible for older people to continue living in their own homes even though they may need some help with the tasks of daily living. To do this, Maine is supporting a battery of services including homemaker and home health care, friendly visitor programs, and meals-on-wheels.

A great strength of the Older Americans Act is that it permits these kinds of services—that it is flexible enough to fit the practical needs of individuals and individual communities.

In York County in my district, for example, we have an innovative training program under title V of the Older Americans Act. With this Administration on Aging grant, the York County Council on Aging will train older adult volunteers to organize and conduct programs in four senior centers to be established in the county.

York is a rural county and its older people need an opportunity to serve their communities and at the same time to find self-fulfillment in retirement years. This program will permit 40 retired people to receive training and supervised experience in surveying the needs and interests of older people, and in organizing senior activity centers with a variety of programs to fit these needs and interests.

The Administration on Aging is looking to this program for guidelines for developing similar programs elsewhere.

After training, the trainees—all senior citizens—will go into four communities in the county—Biddleford, Hollis, Kennebunk, and Saco—to interview older people, to open centers, and to begin programs. Funds for operation of the centers will be provided by the Maine Council on Aging out of title III Older Americans Act funds. Space for the centers is being contributed by local agencies.

I am happy to have the opportunity to vote in favor of continuation and expansion of a Federal program that is working out such an effective partnership with States and local communities, and one that has so much meaning for the older citizens of the Nation.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10730. The programs made possible by the Older Americans Act of 1965 have demonstrated conclusively in the Fifth District of Tennessee that new dimensions in living are being provided to older people.

Prior to the enactment of this vital legislation, Nashville had pioneered in the area of creating opportunities for older persons to enrich their living. Since 1965, the Nashville Senior Citizens, Incorporated, backed by community enthusiasm and support, from small beginnings has grown tremendously in size and scope of activities. Nashville, in fact, has attracted national attention. The resources made available through the Older Americans Act have been a major factor in the success of our efforts.

Under title III of the Older Americans Act, funds were provided through the Tennessee Commission on Aging, which administers the Older Americans Act in Tennessee, for a highly successful training institute for adult leaders. Persons over 50 years of age were trained to serve as aides to professional personnel in working with other older people. At the same time, this project has had a larger significance. It has enabled us to expand our horizons by assisting other senior centers and clubs improve and extend their programs in other communities of Tennessee.

Nashville is also the site of one of the 17 pilot projects in the United States to train older persons to serve as home health aides. This vital program, designed to provide necessary health services under medicare, has won the unanimous approval of community leaders in Nashville. The program is cosponsored by the Administration on Aging, the Public Health Service, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I believe the results which we have experienced have been accurately stated by two of our community leaders, Mayor Beverly Briley, and Mr. Edward J. Shea, the executive vice president of the Metropolitan Nashville Chamber of Commerce. In the words of Mayor Briley:

> The programs of the Older Americans Act in Metropolitan Nashville have created a new dimension of living for older people in our community.

Mr. Shea has this to say:

> The impact of the programs under the Older Americans Act has been nothing short of phenomenal. Older people have found a new self—a more vibrant expression—in today's living.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Nashville story is one which has been told in many other communities whose older citizens have benefited directly through the Older Americans Act. I feel strongly that this legislation can and will implement the determination of the American people to assure that the later years are rich and meaningful.

Let us meet the challenge of the later years. Let us support the passage of H.R. 10730.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, a little less than 2 years ago, the Older Americans Act of 1965 was signed into law by President Johnson who said at that time:

> The Older Americans Act clearly affirms our nation's responsibility toward the well-being of older citzens.

Since then, the act has benefited many of our senior citizens. It has generated new interest in the problems of aging and facilitated new achievements and progress in this field. Through its emphasis on joint Federal, State, and local efforts, the act has created new opportunities and services for older persons at all levels. There is much yet to be done.

To insure the continuation of the projects already underway and to give impetus to a wider series of programs, extension of the provisions of the Older Americans Act is a necessity, I strongly support the adoption of H.R. 10730, the proposed Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967. I introduced similar legislation, H.R. 2607, on January 7.

This program is one of the great legacies left to us by Congressman Fogarty. It was through his initiative and drive that the bill was originally enacted, and it stands as a monument to his interest and concern with the problems of the elderly American.

The amendments contained in H.R. 10730 and in my bill, H.R. 2607, would extend the grant provisions of the Older Americans Act and would increase the funds authorized to $10,550,000 for grants to States under title III of the act and to $6,400,000 for research, demonstration, and training grants under titles IV and V of the act. It would authorize "such sums as may be necessary" for the 4 succeeding years. The increased sums for titles IV and V will provide for the support of many new projects and the continuation of some existing ones. The increased funds under title III will mean that each State will be able to expand its programs and support more activities. Under the new amendments New York will receive in fiscal year 1968, $601,350—an amount nearly equal to the total it has received to date. In addition, section 3 of the amendments would increase the amount expendable for administration by 5 percent, so that under a grant of $601,350, $90,202 would be available for the support of administration. New York should be able to increase the scope of her activities in the field of aging. Other States would receive similar increases, and their aged population would benefit accordingly.

Today there are more than 19 million men and women age 65 and over. New medical discoveries and improved living conditions have dramatically increased the size of our older population in the last decade; and a longer lifespan, and a shortened worklife have created many problems for the older person; housing, health care, income, use of leisure time and employment for those desiring to continue work, all are increasingly frequent dilemmas confronting the elderly. In addition, the older individual is increasingly separated from a youth-oriented society—for example, although evidence indicates that the problems of the elderly poor are as great as those of any other disadvantaged group, they have received far less attention than other, more noticeable elements of our society. Through the provisions of the Older Americans Act a major effort is being made to bridge this gap.

The Administration on Aging, created by the Older Americans Act, is the newest agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the first Government agency to be created to deal exclusively with the problems of the older citizen. Its functions are varied, but perhaps the most important of all is its role as a clearinghouse for information concerning the aged. It supplies information and advice to the State and local agencies concerned with the aged; it compiles and disseminates information about older persons to newspapers, magazines, and other communications media. Its specialists are available for consultation to public and nonprofit agencies, organizations, and individuals, as well as to the President's Council on Aging.

In addition to its information activities, the Administration on Aging is responsible for the grant programs under titles III, IV, and V of the Older Americans Act.

In order to participate under title III, each State must designate an agency to administer its program. Each State also submits a plan outlining a broad program for action for older persons, and after the plan has been approved by the Secretary, States may make grants available for projects to local agencies and institutions. The programs which have been instituted in New York under this title are many and varied. One program, Operation Triple R—reach, retiree, and referral—is operated by the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union and trains retirees as "friendly visitors" to visit their fellow retirees in the Greater New York City area. Another program in the city, sponsored by the Hudson Guild, provides consumer education programs for the aging. These are but two of the many programs which have already been implemented under title III of the act in New York.

Equally important as its impact on individuals through the many programs which it has funded is the impact which title III has had on the ability of the individual State to deal with the problems of aging. Before the enactment and implementation of the Older Amer-

icans Act, many States did not even have a State agency concerned with aging. State responsibility has been strengthened through title III, and coordination between government and private groups is likewise strengthened.

Titles IV and V of the act provide grants for research, development, and training. Far too little is known about many of the problems of the aged—for example, early retirement is creating a new leisure class, many of whom are unprepared for the long hours of free time which they now possess. We need to know much more about the constructive use of leisure time for the elderly or the possibilities of substituting a shorter workweek, longer vacations, or yearly retraining periods for early retirement. Another problem about which little is known is the plight of the elderly widow—her social outlets, her income, her living arrangements—all these areas need further study and planning if the needs of our ever-increasing population of single elderly are to be resolved. Grants under titles IV and V are being expended to solve these and similar problems. One of the title IV projects which has been initiated in New York is sponsored by the Community Service Society of New York City and attempts to demonstrate that a group approach to recruitment, placement, and training of older volunteers for community service will increase their retention time and satisfaction which they find in the job. Other of the State's title IV projects are concerned with education for community leadership, study of the problems of the older blind, and staffing senior centers with competent personnel.

One of the problems to which the extended grants under the Older Amercians Act Amendments of 1967 would be applied is that of the nutritional needs of the elderly. Commissioner Bechill of the Administration on Aging, in testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on June 12, 1967, stated that the existence of many serious nutritional problems for older persons which lead to poor health and personal dependency is well known. The Administration hopes to extend the several programs it is now operating in this area to determine an efficient means of providing low-cost hot meals to older persons in senior centers, and government and private cafeterias at off-peak hours.

Title V grants provide much needed support for the training of professional personnel in aging. The need for competent and enthusiastic people in this area has greatly increased in recent years, and until the need can be met effectively, much of what is being accomplished must necessarily be done at a slower rate than is desirable. One of the program grants which is underway at present is under the sponsorship of the Jewish Home for the Aged in New York City, which is offering training on a short-term basis to persons employed in homes for the aged. Secretary Gardner pointed out in his remarks before the House Select Committee on Education that many additional useful research, demonstration, and training project grants could be supported under titles IV and V of the act, and that the increased authorization requested under the 1967 amendments to the act would enable the support of 70 to 80 new research projects, and the continuation of 49 projects now underway.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that progress has been made in the implementation of the Older Americans Act in the past 20 months, but it is also evident that effectiveness depends upon continued and increased action. We have just begun on the road to a full life for every older individual. This is a real challenge which the Older Americans Act is designed to help meet. I urge its adoption.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10730, which would extend the great programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 through 1972. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House, I know this Older Americans Act created an Administration on Aging to serve as a central authority of the Government on all matters of concern to older people. This commission will administer the grants provided by this act and prepare and disseminate educational material having to do with welfare of older persons. Also it will gather statistics in the field of aging which other Federal agencies do not collect and in general will stimulate more effective use of existing resources.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is especially important that aging Americans not be forced into retirement or dependence on others. This is the result of provisions of the social security program where outside earnings must be limited to receive benefits.

Also it seems to me we fail to recognize the great contributions that are and can be made by senior citizens. They can add much to our society if encouraged to do so. I have in mind in my district, Seattle and King County, a council for the aging composed of leaders in the community who are aware of the needs and interests of the senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in Seattle there are 100,000 persons 65 or older, and only 11,000, or 11 percent of them are financially independent. Six percent still work; 30,000 or 30 percent live on less than $1,500 a year; and the median income of the balance, or 53,000 persons, is $3,130.

Mr. Speaker, there is a need for Government to develop more assistance and encouragement to this great segment of our population.

I strongly support H.R. 10730.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as an advocator and supporter of the enactment of the original Older Americans Act of 1965 I most earnestly urge this House to expedite approval of this measure, H.R. 10730, principally designed to extend and amplify the provisions of the 1965 act.

Mr. Speaker, in the remarkably short time, comparatively speaking, of some 50 years the anticipated longevity of Americans has been increased, through scientific research and development in the medical fields, from 47 to 70. Consequently an increasing number of our population joins the ranks of the senior citizen each year. The Congress recognized this national development and its obligation, together with State and local governments, to be concerned with the growing problems of the aged, by the adoption of the 1965 Older Americans Act. Through this act the Congress declared the conviction that the older people of our Nation are entitled to reasonable Government help and encouragement in seeking and attaining the full and free enjoyment of these basic objectives:

First. An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.

Second. The best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status.

Third. Suitable housing—independently selected—designed and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.

Fourth. Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.

Fifth. Opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.

Sixth. Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy.

Seventh. Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

Eighth. Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

Ninth. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

Tenth. Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Mr. Speaker, these are the wholesome objectives this bill, under discussion, proposes to extend. Also the bill projects a more efficient, coordinated, economical, and strengthened operational program, drawn from the lessons of the experience of these past 2 years, for the Administration on Aging to carry out.

The essential need for the services and programs extended by this bill is obvious; the provisions of the bill are substantially and entirely in accord with the established American concept and tradition of promoting the inherent dignity of the individual in our vaunted democratic society; and the objectives of the bill are undoubtedly in the best national interest. Let us therefore approve this measure without any unnecessarily prolonged delay.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, too often older Americans spend their time in lonely sadness, when for many there should exist the opportunity of enriching their lives and our society through a second career. The House has before it today a measure to help make this possible, H.R. 10730, a bill to extend the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and I urge the House to adopt these amendments.

The 1965 act is now making major breakthroughs in helping senior citizens live full and constructive lives, while keeping them in the mainstream of American life. We have a tendency to push aside people because they are too old, too young or disabled in some way, when what we should be doing is helping

to develop the abilities of the old, the young, and the disabled to the fullest extent possible.

Those individual projects now underway afford excellent examples of what can be accomplished under the Older Americans Act, but they but scratch the surface of existing need.

The proposed amendments to the act in H.R. 10730 are vital and will help fill this need, but they do not go far enough. I believe a National Community Senior Service Corps—as proposed in my bill H.R. 247—is needed to help channel the energies and talents of older citizens into useful community projects where they would be welcomed. For most Americans, the most enriching moments of life are those spent helping their fellow man. The National Community Senior Service Corps can mean new opportunities for older Americans for community service, developing new interests, and acquiring new knowledge.

I was proud and pleased to be one of the sponsors of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and I am enthusiastic about the program and what it has accomplished. I urge the House to today pass H.R. 10730, and to establish in this Congress a National Community Senior Services Corps.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give my support to H.R. 10730, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967, and I am glad to be among the cosponsors of an identical bill, H.R. 10809. This measure would assure that the promising work begun under the Older Americans Act will be continued and expanded.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] on his outstanding leadership as chairman of the subcommittee which considered this significant measure.

Two years ago when the original act was passed, we in Congress set as a national objective the provision of opportunities and services for America's older people that would add dignity and meaning to later years of life. Today, that goal is beginning to be achieved in over 500 community programs that have been started or strengthened, and hundreds of thousands of our older citizens are now benefiting from and participating in these efforts. Significant research and demonstration projects have been launched, and badly needed personnel in this increasingly important field of human endeavor are being trained.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind the great positive focus of the Older Americans Act. For example, a senior center such as those supported in 180 communities under title III of the act, must not simply be thought of as a convenience for a community's older citizens. Instead, it is a way by which older people themselves can contribute to community life.

As the President pointed out in his message on older Americans:

> We should look upon the growing number of older citizens, not as a problem or a burden for our democracy, but as an opportunity to enrich their lives and, through them, the lives of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the President's message recommended to Congress a comprehensive package of legislation that gives major attention to the needs of older Americans in relation to income, health, continued job opportunities, housing, and meaningful use of their skills and capacities. The legislation before us today is a major part of that program.

The recommendations made by the President include a much-needed 20-percent overall increase in social security benefits; national legislation to outlaw the serious problem of age discrimination in employment confronting many of our older workers; additional improvements in medicare, and many other proposals designed to meet this Nation's responsibilities to assure a life of decency, honor, and independence to its older citizens.

The President stressed in his message:

> Our goal is not merely to prolong our citizens' lives, but to enrich them.

In many respects, the challenge of the later years is the same as the challenge of youth—of any age: to live meaningfully, to contribute to society, to feel alive.

To meet the challenge of making the later years meaningful, the President made several recommendations.

One of his principal recommendations was the legislation we consider today, an extension of the Older Americans Act.

The Older Americans Act created the Administration on Aging as an independent agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to serve as a focal point for information and programs on the older American, a clearinghouse, coordinating and evaluating and planning programs for using the resources of all Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, an essential part of the Older Americans Act is its program of grants to the States for community planning. The State agency becomes a mechanism for statewide planning and action to meet the total range of interests of older people. The State agencies make Federal funds available for community planning and development of services for older people in their home community. Thus, the Older Americans Act provides the direction for a strong partnership among all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

The Administration on Aging also makes direct grants for research and training programs.

Mr. Speaker, in my home community of South Bend, Ind., we have a vivid example of the contributions that older people can make. Under a title IV demonstration grant made by the Administration on Aging, the United Community Services of St. Joseph County has developed a model information, counseling, and referral program. The project began last January, and by February, older men and women had been recruited, trained, and were making a house-to-house survey of the needs of older people in South Bend and determining what resources were available to those who needed help. Despite severe snowstorms, this survey was completed in February and even during the survey, more than 200 senior citizens were given assistance in matters of health, welfare, legal aid, housing, and home care services.

By the end of March, the entire citywide survey was completed. Since then, the first directory of health, welfare, and recreation services for St. Joseph's County older citizens was completed. I have in my hand a copy of that directory. It lists the real and actual services that are available to older people in our area. It lists a single phone number which older people can call and be sure to get adequate information and assistance.

I want to emphasize that this demonstration project has the full support of community leadership in South Bend and St. Joseph County. Leading representatives from business, civic, labor, and religious organizations are assisting in this project. All of our major health and social agencies are involved.

Mr. Speaker, much to my regret, Indiana is one of the few States that have yet to implement the title III provisions of the act. H.R. 10730 would authorize $10,550,000 to the States for community programs. Under the allotment formula, Indiana's share would be $229,990. I submit from the experience of the South Bend demonstration that many communities in Indiana, both large and small, could benefit from a similar program. It is my hope that early action will be taken in Indiana to see that this goal is accomplished.

Under H.R. 10730, these grant programs would be extended and expanded, and the continuance of numerous worthwhile projects launched through the Older Americans Act would be assured.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10730, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967. I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 9784, on May 9, 1967.

The enactment of the Older Americans Act, almost 2 years ago, marked a legislative milestone of considerable significance. It provided hope and self-respect to a rapidly growing segment of our population—Americans of advanced age. Its provisions were designed to make useful and productive citizens of Americans who, deprecatingly, were often said to be in the "twilight" period of their lives. That piece of legislation, one of the most outstanding to emerge from the 89th Congress, created the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the development of programs at Federal and State levels related to the needs of older Americans.

The programs and activities of the Administration on Aging have already produced beneficial and far-reaching results. However, it is vital that the Older American Act, born and nurtured in 1965, be strengthened and expanded in the years ahead to promote the welfare and meet the problems of our senior citizens. This the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967 will do.

The bill we are now considering would extend the grant programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965 through fiscal year 1972 and authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1968. The Congress would appropriate, for each fiscal year from 1969 through 1972, such sums as may hereafter be authorized by law. The measure would provide the con-

tinuity and stability which are so important in carrying out the purposes of the original legislation.

Mr. Speaker, support for the measure on the floor would help us not only to meet our "responsibility toward the well-being of older citizens," as stated by the President when he signed the 1965 act into law, but it would also bring enrichment and fulfillment to their lives.

I urge a unanimous vote for H.R. 10730.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in support of this essential legislation to extend and improve the Older Americans Act. It was my pleasure to cosponsor it, as well as the original legislation in 1965 which established the Administration on Aging and the programs of grants administered by it.

Since its enactment, some 432 community projects have been initiated under the title III grant program, and under the authorization in the bill before us they could be continued and some 240 to 300 new projects could be funded. Under the title IV and V demonstration and training programs, existing projects could be continued and provision is made for 70 to 80 new projects, including a major one to develop food and nutritional services in senior service centers.

There are now over 19 million Americans 65 years of age or older. In New Jersey, every 10th resident is over 65, and this segment of our population is increasing at a greater rate than the rest of the populace.

Our older citizens thus represent a rich potential of wisdom and experience for the Nation to draw upon. All levels of government should work together to provide the opportunities by which this potential can be effectively utilized for the benefit of the entire Nation.

We have seen many fine examples of useful programs to which our senior citizens have contributed their talents and enthusiasm. The Foster Grandparents, to single out just one, is in its infancy but is proving a most successful and valuable one. Under this program senior citizens can give neglected or lonely children the attention and affection which may mean the difference between maladjusted or delinquent youths and productive, responsible young people.

As Cicero long ago stated in his classic essay on old age, "De Senectute"—

> What is more charming than an old age surrounded by the enthusiasm of youth? Shall we not concede old age even strength to teach the young, to train and equip them for the duties of life? What can be nobler?

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge approval of H.R. 10730. The Nation will benefit, and will be the better from the compassion and respect for our elders which it represents.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10730.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 0, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—331

Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—102

Abbitt
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Blanton
Brasco
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Curtis
Daddario
Denney
Devine
Diggs
Dulski
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gettys
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Heckler, Mass.
Irwin
Johnson, Pa.
Karth
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Leggett
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
May
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Minshall
Moore
Moorhead
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Pirnie
Purcell
Resnick
Reuss
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ruppe
Sandman
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Selden
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Utt
Watkins
Whalley
White
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Yates
Younger
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Miller of California with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Dulski with Mrs. May.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Zwach.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Irwin.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Fraser.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. White.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 10918

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 10918, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1968.

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

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 601), extending for 4 months the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 601

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 1, 1967".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there a second demanded?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of House Joint Resolution 601 is to make a short-term extension in the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program which would otherwise expire on June 30 of this year.

Under this program, grants can be made to States and public bodies and agencies for the acquisition, construction, and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment even though the planning requirements of the regular mass transportation grant program have not been fully met, if there is an urgent need for the facilities and equipment. However, the program for the development of a coordinated mass transportation system must be under active preparation. The Federal grant under the emergency program is for one-half rather than two-thirds of net project cost.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was referred unanimously to the Committee on Banking and Currency by our Housing Subcommittee and was unanimously adopted by the full committee. It has the full support of the administration.

Unless we speed this short-term extending resolution to the other body, many areas will be cut off from receiving any mass transportation assistance after June 30. In some metropolitan areas, areawide planning is very complex and time consuming. Many smaller cities and towns have only recently begun the required planning to qualify for the regular two-thirds grant program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution is virtually without controversy and hope that the House will pass it forthwith.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. We are providing for the emergency provisions of the mass transportation legislation and this has been the most used section of the bill despite the greater Federal contributions available under other provisions of the bill.

It is important to all communities that this legislation be extended in order that a much needed program continue.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated this bill received unanimous support from both the Housing Subcommittee and the full Banking and Currency Committee. There was not a dissenting vote. The legislation is not controversial. I believe it deserving of immediate consideration by the House and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time—and I believe this is appropriate legislation on which to do so—to point up again what the effect of section 204 of title II of the demonstration or model cities program would be on this program, as well as on many others despite this extension. Section 204 could nullify this action contained in this bill.

I have stated on the floor before—and I did so when I offered an amendment to the appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development recently which was adopted—what the effect would be on a number of programs, based upon section 204.

However, this extension of the date by 4 months from July 1, 1967, relating to urban transportation-mass transit is running counter to, or has a different effect than, the June 30 date relating to the demonstration cities program. Let me show you what I am talking about. My point here is action on the part of the House, on the bill before us. Assuming it will pass, which I assume it will, is it a nullity and are we doing something for nothing here? In my opinion, we are, if, in fact, section 204 is permitted to stand and to remain in effect and if it continues to give the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development unlimited power to cut off all grant money in this and other programs. I mean by that this power would be given not only to override this section for this but all grant money as it relates to mass transit and highways, hospitals, libraries and any one of numerous other programs.

To bring this into focus it was my intention, had this matter not come up under a suspension of the rules, to offer an amendment to make certain that section 204 of the demonstration cities program would not apply to mass transit. As I understand it, this 4-month extension would permit these communities to get this 50–50 matching money under this program of mass transit until November 1. However, what will happen if the other body does not include language such as this and it comes back from conference in the appropriation bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and model cities with that language of my amendment preventing implementation of section 204 stricken? You will have, despite this bill starting July 1, under section 204, a cutoff date of July 1 unless these communities participate in areawide planning on a metropolitan planning basis and conform to federally dictated metro government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge, using this as an example, and if I had the opportunity, I would offer an amendment to make certain it did not happen, we demonstrate to the Banking and Currency Committee the hope that they will at the first opportunity reconsider section 204 and, I hope, repeal it.

I say this because the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. If the Department of Housing and Urban Development decides it feels section 204 is a mandate of the Congress and as long as it is on the books it must be followed, then this extension of 4 months' time would mean nothing, because the Depart of Housing and Urban Development could cut off the money unless they are satisfied with the statistical metropolitan areawide planning.

I hope that this great committee will give consideration to this matter as soon as possible and that the conferees will stand firmly by the House position relating to my amendment to the appropriation act.

To restate the case, this joint resolution would extend for 4 months—until November 1, 1967—the expiration date for the emergency grant program authorized by section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Federal grants under the emergency program are

for one-half of the net project cost—that portion of the cost of a project that cannot be financed from fare box revenues—rather than the regular two-thirds grant.

Section 4(a) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act requires, among other things, that to be eligible for a two-thirds grant the facilities and equipment be "needed for carrying out a program for a unified or officially coordinated transportation system as a part of the 'comprehensive planned development of the urban area.' "

Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act provides that prior to July 1, 1967, Federal assistance may be provided on a 50–50 basis where, among other things, "the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system is under active preparation although not yet completed." According to the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency on House Joint Resolution 601, as of June 1, 1967, emergency 50–50 grants, where comprehensive urban planning has not been completed, have been approved for 36 projects, for a total of about $128 million. This is 58 percent of all capital grant projects, and 61 percent of the amount of such grants. Thus, a majority of the grants made under the Urban Mass Transportation Act since its enactment on July 9, 1964, have been in urban areas that do not have acceptable comprehensive urban plans.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, according to the committee report on House Joint Resolution 601, is requesting a 2-year extension of this emergency program authorization, and the proposed amendment appears as section 211 of H.R. 8068, the 1967 Housing Act, which is presently under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This emergency 4-month extension, as well as HUD's requested 2-year extension of the emergency program, seems to clearly demonstrate that section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is premature and should be repealed. It will serve little purpose to enact House Joint Resolution 601 if section 204 is to be enforced commencing July 1, 1967, which is less than 2 weeks away.

Section 204 would require that all applications after June 30, 1967, for many types of Federal loan and grant programs, including mass transportation grants, be reviewed by an areawide agency designated to perform metropolitan or regional planning in each standard metropolitan statistical area, and that the application be accompanied by comments and recommendations by such agency and a statement by the applicant that such comments and recommendations have been considered. If section 204 is enforced, it would appear that the temporary 4-month extension of the mass transportation emergency grant program would be a nullity. If section 204 is not enforced, or if it is enforced in some areas and not in others, then clearly section 204 should be repealed or substantially amended.

This bill would accomplish in the limited area of emergency mass transportation grants what I have been attempting to do on a broader scale, and that is to get around the onerous and unreasonable provisions of section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. The attention of the House is particularly invited to the following paragraph contained in the committee report on House Joint Resolution 601, which supports the position you have been taking relative to section 204:

> Many urban areas are not yet able to meet the regular planning and programing requirements. Only a few of the major metropolitan areas have qualified, and the work involved in meeting the requirements in these areas is particularly complex and time consuming. Also, in many smaller areas, the problem is further complicated by the national shortage of experienced and trained planning personnel.

My amendment to the HUD appropriation bill to eliminate funds for administering section 204 was adopted by the House to prevent the cutoff of funds in mass transit and other programs for failure to conform to federally dictated metro planning. I hope the House conferees on appropriations for HUD will stand firm on this and that the Banking and Currency Committee repeal section 204 of model cities as soon as possible.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I join wholeheartedly with my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia who is chairman of our Housing Subcommittee and the distinguished minority leader on our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], in supporting this absolutely essential short-term extension of the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program. It has no opposition that I know of. By continuing the program, at least until November 1, the Congress can consider, in later legislation, what the appropriate long-term extension in the program should be. I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PUCINSKI was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONTRAST IN APPEALS MADE BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND PREMIER KOSYGIN TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] for yielding to me this time in order to call attention to the fact that today President Johnson offered a five-point program designed to bring peace to the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's sincere and compassionate appeal for peace in the Middle East is in sharp contrast to the arrogant demand by Soviet Premier Kosygin before the General Assembly of the United Nations to the effect that Israel be branded as an aggressor and be ordered to pull back her troops.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States acknowledged the need for the withdrawal of troops, but said such a withdrawal should be linked to negotiation of a general peace settlement in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson very wisely stated the fact that a simple withdrawal of Israel troops from conquered territories would not be a prescription for peace, but for renewal of hostilities unless such a withdrawal of troops is part of a general negotiation for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Johnson has shown the world how a fair formula can be approached for lasting peace in the Middle East. This formula must have as it very basis the recognition of Israel as a sovereign state with all the rights afforded such a state.

Contrast Mr. Johnson's statesmanshiplike approach to the totally irresponsible conduct of Premier Kosygin. It is a fundamental rule of law that one must come into court with clean hands.

Mr. Speaker, let us see how clean are the hands of Premier Kosygin as he appeared before the General Assembly of the United Nations today demanding the withdrawal of Israel troops.

A simple study of recent history shows that the Soviet Union has captured by force and through occupation by her troops, more than 478,000 square miles of land involving 10 nations which include a population of more than 180 million people.

Here is the timetable of Soviet aggression that Premier Kosygin would like to ignore:

East Poland. In 1939, Russia annexed 65,610 square miles of Polish territory with a population of 10,315,000 after an agreement with Nazi Germany dividing the country.

Southern Finland. In 1940, Russia occupied 17,173 square miles of that country, and in 1944 as part of the armistice terms exacted additional lands to the north with an estimated Finnish population of 54,000 after resettlement.

Bessarabia. In 1940, Russia occupied 19,247 square miles of Bessarabia and North Bukovina—North Rumania—with a population of 3.7 million.

Estonia. In 1940, Russia annexed that nation of 18,357 square miles with a population of 1,134,000.

Latvia. In 1940, Russia annexed that nation consisting of 25,395 square miles with a population of 1,944,000.

Lithuania. In 1940, Russia annexed this nation with an area of 25,174 square miles, with a population of over 3 million people; and Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia became Soviet socialist republics after the Second World War, against all rules of international diplomacy and in violation of every international law upon the books of this world.

Germany. In 1945 Russia, by decision of the Potsdam Conference, annexed 5,360 square miles of East Prussia, with a population of 1,187,000 people.

Czechoslovakia. In 1945, Russia annexed the Carpatho-Ukraine, a part of Czechoslovakia, with an area of 4,866 square miles and with a population of 850,000 people.

Japan. In 1945, by the terms of the

Yalta Agreement, Russia annexed Southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, representing an area of 13,935 miles and a population of 415,000.

Tuva People's Republic. In 1944, Russia took that Asiatic nation located near Mongolia, with an area of 66,139 square miles and with a population of 95,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the world ought to know of the hypocrisy in which Mr. Kosygin is engaging in the United Nations today and should know that he is not fooling anyone in the free world.

We must also not forget the nations the Soviet Union has illegally captured and imposed on them Communist governments against their will. These nations are:

Rumania. In 1945, Rumania was occupied by Soviet troops. In 1947 a People's Republic was proclaimed and King Michael forced to abdicate. The area is 91,699 square miles, and population in 1966 was 19,150,056.

Hungary. In 1947, Communists forced president of Republic out, and in 1949 a Soviet-type constitution was adopted. In 1956 an uprising attempt to restore free government was crushed by an estimated 200,000 Soviet troops with thousands of freedom fighters deported and killed. Area is 35,918 square miles, with population of 10,148,000.

Bulgaria. In 1947 a constitution modeled after that of the U.S.S.R. was adopted, following abolition of the monarchy and formation of a people's republic headed by the Communist Party leader as Premier. Land area is 42,796 square miles, with 1965 population of 8,-226,564.

Poland. In 1947, Communists won an election which they completely dominated after Stalin rejected international supervision of balloting. Antigovernment riots were put down in 1956. Land area is 120,359, with population of 31,496,000.

Czechoslovakia. In 1948, Communists won complete control of the government they had already dominated. Land area is 49,367 and 1965 population was 14,-159,000.

East Germany. In 1949, the German Democratic Republic—East Germany—was declared in areas of Germany occupied by the Soviets since the Second World War. Thousands of Germans fled to the West before a fortified wall was built dividing East from West Berlin and a prohibited zone was declared along the 600-mile border with West Germany. Land area is 41,645 square miles, with a 1965 population of 17,028,000.

It is my sincere hope that the General Assembly of the United Nations will repudiate and renounce this hypocrisy as just another Communist effort to create confusion to gain domination of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the wise words as expressed by our President, President Johnson, will lead the way toward the settlement of a troubled peace in the Middle East.

The General Assembly should study the record of Soviet treachery before any of these nations are foolish enough to vote with the Soviets against Israel.

I hope the newly emerging nations in particular will join Israel in her call for a lasting peace based on justice in the Middle East.

The United States should lead the way toward world order by endorsing the program outlined today by President Johnson.

Israel—a free and sovereign Israel—is an established fact and I hope the General Assembly rejects overwhelmingly the Soviet Union's despicable attempt to obscure this fact.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my strong support to the bill, House Joint Resolution 601, which would extend for 4 months, from July 1 to November 1, 1967, the emergency provision of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. This provision is to be found in section 5 of the act, which reads as follows:

> Prior to July 1, 1967, Federal financial assistance may be provided pursuant to section 3 [which provides for grants and loans to assist States and local bodies in financing the acquisition and improvement of mass transportation service in urban areas] where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system, referred to in section 4(a), [which sets forth the requirements of the long-range program] is under active preparation although not yet completed, (2) the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system, and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed one-half of the net project cost: *Provided*, That where a Federal grant is made on such a one-half basis, and the planning requirements specified in section 4(a) are fully met within a three-year period after the execution of the grant agreement, an additional grant may then be made to the applicant equal to one-sixth of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

For the grants and other financial assistance provided by the Urban Mass Transportation Act in general, the Department of Housing and Urban Development must determine that the facilities or equipment for which financial assistance is sought are needed to carry out a program for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system, and that such system must be a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. However, this emergency provision, in effect, permits loans and grants to be made, even though all the regular planning requirements have not been met.

Actually, it is somewhat of a misnomer to call this provision an emergency provision. In point of fact, very few communities have been able to complete the comprehensive planning required for the long-range grants. It has become apparent that nearly all of the $123,500,000 scheduled for mass transit capital improvements in fiscal year 1968 under this act will go unused, unless this emergency provision is extended. Less than a half dozen of the 39 large metropolitan areas which have applied for transit aid could receive these funds if the Congress fails to act to extend section 5 of this act.

Let me point out that New York State and the New York metropolitan area have already benefited substantially from grants made under the "emergency" provisions of Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. The Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority, which operates the Long Island Railroad, has received a grant of $22.7 million and will receive an additional $7.6 million if it meets planning requirements within 3 years. The City of New York Transit Authority received a grant of $23.4 million as 50 percent of the net project cost of a transit project. The city of Utica received a $383,000 grant with an additional deferred payment of $127,000 if it meets planning requirements within 3 years. Similarly, Jamestown received $157,000 and will receive an additional $52,000 upon meeting the planning requirements.

The merits of these projects make all the more vivid the loss which New York State and the New York metropolitan area would sustain if this emergency program is not extended.

At this moment the Department of Housing and Urban Development has on hand three applications totaling over $71 million for transit projects which cannot be authorized if this bill, House Joint Resolution 601, is not passed. A total of $53-and-a-third million has been requested by the Connecticut Transportation Authority and the Metropolitan Commuter Transportation Authority for an $80 million project for modernization of commuter service of the New Haven Railroad, one of the most vital of the commuter services leading to New York City. The Port Authority Trans Hudson Corp. has requested $16,700,000 to modernize and improve interchange facilities at Jersey City. And the New York City Transit Authority has requested over $1 million to modernize its 49th Street Station. An application has also been received from Ithaca, N.Y., for a grant.

I am sure that the representatives of every major metropolitan area of the country could cite similar examples.

This is not a measure which is designed to circumvent the long-range planning requirement. As I have already indicated, the full amount of the grant for which communities are eligible cannot in fact be authorized unless the planning requirements are met within 3 years. But where it is already clear that certain facilities and equipment are going to be needed for a transit system, and where there is urgent need for the preservation or acquisition of these needed facilities and equipment, this law provides a way in which grants can be made without stalling the entire program.

Fortunately, it appears that the momentum created by passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Act, modest as its authorizations have been, is accelerating. We must find practical and economically sound solutions to our urgent metropolitan transportation problems.

It would be tragic to lose this momentum through failure to extend this emergency provision. The transportation problems of our cities are too critical to tolerate any delay. I, therefore, urge

prompt passage of this resolution which will permit the Department of Housing and Urban Development to proceed with needed grants for another 4 months, while the metropolitan areas and their transportation authorities formulate the required plans.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 601.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT], that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 601.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING FOR AN ADDITIONAL 8 YEARS THE ACT OF OCTOBER 4, 1961, RELATING TO THE ACQUISITION OF WET LANDS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 480) to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wet lands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 480

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes", approved October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k-3), is amended by striking out "seven-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen-year period".

(b) Section 3 of such Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k-5), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund. Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1977, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund, such repayment shall be made in annual amounts comprising 75 per centum of the moneys accruing annually to such fund. In the event the full amount authorized by the first section of this Act is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid fifteen-year period, the repayment of such funds pursuant to this section shall begin with the next full fiscal year."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, are we considering H.R. 480 or H.R. 482?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. H.R. 480.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, originally in the 48 States there were 127 million acres of wet lands. By 1955 this total acreage had been reduced to approximately 74 million acres. Of this amount only 22.5 million acres were of significant value for migratory waterfowl use. It was anticipated that 10 million acres would remain in private ownership leaving 12½ million acres to be acquired for public control. Of this amount it was indicated that about 5 million acres would be secured by the States, leaving 7½ million acres to be purchased by the Secretary of the Interior from the migratory bird conservation fund. By 1961, 2.5 million acres remained to be acquired under the original goal. Since 1961 only 750,000 additional acres have been acquired in fee and easement leaving 1¾ million acres still to be acquired.

Present law requires the proceeds from the sale of duck stamps to be set aside into a special fund known as the migratory bird conservation fund. To provide additional funds in order to expedite the purchase of such lands, in 1961 the Congress enacted the Wetlands Acquisition Act which authorized an advance appropriation without interest to the migratory bird conservation fund of up to $105 million over a 7-year period beginning in fiscal year 1962. Beginning with fiscal year 1969 such appropriated funds are to be repaid annually to the Treasury out of duck stamp sales, the repayment being 75 percent of the net receipts from such sales.

The purpose of this legislation is to extend this program for an additional 8 years, without increasing the authorization appropriation, and to defer for an additional 8 years the date when the advance appropriations must be repaid to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of the 1961 act $38.5 million have been appropriated. Awaiting to be signed by the President is a bill that would appropriate $7½ million for fiscal year 1968. This would bring the total amount appropriated to $46 million, leaving $59 million available for appropriation under the original $105 million program.

Mr. Speaker, no opposition was expressed by any Government agency to this legislation and all witnesses testifying at the hearings enthusiastically supported its objectives.

In fact, all correspondence received by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what would happen if we pass H.R. 480, and do not pass H.R. 482; would this program then become inoperative?

Mr. DINGELL. No. The committee in its wisdom separated the two bills, but if the House fails to adopt H.R. 482 what will happen will be that the migratory bird conservation fund at the end of 8 years will be about $16 million short of what the committee feels it should be, and this will reduce the acquisition of land for refuge purposes and fail to provide opportunities for duck hunters by a very large amount since land is now costing about $60 an acre.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, what was the wisdom in separating the two bills?

Mr. DINGELL. I must confess this was an exercise on the part of myself on this piece of legislation in that I chose to see to it that matters which were sufficiently divergent, at least, should be considered separately by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. They are closely related?

Mr. DINGELL. They are indeed most closely related.

Mr. Speaker, valuable habitat for migratory waterfowl is rapidly disappearing. The completion of the original goal is even more urgent than it was when initiated.

Finally, I would like to stress that the success of this program is based on the need for a balance of fee and easement acquisitions. It was originally estimated—and this was the understanding of the membership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries—that this balance should be 1 acre of fee for each 2 easement acres. Mr. Speaker, undue emphasis on easement acquisition would materially reduce the effectiveness of this program. Therefore, I urge that we act now while there is still time to acquire these areas and that every effort be made to accomplish the goal originally established by the Secretary of the Interior of acquiring 1 acre in fee for each 2 easement acres.

Mr. Speaker, I move the passage of H.R. 480.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me and I am appreciative of what the gentleman has said.

I have read the report and the two bills carefully.

Just why is it necessary to extend the time of the payback for an additional 8 years to make it a total of 15 years, of these moneys, loaned in advance without interest, to the tune of $105 million for reclaiming these wetlands?

Mr. DINGELL. Probably because it is the only hope for meeting the problems in this country and having multiple resources for the benefit of duck hunters.

This program is a part of the balanced program which came forth from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a number of years ago, first of all, of acquiring a sufficient amount of wetlands for resources and, second, to get wise managing of the expenditures by the Departments downtown and assuring, for example, the goal of some 12½ million

acres for the preservation of the ducks which should have been achieved in a feasible amount of time.

When this committee and subcommittee first began working on this matter some dozen years ago, it would have taken something like 330 years to achieve the goals.

We have reduced it today to a period of less than 30 years and if this legislation goes through, it is conceivable that it may be achieved in a total of 15 years from 1961 which was the date of the original enactment of the legislation.

Mr. HALL. Is the recoupment of money into the Federal Treasury progressing on time and as planned, from 75 percent of the moneys accrued annually into this special fund from duck stamps?

Mr. DINGELL. That has to do with the statutory conclusion of the termination date of the legislation because the 75-percent payment will not go into effect until such time as the program is completed.

I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri, if he will turn to page 5 of the report, he will see some comments indicating what was expected.

At the top there is a table which indicates the funds appropriated thus far under the $105 million advance appropriation authorization and then under that, the amounts that have been appropriated on an annual basis.

It was the expectation of the committee and the Bureau of the Budget and the House of Representatives and the other body when this legislation was originally enacted that we would be expending funds somewhere around $15 million a year.

I would point out to my friend that we have not achieved the goal as planned. Only once did the appropriations committee appropriate $10 million and that was in 1964 and that was about $2 million less than had been expected per year. Through fiscal year 1968, $46 million will have been appropriated, leaving a net deficit in the program according to the original expectations of the Congress of some $59 million.

This legislation is necessary, I would tell my friend, to assure that the original goal of Congress is carried out fully as the Congress expected.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman has answered my questions, perhaps the first in answer to the second question—my next question is, are we not falling far short of what we expected to raise in revenues and, secondly, if we do not have to make the payback until the land acquisition is complete?

Mr. DINGELL. Or until the expiration date fixed in the act for repayment.

Mr. HALL. Of course, I have no doubt that we would continue to extend the date, if necessary, in order to obtain the lands that need to be acquired for duck hunters in the name of conservation—all the wetlands, the potholes and the places where these flyaway critters breed. I will say to the gentleman that I am a huntsman and fisherman myself. This does apply to geese as well as ducks, does it not?

Mr. DINGELL. All migratory waterfowl, including ducks and geese.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman tell me why it was felt important by the committee that the provision relating to the veto by the Governors of the States in whose jurisdiction this land was being acquired should be removed? I recall the debate back in 1961. At that time the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and others felt that we should have the rights of the various States of the Union incorporated in the legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to respond to that. The language in the report on page 4, about four lines from the top, spells out clearly why the committee took that action. There are requirements in the law now which impose upon the Interior Department the responsibility of meeting fully the wishes of the States.

For example, when the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission sits to consider a refuge involving an area in a particular State, the representative of the Governor of that State is required under the constitution of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission to sit also during consideration of the matter and to have his views considered fully.

Mr. HALL. He could still be outvoted, could he not?

Mr. DINGELL. Conceivably he could, but I would point out to my friend from Missouri that there is a further safeguard which I believe provides full protection, and that is it is already necessary for the Federal Government to have the approval of the legislature and the Governor of the State in which the refuge program is going to be conducted before it is possible for the Federal Government to go in and conduct any refuge operations in that State at all. It was the feeling of the committee that this requirement for the Governor's veto is no longer needed, particularly in the light of the enactment of the Congress during the past session, which earmarked three-quarters of 1 percent of the assessed valuation of the refuge for payments to the States, in lieu of taxes, which is used for the purposes of constructing schools and roads.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's making this legislative record. I shall ask one further question. Under existing law or this amendment would the provisions of law relative to condemnation and eminent domain be made applicable to this method of land acquisition?

Mr. DINGELL. I would say that the bill H.R. 480 has nothing to do with that. The existing law remains precisely as it was. I would point out to the gentleman that the right of eminent domain and condemnation does reside in the Department of the Interior and the Federal Government under existing migratory bird law. But I would point out to my friend that it is rarely used because it has been the experience of the Federal Government that negotiated sales are much better. They involve less cost and less time.

I would also point out to my good friend that the House of Representatives and the Senate have two members each on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and they are very careful to adhere to the views of the Member of the Congress in whose area the refuge would be established, and I know of no instance in history in which a refuge has been established in the district of a Member who did not want it there.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's response. With reference to his comments on the right of eminent domain in other agencies of the Government, I would like to point out that we are getting back in the Federal Government's control, more land than we originally gave away under the homestead law. I appreciate the gentleman's responses.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman. I wish to pursue one step further the colloquy having to do with the removal of the veto authority of the several States. Is it not simply because the revenue-sharing legislation of 1964 made it mandatory that each State legislature pass an enabling act to participate in this revenue-sharing legislation?

Mr. DINGELL. No; the enabling legislation was required back in the days when the first duck stamp legislation was passed. That was not in the 1964 amendments at all. For that reason this measure would merely restore the law to the form in which it was previous to the enactment of the original Wetlands Act program passed in 1961.

Mr. WAGGONNER. But it is felt that the veto authority is no longer needed in view of having reinstated this enabling act?

Mr. DINGELL. The legislature's assent in several States was in effect at all times during this period.

The principal reason for the Governor's veto being inserted was the fact that the Governors in several States—and people in the counties particularly—felt these refuges might well wind up in a situation where lands were going off the tax rolls without any additional moneys coming in to meet the needs. We have passed legislation funding on a legitimate basis the legitimate needs of counties for schools and roads, so that the Governor's veto I do not believe is any longer necessary. And this was the opinion of the committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleague on our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentlemen from Michigan, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, in urging favorable consideration of the bill, H.R. 480.

In October 1961, there was enacted Public Law 87-383—the so-called Wetlands Loan Act—which initiated what was to be an accelerated land acquisition program over a 7-year period beginning in fiscal year 1962. The purpose of that earlier act was to preserve valuable and needed waterfowl habitat, and for that purpose $105 million was authorized to be appropriated over the 7-year period.

Unfortunately, the acquisition of needed wetlands has not proceeded as

rapidly as originally intended. Yet the need for this program is as great, if not greater, than when the legislation was enacted almost 6 years ago. In fact, the need is perhaps even more urgent now, since the remaining acreage of waterfowl habitat continues to shrink as our population grows with increasing pressure to convert wetlands to other than wildlife conservation.

The bill, H.R. 480, now under consideration recognizes this growing national need to preserve sufficient acreage for essential breeding, feeding, resting, and wintering, so as to accommodate the needs of migratory waterfowl. The bill accomplishes this by extending the wetlands acquisition program for an additional 8 years but without increasing the original appropriation authorization of $105 million, of which less than one-half has thus far been appropriated.

The objective of this legislation is a praiseworthy one and one which has received enthusiastic support. On March 6 of this year, Mr. John A. Biggs, director, State of Washington Department of Game, wrote to the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife Conservation, as follows:

> The Washington State Game Commission, the Washington State Department of Game, and I am most confident, the many thousands of sportsmen and persons interested in wildlife in the State of Washington, without qualification endorse and support your proposal . . . to extend the term of the Wetlands Loan Act of 1961.
>
> We have several major waterfowl refuges in the State of Washington, where land acquisition has not as yet been completed for the reason that monies, in sufficient quantities to do this, have not been available. The extension of the Wetlands Loan Act would do much to assure completion of these refuges.

Accordingly, I earnestly urge that the bill, H.R. 480, be favorably considered and that it do pass.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Michigan and the ranking minority member for bringing this bill before the House, because I, too, observe the need to extend the time, because due to the delay in getting underway, the Department has not had an opportunity to acquire the wetlands which had been envisioned.

I noticed the observation by the gentleman from Iowa a while ago as to what would happen if the bill scheduled immediately to follow consideration of this one should fail to pass. Of course, when we first envisioned this $105 million authorization, there was no contemplation at that time of raising the cost of the migratory bird stamp. I cannot comment any further in that regard, because I cannot agree that the two must go hand in hand.

I do support this bill for the extension of the time, so that we can acquire the additional 1¾ million acres of land, approximately, needed for the wetlands program.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PELLY. I might say to the gentleman that it was because members of the committee, including myself, recognized other members might wish to take different positions on these respective bills, we decided to separate them.

However, I do believe that those of us who are vitally interested in conservation will recognize that the sportsmen themselves in many cases desire to increase their contribution toward the acquisition of lands for migratory waterfowl to which the proceeds from the duck stamp program go. Therefore, they do support the increase provided for in the duck stamp cost under the legislation which will follow.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with him that many of us do contribute additionally, through Ducks Unlimited, and many of us would have no objection to the additional charge.

I do wish to point out what was shown in the hearings. Each time the duck stamp cost has been raised fewer stamps have been sold. They are not selling as many stamps now as they were selling 6 years ago.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CASEY. I am thinking about the little fellow. I am not thinking about myself, but thinking about the little fellow, who gradually is being squeezed out.

Mr. PELLY. The committee also was thinking about that little fellow. That is why the committee authorized the Department to increase the stamps by degrees, so that it would not work too great a hardship.

Mr. CASEY. We will discuss that later.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. First I should like to commend the committee for bringing out this piece of legislation.

In a sense I am disappointed. I am disappointed because the bill does not increase the original authorization. Unless the original authorization is increased, this bill will not accomplish what Congress intended when we passed the original act in 1961.

In the initial period for which the act was to be in effect, instead of $105 million there has been appropriated only $46 million, or less than one-half of the amount Congress authorized.

This indicates either one of two things to me. Either the Department downtown has been negligent in its duty or the Appropriations Committee has decided that it has more interest in this matter and wants to save money, which Congress has indicated should be spent.

I do not care what the reason is for the failure to provide $105 million in 7 years. Either one is no excuse for not having gone forward with the program which has been approved by the Congress.

I sincerely hope that if the bill is passed and the period is extended to 15 years the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which reported this bill will see to it that the Department of Interior proceeds promptly with the direction of Congress in this bill and does acquire the land.

Second, I hope they will make sufficient demands, which will be approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committee, and the Chief Executive, to see to it that the will of Congress is carried out in this matter.

I hope we will be back in the not too distant future, indicating the $105 million has been spent in less than the 15-year period, and that there is still a need. I am sure when that need is shown the Congress will authorize the expenditure of additional funds.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone in the House realizes that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been outstanding in his interest in conservation. I say to the gentleman that there are members on our committee, including the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan, who are equally dedicated. The gentleman can be assured that those of us who share his feelings with regard to the need for increasing the authorization will work toward that end.

We will hope to have legislation looking toward that objective in some near future session of this Congress.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my good friend from Washington for his comments. Having served many years as chairman of the subcommittee, I found my good friend from Washington [Mr. PELLY] has been a great tower of strength, wisdom, and courage on behalf of conservation. I am certainly deeply indebted to him for his help to me and his very devoted and dedicated service on behalf of the conservation of our national resources.

I would like to pay the same tribute to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] whose work on behalf of conservation is well known to everybody. I thank him for his work, also.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I seek some clarification of the matter which was brought up by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY]. To what extent is this measure tied to the one which will be coming to us next dealing with the increase in the duck stamps?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an answer to that?

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

Mr. DINGELL. First let me say there is no tie. Also, in the mind of the chairman of the subcommittee and I am sure in the mind of any Member it was suggested by the Department of the Interior and at the suggestion of the Bureau of the

Budget that the two bills be put together. However, it was my judgment and the judgment of the committee that this was not the best thing to do in order to bring this legislation before the Congress. We would like to see the two bills separately, based on their own merits. I very strongly believe that the two bills are good enough to stand on the basis of their own merits and of their needs, and further, each of them has value for conservation which is enormous I say to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Is the gentleman then telling me it would not be inconsistent whatsoever to vote in favor of this bill and against the increase in the cost of duck stamps?

Mr. PELLY. I would respond to the gentleman by saying probably some Members will vote in different ways on the two bills. However, as far as I am concerned and as far as the committee is concerned, we are strongly urging all Members to support both bills as being in the best interests of conservation of waterfowl. The bills provide funds to acquire refuges for the protection of our migratory birds.

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

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I am in support of this effort. However, I wish to ask both the distinguished gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], this question: This does not set a precedent, does it, for acquisition by the Federal Government of Estuarine Areas as provided for in H.R. 25? There is this bill H.R. 25 now in to accomplish that, and this subcommittee, this same subcommittee, will shortly consider this bill dealing with estuarine lands in many areas of this country, particularly coastal areas, which include a good portion of the coastal areas of the respective States. Do you suggest that that entire area, where you have fresh and salt water commingling, should be acquired by the Federal Government or regulated by the Federal Government and that the Federal Government should be getting into this area of water as it relates to Federal control over what is now under State control?

How far are we going and how much money will be spent, I would like to ask the gentleman? I hope that the attitude of the subcommittee and the committee in supporting this bill on wetlands does not set a precedent for next stepping into all estuarine lands and have them controlled by the Federal Government and some of them eventually acquired by the Federal Government. I would like to ask the opinion of the gentleman from Washington on that.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I might say that estuarine areas are those where tidal waters meet fresh waters and as a result there is a great abundance of fisheries there. Also, of course, these include some waterfowl resources. We have an interest as a committee in trying to conserve all types of wildlife. As such we hope one of these days to bring some satisfactory legislation to the floor of this House which will look toward the preservation of these estuarine areas.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me H.R. 25 deals with an area concerning wildlife conservation and this bill does deal with birdlife. However, it seems to me that somewhere along the line there should be some authority reserved to the various States involved.

Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to concede to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that the State of Florida is not doing a job in this estuarine field or is unwilling to do a job in this area and therefore there is required Federal intervention in order to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if that is the situation.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, that particular legislation has not yet been considered by the subcommittee, as I understand the question which has been propounded by the gentleman from Florida. However, I shall be very happy to discuss that legislation with the gentleman briefly on the floor of the House now or at anytime at his leisure.

Mr. CRAMER. It was up for consideration of the House at the last session of the Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida will yield further, we have a great deal of time, I will say to the gentleman from Florida, during which to discuss this subject and I shall be happy to discuss it at great length with the gentleman if the gentleman so chooses.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, however it is true I know it was up for consideration on the floor of the House at the last session of the Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Florida is correct, and it is my hope that we can eliminate the objections which were manifested to the legislation at that time.

Mr. CRAMER. And, it is my understanding that the estimated cost of that program is unknown and H.R. 25 has an open-end authorization and that it could be far in excess of $100 million when there are more and larger estuarine areas than wetlands and this wetlands bill calls for $105 million.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida will yield further, the gentleman from Florida is entirely in error on that point, because the legislation to which the gentleman from Florida refers is not pending before the House at this time, but it carries a strict limitation upon the funding thereof.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of the hearings on that legislation is available to the gentleman from Florida, and I would point out to my friend, the gentleman from Florida, that if he wishes to discuss that legislation, I shall be very happy to do so either at this time, or I shall be very happy to discuss it at length with the gentleman either in his office or in my office in order to ascertain the real facts as contained in that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position at this time to prophecy to the gentleman from Florida what will happen to this legislation or to prophecy the ultimate outcome of any amendments offered with respect thereto.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which also falls within the interest and jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works and I hope time and an opportunity to discuss it before it becomes a fait accompli is provided.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my telephone extension is 4071, I will say to my good friend, and I will be more than pleased to meet with the gentleman either in my office or in his office at his pleasure.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate that expression. I am glad that the gentleman does not consider this as precedent in any way.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from Florida has my assurance that the present Migratory Bird Act does include the provision that no deed or instrument of conveyance shall be accepted by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior under the various sections of that title, unless the State in which the area lies shall consent to such action based upon separate action in each case.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this should give to the gentleman from Florida full assurance with reference to his question.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his assurance on that matter. That was just another point raised previously. I am concerned about repealing the power of the Governor of the individual States to act in this matter on a project-by-project basis and to determine whether it is in the best interest of the State, as well as the Federal Government to acquire these bird sanctuary areas as they arise individually.

I am very sorry to see this very constant effort to write out the State Governor in making these decisions. We wrote them into the law in 1961, and yet when you come in for an amendment or extension, you write them out.

This bill has come up for the consideration of the House under a suspension of the rules and one cannot offer amendments designed to write the Governor's power back into the legislation.

I want the Governor to have an opportunity to make these decisions, and I will say to the gentleman that I am aware that it requires further State legislative action in order to give that authority to the Federal Government, in effect, or to authorize it. But this amendment takes away the right of the State government, the right to judge these matters by project, when certain problems come up.

Mr. DINGELL. I would point out to the gentleman from Florida that this matter has been under consideration by the subcommittee and the subcommittee is aware of the fact that each of the States is concerned about this legisla-

tion. However, there has not been a word of opposition to the legislation as it is drawn. I would point out that most of the States are in support of the legislation and that there has been no opposition to it from the State of Florida from which the gentleman [Mr. CRAMER] comes.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. I have some difficulty in recognizing the separation of these two measures.

I note in the report accompanying H.R. 482 that it clearly states the Treasury Department—and I am sure this is also true of the Department of the Interior—states that if you vote for one, then you should vote for the other.

It clearly says on page 2 of the report accompanying H.R. 482 that consideration should then be given to an increase in the price of the migratory bird hunting stamps.

It seems to me that both departments fit into the pattern of the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. I would point out the fact that the gentleman is now pointing out language from the Department of the Interior, which is included in the rules of the House, in the report of the committee.

I would point out to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE], that I shall be delighted to discuss the other legislation to which he refers at an appropriate time when the gentleman from Texas is free to discuss it or shall be happy to discuss it with him before this body.

So that as soon as it comes to the floor I will be delighted to discuss it, but I do not view one of these pieces of legislation as prerequisite for the other. I am satisfied the subcommittee does not view it that way either, and the committee does not. That is why the two pieces of legislation came before the House of Representatives separated, as they are.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to have the gentleman explain what would happen in the event that we do not pass——

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield any more time to the gentleman. I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] possibly has time that he could yield, but my time has expired.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 19 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I am singularly aware of the importance of completing the wetlands acquisition program established on an accelerated basis in the original act of 1961. The need was apparent then and is even more obvious now. Creeping urbanization, exploding populations, highway construction and the corollary increments in land values should provide additional impetus to the attainment of goals established 6 years ago.

At that time, Congress authorized $105 million for the acquisition of 2.5 million acres of wetlands. For a number of reasons the goals cannot be achieved by the time the authorization expires at the end of fiscal 1968. As a result less than half of the total authorization—approximately $46 million—will have been expended and only 1,135,000 acres acquired.

If we are to fulfill our original goals, much less establish new objectives, it is important that additional time be made available through the extension of the period in which the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission can negotiate for wetland acquisitions. The passage of H.R. 480 will provide an additional 8 years in which to attain the desired acreage, all within the original $105 million authorization of the 1961 act. If our goals are reached in less time than that requested, the bill provides commencement of the repayment period with the next fiscal year.

The need for accelerated acquisition has not diminished in ensuing years since the enactment of the 1961 legislation. If anything the need has become more urgent. Attaining only half of our goals in no way reduces the importance of the program.

I therefore respectfully and emphatically urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration to H.R. 480 and that the bill be approved. Without it, our society faces a critical possibility of extinction for a great many varieties and species of migratory wildfowl. Without the sanctuaries which this authorization will provide, they will surely perish for lack of food, shelter, and a protected natural habitat.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My question is what will take place if the bill, H.R. 480, were to become law, and not the bill H.R. 482?

Mr. DINGELL. I would say to the gentleman that I have already answered that question, and that is that there will be $16 million less available for the migratory bird conservation fund to buy hunting lands for duck hunters.

Mr. PICKLE. In other words, there would not be any acquisition of land?

Mr. DINGELL. There would be $16 million less than would be available for such purposes. In other words, that is the difference between the $4 and the $5 duck stamp.

As I have mentioned before, the two pieces of legislation are entirely separate. They are not at all related in any way, and one is not contingent upon the other, but if H.R. 482 is not passed there would be $16 million less available, that is, at the rate of about $2 million a year less available for the acquisition of such land.

Mr. PICKLE. Do I understand that if the House does not pass the bill H.R. 482, there will be no further acquisition of such lands?

Mr. DINGELL. No. The gentleman completely misunderstood me. If we are going to get into a discussion of the migratory bird stamp, this amounts to about $4.8 million. If the duck stamp goes to $5, the amount of money increased will be about 40 percent, or about $16 million over the next 8 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 480.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 328, nays 8, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—328

Abernethy	Daniels	Hansen, Idaho
Adair	Davis, Ga.	Hardy
Adams	Dawson	Harrison
Addabbo	de la Garza	Harsha
Albert	Delaney	Harvey
Anderson, Ill.	Dellenback	Hathaway
Anderson, Tenn.	Dent	Hays
Andrews, Ala.	Derwinski	Hébert
Annunzio	Dickinson	Hechler, W. Va.
Arends	Dingell	Helstoski
Ashley	Dole	Henderson
Aspinall	Donohue	Herlong
Ayres	Dorn	Hicks
Baring	Dow	Holifield
Barrett	Dowdy	Horton
Bates	Downing	Hosmer
Battin	Dwyer	Howard
Belcher	Eckhardt	Hull
Bell	Edmondson	Hungate
Bennett	Edwards, Ala.	Hunt
Berry	Edwards, Calif.	Hutchinson
Betts	Edwards, La.	Irwin
Bevill	Eilberg	Jacobs
Biester	Erlenborn	Jarman
Bingham	Eshleman	Joelson
Blackburn	Evans, Colo.	Johnson, Calif.
Blatnik	Everett	Jonas
Boggs	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.
Boland	Fallon	Jones, Mo.
Bolling	Farbstein	Jones, N.C.
Bow	Fascell	Karsten
Brademas	Feighan	Kastenmeier
Bray	Findley	Kazen
Brinkley	Fisher	Kee
Brock	Flood	Keith
Broomfield	Flynt	Kelly
Brotzman	Ford, Gerald R.	King, Calif.
Brown, Calif.	Fountain	Kornegay
Brown, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	Kupferman
Brown, Ohio	Friedel	Kyl
Broyhill, N.C.	Fulton, Tenn.	Kyros
Buchanan	Fuqua	Laird
Burke, Fla.	Galifianakis	Landrum
Burke, Mass.	Gallagher	Latta
Burleson	Gardner	Lennon
Burton, Calif.	Garmatz	Lipscomb
Bush	Gathings	Lloyd
Button	Giaimo	Long, La.
Byrne, Pa.	Gibbons	Long, Md.
Carter	Gilbert	Lukens
Casey	Gonzalez	McCarthy
Cederberg	Goodell	McClory
Chamberlain	Goodling	McClure
Clancy	Green, Oreg.	McCulloch
Clawson, Del	Griffiths	McDade
Cleveland	Gross	McDonald, Mich.
Cohelan	Grover	McFall
Collier	Gubser	McMillan
Colmer	Gude	MacGregor
Conable	Gurney	Machen
Corman	Hagan	Mahon
Cramer	Haley	Mailliard
Culver	Halleck	Marsh
Cunningham	Hamilton	Martin
Curtis	Hammer-schmidt	Mathias, Calif.
Daddario	Hanley	Mathias, Md.

Matsunaga	Randall	Stanton
Mayne	Rarick	Steed
Meeds	Rees	Steiger, Wis.
Miller, Calif.	Reid, Ill.	Stratton
Miller, Ohio	Reid, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Mills	Reifel	Stuckey
Minish	Reinecke	Sullivan
Mink	Rhodes, Ariz.	Taft
Mize	Rhodes, Pa.	Talcott
Monagan	Riegle	Taylor
Montgomery	Rivers	Teague, Calif.
Morgan	Roberts	Tenzer
Morris, N. Mex.	Robison	Thompson, Ga.
Mosher	Rodino	Thomson, Wis.
Moss	Rogers, Colo.	Tuck
Multer	Rogers, Fla.	Tunney
Murphy, Ill.	Rooney, N.Y.	Udall
Murphy, N.Y.	Rosenthal	Ullman
Myers	Roth	Van Deerlin
Natcher	Roudebush	Vander Jagt
Nedzi	Rumsfeld	Vanik
Nichols	Ryan	Vigorito
O'Hara, Ill.	Satterfield	Waggonner
O'Neal, Ga.	Saylor	Waldie
Ottinger	Schadeberg	Walker
Passman	Scherle	Wampler
Patten	Schneebeli	Watson
Pelly	Schweiker	Watts
Pepper	Schwengel	Whalen
Perkins	Scott	Whitener
Pettis	Selden	Whitten
Philbin	Shipley	Widnall
Pickle	Shriver	Wiggins
Pike	Sikes	Williams, Pa.
Poage	Sisk	Wilson, Bob
Poff	Skubitz	Winn
Pollock	Slack	Wolff
Pool	Smith, Calif.	Wright
Price, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.	Wyatt
Pryor	Smith, Okla.	Wydler
Pucinski	Snyder	Wylie
Quie	Springer	Young
Quillen	Stafford	Zion
Railsback	Staggers	

NAYS—8

Ashmore	Duncan	Langen
Davis, Wis.	Hall	Price, Tex.
Devine	Ichord	

NOT VOTING—96

Abbitt	Green, Pa.	Pirnie
Andrews, N. Dak.	Halpern	Purcell
Ashbrook	Hanna	Resnick
Blanton	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Bolton	Hawkins	Ronan
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, Pa.
Brooks	Holland	Rostenkowski
Broyhill, Va.	Johnson, Pa.	Roush
Burton, Utah	Karth	Roybal
Byrnes, Wis.	King, N.Y.	Ruppe
Cabell	Kirwan	Sandman
Cahill	Kleppe	St Germain
Carey	Kluczynski	St. Onge
Celler	Kuykendall	Scheuer
Clark	Leggett	Smith, Iowa
Clausen, Don H.	McEwen	Steiger, Ariz.
Conte	Macdonald, Mass.	Stephens
Conyers	Madden	Teague, Tex.
Corbett	May	Thompson, N.J.
Cowger	Meskill	Tiernan
Denney	Michel	Utt
Diggs	Minshall	Watkins
Dulski	Moore	Whalley
Esch	Moorhead	White
Fino	Morse, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Foley	Morton	Willis
Ford, William D.	Nelsen	Wilson, Charles H.
Fraser	Nix	Wyman
Fulton, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.	Yates
Gettys	O'Konski	Younger
Gray	Olsen	Zablocki
	O'Neill, Mass.	Zwach
	Patman	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Denney.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. St Germain with Mrs. May.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Younger.

Mr. White of Texas with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Stephens.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AN INCREASE IN FEE FOR MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 482) to amend the act of March 16, 1954, relating to hunting stamps for the taking of migratory waterfowl, to require a hunting stamp for the taking of any other migratory bird, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 482

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act (48 Stat. 451), as amended (16 U.S.C. 718b), is amended to read as follows: "For each such stamp sold under the provisions of this section there should be collected by the Post Office Department a sum of not less than $3 and not more than $5 as determined by the Secretary of the Interior after taking into consideration, among other matters, the increased cost of lands needed for the conservation of migratory birds."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 482 is to provide means for producing greatly needed additional funds for acquisition of additional habitat for migratory birds, especially waterfowl.

Mr. Speaker, the original Duck Stamp Act was passed in 1934. The price of the duck stamp at that time was set at $1. Over the past 33 years the price of a duck stamp has been increased only twice; once in 1949, to $2, and, again, in 1958 to $3.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation now pending before us today proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to increase the price of the duck stamp from a minimum price of $3 and to a maximum price of $5.

It was the expectation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that we would not have to raise the duck stamp but to the extent of $1 more than it is at the present time at the time we took such action.

This legislation means, Mr. Speaker, that over the next 8 years—the period of the legislation just passed—the Federal Government will increase the revenue from the migratory bird conservation fund by very close to $2 million a year and that this increase in revenue—all of which will be earmarked for acquisition of refuge habitat for migratory birds, will be financed in large part as a result of this program and it will enable the Secretary to purchase about 200,000 acres more of migratory bird habitat for the purpose of preserving the migratory bird population of this country.

I would point out to my colleagues that the legislation now pending before us was referred to every one of the State fish and game agencies, to all of the conservation organizations, to all of the duck hunter associations or organizations and that the committee received no correspondence in opposition from any of the conservation organizations involved.

The only opposition which it received came from six States, two of which objected only to a provision which would have established a special stamp for the hunting of doves and migratory birds other than waterfowl. This provision has been stricken out.

Mr. Speaker, there was no opposition of any vigor to the legislation. It was the feeling of the committee that this is good legislation. The subcommittee reported this legislation unanimously to the full committee and it has now been reported by the full committee to the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now, the increased revenue about which the gentleman from Michigan spoke, is that based upon the increase to $4 per duck stamp or the increase to $5 per duck stamp?

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Well, this is assuming an increase of $2; that is, from $3 to $5—which would mean that on an annual basis it will increase the revenue to the migratory bird conservation fund from about $4.8 million, which is the present level of income, to about $6.8 million each year thereafter.

If the increase went from $3 to $4, it would mean an increase in terms of revenue to the fund of just about $1 million, according to the best estimate the committee was able to obtain.

Mr. GROSS. Surely the gentleman will agree that an increase to $5 will result in a decrease in the revenues.

Mr. DINGELL. No, that is not so. The information was submitted to the committee, I will say to my friend, that obviously sales would fall off slightly but it was the opinion of the Department of the Interior that in the first year there would be somewhat of a falling off and then based on the experience in the cases of other increases and studies that have been made by the Department of the Interior that this factor would diminish almost to zero and so the sales falloff in the long run would not occur.

This is one of the reasons that the subcommittee and the full committee have indicated they expect wide discretion in the exercise of this legislation and there would be only a $1 raise initially and then a second $1 raise either next year or at some later time to ease the burden on the small duck hunters.

The gentleman well remembers from his days on the subcommittee when he served there as a very useful member, that we raised the cost of the duck stamp from $2 to $3 and earmarked all of that money for refuge and habitat acquisition.

The gentleman well remembers that there was a slight falling off at that time but after a few years it picked back up. It was approximately 10 years ago that increase took place.

It is the feeling of the committee that the standard equipment of a duck hunter like a box of shells or a pint of whisky to keep warm in the blind would by far exceed the cost of increasing the duck stamp to even a $4 level or a $5 level.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, I think that if you are going to increase the duck stamp to $5, as prospectively you propose to do, that that is going to make it pretty rich for the blood of the ordinary, common garden variety of citizen, and I for one am not going to support a provision for $5 for a duck stamp.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry to hear that that is the position the gentleman takes on this. He expressed no opposition to this legislation when we had it before us last year when the bill was passed under suspension of the rules and I do not believe that there was even a rollcall vote on it.

Mr. GROSS. I regret to say I was gone at the time.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry to hear that as I thought the gentleman was here at the time.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Since this bill in its present form is not subject to further amendment since it is being considered under suspension of the rules, I want to ask for purposes of clarification as to the use of the word "should" on page 5, line 3, and I would like to call your attention to this.

The language reads on page 5:

> For each such stamp sold under the provisions of this section there should be collected by the Post Office Department a sum of not less than $3 and not more than $5 * * *.

And so on.

The use of the word "should" seems to me to be rather—shall I describe it as "recommendatory" shall we say and not at all directive in tone.

I am wondering if the word should not have been "shall" and since the matter is not now subject to amendment, I would like to have the gentleman state as a matter of legislative history what the intent of that word is.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my friend for asking that question.

I will say that the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan, speaking as the author of the bill, is that this requires the Department of the Interior to fix the price of the migratory bird stamp at not less than $3 and not more than $5.

It affords wide discretion within that area, but it was the expectation of the committee that the level should be fixed on the basis of probably a $4 amount for the first year, and ultimately there would be a second increase of $1 more. In other words, there would be an increase to $4 in the first year, and then the stamp would ultimately be increased to $5.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. This also says that the Post Office Department shall collect whatever the amount is.

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct. This is done because the Post Office Department is the agency which actually sells the duck stamps to the public.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know much about duck hunting or duck hunters, but I could not help overhear some of the colloquy that took place about the great burden that this increase of $1 would be to the duck hunters if we were to raise the stamp by $1, and also if we were to raise it to a total of $5.

I was just wondering if the gentleman's committee had taken any testimony at all that would give us an idea of what the average duck hunter might spend in the way of equipment, such things as guns, ammunition, clothes, and equipment, things of that nature, because it does not sound to me as if this is an overwhelming amount of money to pay for the privilege of duck hunting.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is correct. I thank him for his comments. But as far as answering him as to the average, I am unable to do that. I would mention that a great many duck hunters have from $1,000 to $2,000 or $3,000 or $4,000 tied up in their equipment. So that in terms of the total amount, a dollar increase in the fee is a small amount.

I thank the gentleman for his comment.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very interested in the colloquy that has been going on here, and I do want to commend the gentleman for his efforts because I know his objectives are good, but I do not agree with the manner in which he proposes to achieve them.

I do want to call the attention of the House to the fact that we are selling less duck stamps now than we did 6 years ago, and by the testimony before this committee by the time we increase it to $5 there will be a quarter of a million less people buying the duck stamps.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will pause for just 1 moment, I would like to correct the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman that we are now selling more duck stamps than we have sold in any year since 1961. In 1967, the fiscal year, or the 1966 duck-hunting year, we sold $4.8 million worth of duck stamps. The last year when we sold more than that was in 1961.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad the gentleman is making that statement.

Mr. DINGELL. One of the reasons that we have not sold as many is due to the fact that we have had some very bad years in terms of waterfowl population. And I would say to the gentleman that this subcommittee is trying to buy more land so that we can have more migratory waterfowl for the gentleman's constituents to hunt.

Mr. CASEY. I would say do not let the gentleman mislead you, because we are still going to buy the wetlands even if we do not raise this duck stamp. The legislation has already been authorized for doing it.

But the testimony before the committee by the expert, Mr. Gottschalk, is that he estimated that they would sell 1.6 million stamps, and it is his estimate that after we raise the cost of the stamps to $5 that it would drop to an average of 1.36 million annually, and there would be a reduction of a quarter of a million or thereabouts of hunters who would not buy the stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those hunters who has $1,000 worth of equipment. I have a gun, one that I have had for a long time. I have to look after it. I use the same waders over and over again—you know, you can patch those plastic waders up pretty good—and I do not, for one, think that duck hunting should be something that is only for the

exclusive use of those who have the money to spend.

I do not know who those quarter million people are who are going to be cut out when they raise the price of the stamps. But I wish to point this out; that in 1950 they were selling 2.127 million stamps, and now they are selling only 1.6 million.

There is no necessity to increase this price at all. When we first authorized the acquisition of the wetlands and provided an authorization to spend $105 million out of the Treasury without interest—we advanced it, rather—there was no talk of raising the stamp price and, mind you, at the present rate it is increasing at the rate of $100,000 a year. Let us leave it as it is.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a statement which I had prepared on this particular bill. It would be largely repetitive of what the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has already said. However, I wish to add one thought concerning the price of the duck stamp as it affects the duck hunters.

If the Members will refer to page 58 of the printed hearings on this bill, they will see that experience from two previous price increases in the duck stamps indicates that the opportunity for successful hunting has a much greater bearing on the number of stamps sold than the price of the stamp itself. In other words, if there are no ducks or only a few, then you are going to sell proportionately fewer duck stamps. I think that basically sportsmen who spend a great deal of money on duck hunting are anxious, willing, and ready to contribute more if they can conserve our wildlife.

There is a way in which to conserve our wildlife and that is to provide more refuges and to accelerate the acquisition of such refuges. The bill, H.R. 482, increasing the cost of the duck stamp would permit this necessary acceleration in the acquisition of refuges for migratory waterfowl.

I, therefore, urge Members who can consistently do so to support this program, which would make it permissive for the Secretary of the Interior to raise the price of the duck stamp to a maximum of $5.

I would like to also point out that we recommend in the report raising the duck stamp fee from $3 to $4 in the first year and from $4 to $5 in the second year so as to minimize the impact of the increase.

In summary, H.R. 482 would amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 1934, by vesting in the Secretary of the Interior discretionary authority to increase by $2 the fee for such stamps. This is accomplished by establishing a minimum and maximum fee for the so-called duck stamp at $3 and $5, respectively.

Currently, valuable habitat for migratory birds, and particularly migratory waterfowl, is being diverted rapidly to other uses. It is the purpose of this legislation, H.R. 482, to provide additional funds for the acquisition of such lands so as to preserve them for purposes of conservation.

At a time of generally increasing costs, our committee was extremely reluctant to entertain placing any further financial burden upon the sportsmen of this country, but the facts of the case dictate the necessity for this discretionary increase in fee. The last increase in the duck stamp fee was almost 10 years ago in 1958, when it was increased to the present level of $3. Yet, since fiscal year 1962, the average price per acre for waterfowl production areas has doubled from almost $31 to almost $62 per acre. Accordingly, additional funds for the acquisition of needed lands for migratory birds must be made available if such lands are to be preserved for migratory fowl.

It was because of your committee's sincere concern over the possible effect of this increase upon sportsmen that the following was specifically noted in the committee's report:

> It may well be that such an increase in a single action would impose some degree of hardship on less affluent sportsmen. While the bill grants discretion to the Secretary in scheduling the increase, the committee hopes that he will consider the interests of both the acquisition program and the sportsmen and possibly make the increase in two installments, for example, $1 for the coming year and, if this appears to be working satisfactorily, the remaining $1 the following year.

Accordingly, in view of the demonstrated need to acquire and preserve sufficient acreage to accommodate the needs of migratory waterfowl and in view of the increasing costs of land, I earnestly urge the favorable consideration of the bill H.R. 482.

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

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

Mr. HUNT. First, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas, who echoed my sentiments. I am a duck hunter. I belong to numerous sportsmen's clubs. I can find no reason now to begin to soak the duck hunter an extra $2 in conjunction with all the State licenses he must buy. He must obtain, first, a license in the State, then the license for the duck, and then the license for deer, and a license for woodcock. Then they will have others for migratory birds. All they are trying to do is to perpetuate themselves in a fantastic idea that ducks do not rest unless they have certain specified resting ground with the huge words "U.S. Sanctuary" on them. I would like to remind the Members of this body that ducks cannot read. They simply fly, and when they get tired, they sit down.

There are numerous places in this country that are now being replenished and refurbished by Ducks Unlimited, for the purpose of nesting. Anyone who has been in the duck hunting business and who has followed this very closely knows this, and for that reason I am going to oppose the measure.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there are Members who have different views on this subject. However, I would point out that the duck population to a great extent depends on wetlands and nesting grounds. The continual human population sprawl and the greater utilization of land in other ways has resulted in the draining off of these wetlands. If we are going to continue having a duck population and duck hunting, then in turn we must provide refuges so that migratory waterfowl can nest and increase in population.

Again I say that if there are no ducks to hunt, then there are going to be no sales of stamps. This legislation provides an opportunity now to conserve our wildlife population so as to provide duck hunting for this and future generations of Americans. While it is regrettable that we have to increase the price of the duck stamp to accomplish this goal—and I regret it as much as anyone—I think it is absolutely essential to accelerate the acquisition of refuges for migratory waterfowl, else this wildlife will certainly suffer.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I simply want to observe that to me it seems H.R. 482 now has definitely been proved to be related to H.R. 480. Indeed, the gentleman from Missouri feels they have come in in reverse order.

Be that as it may, I rise to a point of inquiry as a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. This is a question for information and without any casting of aspersion or even with a lifting of the eyebrow. I note there are treaties involved, and therefore the Department of State is involved. I also note that one of the reasons for the existence of this legislation is that our population explosion is requiring more housing and we are moving into these areas, and our farmlands are being put out of production, and we are gradually draining and using up the potholes and nesting grounds and breeding places and flyways. The Postal Department also collects the fees, and Treasury has an interest in the bill.

We all know the Department of Interior has jurisdiction over fish and wildlife. How does it happen that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries brings this legislation on the floor? Do they have jurisdiction over any part of it, including the funds?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan to respond to that question.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will refer to the Rules of the House of Representatives, he will see the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has jurisdiction over conservation and has traditionally had jurisdiction over fish and wildlife and has had special jurisdiction over the matter of migratory birds, fish and wildlife refuges, and so on. Legislation dealing with duck hunting stamps have always been handled by that committee, and legislation has originated from the committee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I remember this refrain from last fall when the same question came up. There was some discussion at that time about jurisdiction in this area, and I wanted to get it clear in my mind. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I assure the

gentleman that due to the wisdom of our predecessors the committee has jurisdiction over fish and wildlife. It has always been for me a great pleasure as one who is interested in it, to serve on this subcommittee and to try to bring to the floor legislation that truly will conserve our wildlife resources.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dedication of the gentleman and his additional response. How is it that the Department for Fish and Wildlife downtown is not under the administration and jurisdiction of the distinguished committee on which the gentleman from Washington serves?

Mr. PELLY. This is a matter which I know has come up before. Historically, our committee does have jurisdiction over this subject matter, as has been so ably pointed out by the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is rather an unusual approach in setting a fee range, when we give the Department of Interior the discretion of setting a fee at either $3 or $5. I wonder why the committee did not set a sum specific. I do not know any other case where in this field we have set an optional range, for the Secretary to set a fee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was based on the fact that we have no way of definitely ascertaining either the future duck population or the effect of increased cost of lands. It was thought best to allow discretion on the part of the Department of the Interior and to recognize that if there are plenty of ducks, there will be a comparable increase in the sale of duck stamps, so that a fee of $5 may be appropriate. On the other hand, the committee wrote into the report of this bill language which strongly recommends that the increase for the first year be only $1 and then another dollar the second year. In other words the allowed $2 increase would be accomplished in two steps to ease its impact.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the raise ranges between $1 and $4, because we are getting into the field where the little man is going to be hurt by this increased range. I thought it was interesting when the gentleman from Michigan said a few minutes ago the average duck hunter would have $200 or $300 invested before he went forth to hunt ducks.

I should like to ask what kind of equipment they use and what kind of armament they go forth with to hunt the ducks and the geese.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. They have several hundred decoys, a boat, tender, boots, and other hunting equipment.

I pointed out that it is possible a duck hunter might have a good deal less.

A good boat, to get an individual out to lines in the offshore waters of the United States, will cost several thousand dollars, when one adds the cost of the motor to it.

Mr. PICKLE. I am sure the gentleman would not say that this is average. I am in complete sympathy with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] said. The average person has a gun, some shells, some boots and a few other refinements.

If a person goes out in the territory of $2,000 or $3,000, he would be outdoing the rich Texan when he did that.

Mr. PELLY. I believe there are a great many duck hunters in this country who inherited an old scatter gun from their fathers. They go out during the season, perhaps once or twice. To them, whether they pay $3 or $4 or $5 may make a lot of difference.

However, the main interest of the committee is insuring the availability of a duck population level so that we can continue to get out the double-barreled shotgun and continue to find ducks to shoot at.

Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. It would seem to me that raising the figure from $3 to $5 is trying to make this almost solely the little fellow, the man who hunts the ducks, who will pay for the land and for the right to hunt.

It may be well that there be a principle that he pay the major portion. We passed a bill just before this providing for the acquisition of lands. I do not see why some of that cost cannot come from some other source, rather than from the little fellow who has difficulty not only in paying for the stamp but also in paying for the hunting license.

The hunting license in our State costs in the neighborhood of $6 or more. This is in addition. We are about to price the little man out of the business.

Mr. PELLY. I hope we are not, because I believe it is vital that we accellerate this program, if possible, so as to conserve the duck population while we can still do so.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. Is it not true that the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners is opposed to this increase, by resolution of last September?

Mr. PELLY. I see that the gentleman is reading the printed hearings of the subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. The committee has received no correspondence from that institution, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners.

Mr. CASEY. This was furnished to them in the statement of Mr. Gottschalk. from the Department of Interior.

Would that not be true?

Mr. DINGELL. I point out to the gentleman that if the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners is opposed to this legislation they are sufficiently vigorous to communicate their feelings directly to the committee.

I would assume, if they had felt strongly about it, they would have done so.

I happen to be on a first-name basis with most of the membership of that particular organization. My office is well known. We circularized the membership, to afford them an opportunity to fully know what was in this proposed legislation.

Mr. CASEY. Does the gentleman mean we cannot depend upon Mr. Gottschalk?

Mr. DINGELL. They may have told Mr. Gottschalk, but they did not communicate to the committee. This means to me they do not oppose it very strongly.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it might be well to point out that the original bill covered stamps for other migratory birds, in addition to migratory waterfowl. The committee deleted those provisions so as to cover only migratory waterfowl. Therefore, they might have been opposed to the original bill because of its proposed increased scope which is not now an issue because of the committee's deletion.

Mr. CASEY. Is it not true that the revenues are now increasing about $100,000 a year at the present rate of $3?

Mr. PELLY. That is the figure which has been cited here today.

Mr. CASEY. And at the end of 8 years, if this increased proportionately, they would be getting almost half of what is trying to be obtained by an increase in the cost of the stamp. Why not keep it within reason, rather than cut off a quarter of a million people who, it is estimated, will not be able to pay for a $5 stamp?

Mr. PELLY. I will say to the gentleman I think this bill will provide an additional $16 million for the acquisition of the wetlands over the term authorized.

Mr. CASEY. The point I am making is you will get it anyway and get more people participating and buying it for you leave it at this price.

Mr. PELLY. The testimony received by our subcommittee was to the effect that the duck population was the more significant factor and that unless the hunters have something to shoot at the amount of the stamps sold would not increase. You can take anybody's opinion on it. You can have your opinion and I can have mine. But I come back to the fact that more money will go into this fund for lands to be set aside owing to the increase in cost of the duck stamp than if we leave it at $3.

Mr. CASEY. But if we fail to pass this measure, you will still buy the wetlands you contemplated buying, will you not?

Mr. PELLY. We will continue as we have.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as is necessary in order to answer the questions of the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Washington.

Let me point out to my friend from Texas that this legislation means an increase, according to the testimony of the Department of the Interior, of about $2 million a year which will go for the acquisition of refuges for the duck hunters.

If you want to save these lands for the one gallus duck hunter who has a minimum of equipment, a minimum of opportunity, and a minimum of places to hunt and who cannot go to a fancy club, then you will support this bill, because in the next 8 years it will buy about 200,000 acres of additional land that will be open to that kind of hunter and be available to preserve migratory waterfowl. That is the issue which is involved in this piece of legislation.

Let me point out one other thing. Not a single communication in opposition to this legislation was received by me as chairman of this subcommittee and author of this bill except for the six States previously mentioned. Not a single communication was received in opposition to this legislation from a conservation or from duck hunters or fishermen or outdoorsmen. That is how little opposition there is to it.

Let me point out one other thing to my friend from Texas. Last year the House of Representatives considered this exact bill which is precisely as the committee amended it and presented it to the House. This legislation passed the House overwhelmingly last year.

The future in this country of duck hunting is pretty well at stake in this particular legislation. I hope my friend will have enough trust in me and in my subcommittee that worked so hard to assure that this would be so and to assure the future of migratory waterfowl hunting in this country. I hope he will support this bill and not oppose it because it will slightly increase the cost of the duck stamps.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. CASEY. It it not that I have any mistrust of my friend from Michigan, but I do not think that this legislation is necessary. Is it not true that even with an increase you will not repay the amount you are going to borrow?

Mr. DINGELL. No. The gentleman is entirely in error. The answer to the whole business is simply that over the next 8 years every nickel of this $1 or $2 increase or whatever it will be will be earmarked for refuge acquisition purposes and for the purposes of acquiring additional wetlands for migratory waterfowl. I point out to my good friend from Texas, for whom I have very high regard, that if my calculations are correct, it means more than 200,000 acres of additional hunting lands and refuge habitat for migratory birds will be available for hunters of the kind that my friend from Texas is talking about. That is what this legislation is all about.

Mr. CASEY. The reason why the bill passed last time is that I did not ask for a vote on it; but this time I am going to insist on a vote.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 482, which would amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 1934, by vesting in the Secretary of the Interior discretionary authority to increase by $2 the fee for such stamps. This is accomplished by establishing a minimum and maximum fee for the so-called "duck stamp" at $3 and $5, respectively.

Currently, valuable habitat for migratory birds, and particularly migratory waterfowl, is being diverted rapidly to other uses. It is the purpose of this legislation, H.R. 482, to provide additional funds for the acquisition of such lands so as to preserve them for purposes of conservation.

At a time of generally increasing costs, our committee was extremely reluctant to entertain placing any further financial burden upon the sportsmen of this country, but the facts of the case dictate the necessity for this discretionary increase in fee. The last increase in the duck stamp fee was almost 10 years ago in 1958, when it was increased to the present level of $3. Yet, since fiscal year 1962, the average price per acre for waterfowl production areas has doubled from almost $31 to almost $62 per acre. Accordingly, additional funds for the acquisition of needed lands for migratory birds must be made available if such lands are to be preserved for migratory fowl.

It was because of your committee's sincere concern over the possible effect of this increase upon sportsmen that the following was specifically noted in the committee's report:

> It may well be that such an increase in a single action would impose some degree of hardship on less affluent sportsmen. While the bill grants discretion to the Secretary in scheduling the increase, the committee hopes that he will consider the interests of both the acquisition program and the sportsmen and possibly make the increase in two installments, for example, $1 for the coming year and, if this appears to be working satisfactorily, the remaining $1 the following year.

Accordingly, in view of the demonstrated need to acquire and preserve sufficient acreage to accommodate the needs of migratory waterfowl and in view of the increasing costs of land, I earnestly urge the favorable consideration of the bill H.R. 482.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, an increase in the fee for the migratory bird hunting stamp, commonly called the duck stamp, is in my opinion a severe penalty to exact against the citizen of modest means who seeks recreation in outdoor sports. The bill, H.R. 482, will increase the cost of the duck stamp by two-thirds. This is a tremendous increase, and it will serve to deny a wholesome sporting outlet to many thousands of our people who simply cannot afford the expense.

Already, the outdoor sportsman pays much more than his share of the costs of preserving these great outdoor resources. And yet we all enjoy them. In our modern society, recreation and relaxation are requisites of a balanced life. They can no longer be considered mere luxuries. In our haste to secure revenue, let us not create of such hunting a luxury sport, a hobby merely for the wealthy.

A very cursory glance at the Interior Department's statistics will reveal that while revenue from hunting fees have increased over the past year, the number of participants has decreased. It is questionable whether an increase in the cost of the duck stamp will materially improve revenues, but it is certain that the number of duck hunters will decrease.

I am a duck hunter myself, and I know the adverse effect this increase will have upon the number and caliber of sportsmen who will shoot for ducks. The most unfortunate aspect of this situation is the effect the added fees will have upon the young and inexperienced hunters and sportsmen. It seems to me that our wildlife resources can be so managed as to operate as an alternative for the young people, as opposed to far less wholesome pursuits.

We should not remove this great pastime from the reach of our young people or our citizens of modest means. We should not create a luxury sport of our great outdoors. I urge the House to defeat this thoughtless legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 482, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 97, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—238

Adair	Corman	Gude
Adams	Cramer	Gurney
Addabbo	Culver	Halleck
Albert	Cunningham	Hamilton
Anderson, Ill.	Curtis	Hammer-schmidt
Anderson, Tenn.	Daddario	Hanley
Andrews, Ala.	Daniels	Hansen, Idaho
Annunzio	Davis, Ga.	Harvey
Arends	Dawson	Hathaway
Ashley	Delaney	Hays
Aspinall	Denney	Hechler, W. Va.
Ayres	Dent	Helstoski
Barrett	Derwinski	Herlong
Bates	Devine	Holifield
Battin	Dickinson	Horton
Belcher	Dingell	Hosmer
Bell	Donohue	Hull
Bennett	Dorn	Hungate
Betts	Dow	Irwin
Biester	Downing	Joelson
Bingham	Eckhardt	Jonas
Blackburn	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Ala.
Boggs	Edwards, Calif.	Karsten
Boland	Eilberg	Kee
Bolling	Erlenborn	Keith
Bow	Eshleman	Kelly
Brademas	Everett	King, Calif.
Bray	Evins, Tenn.	King, N.Y.
Brock	Farbstein	Kirwan
Brown, Ohio	Fascell	Kluczynski
Broyhill, N.C.	Feighan	Kornegay
Buchanan	Fisher	Kupferman
Burke, Fla.	Flood	Kyros
Burke, Mass.	Ford, Gerald R.	Laird
Burleson	Friedel	Landrum
Bush	Fulton, Tenn.	Latta
Button	Galifianakis	Lennon
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	Lipscomb
Carter	Garmatz	Long, Md.
Cederberg	Gathings	McCarthy
Celler	Giaimo	McClory
Chamberlain	Gibbons	McCulloch
Clancy	Gilbert	McDade
Clawson, Del	Goodell	McDonald, Mich.
Cleveland	Goodling	McFall
Cohelan	Green, Oreg.	MacGregor
Collier	Griffiths	Machen
Conable	Grover	
	Gubser	

Mahon	Pettis	Smith, Calif.
Mailliard	Philbin	Smith, N.Y.
Marsh	Poff	Snyder
Martin	Price, Ill.	Springer
Mathias, Calif.	Pucinski	Stafford
Mathias, Md.	Quie	Staggers
Matsunaga	Rees	Stanton
Meeds	Reid, Ill.	Stubblefield
Miller, Calif.	Reinecke	Sullivan
Miller, Ohio	Rhodes, Ariz.	Taft
Minish	Rhodes, Pa.	Taylor
Mink	Riegle	Teague, Calif.
Mize	Rivers	Tenzer
Monagan	Robison	Thompson, Ga.
Montgomery	Rodino	Thomson, Wis.
Morgan	Rogers, Fla.	Tunney
Morris, N. Mex.	Rooney, N.Y.	Udall
Mosher	Rosenthal	Van Deerlin
Moss	Roth	Vanik
Multer	Roudebush	Vigorito
Murphy, Ill.	Ryan	Walker
Murphy, N.Y.	Satterfield	Wampler
Myers	Saylor	Watts
Natcher	Schadeberg	Whalen
Nedzi	Schneebeli	Wiggins
Nichols	Schweiker	Williams, Pa.
O'Hara, Ill.	Schwengel	Wolff
Ottinger	Scott	Wydler
Patten	Selden	Wylie
Pelly	Sikes	Zion
Pepper	Sisk	
Perkins	Slack	

NAYS—97

Abernethy	Harsha	Railsback
Ashmore	Hébert	Randall
Baring	Henderson	Rarick
Berry	Hicks	Reifel
Bevill	Hunt	Roberts
Brinkley	Hutchinson	Rogers, Colo.
Brotzman	Ichord	Rumsfeld
Brown, Mich.	Jacobs	Ruppe
Burton, Calif.	Jarman	Scherle
Casey	Johnson, Calif.	Shipley
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Shriver
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Skubitz
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Smith, Okla.
Dole	Kazen	Steed
Dowdy	Kyl	Steiger, Wis.
Duncan	Langen	Stratton
Dwyer	Lloyd	Stuckey
Edmondson	Long, La.	Talcott
Edwards, La.	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Evans, Colo.	McClure	Tuck
Findley	McMillan	Vander Jagt
Flynt	Mayne	Waggoner
Fountain	Mills	Waldie
Frelinghuysen	O'Neal, Ga.	Watson
Fuqua	Passman	Whitener
Gardner	Pickle	Whitten
Gonzalez	Pike	Widnall
Gross	Poage	Winn
Hagan	Pollock	Wright
Haley	Pool	Wyatt
Hall	Price, Tex.	Young
Hardy	Pryor	
Harrison	Quillen	

NOT VOTING—98

Abbitt	Gettys	Purcell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gray	Reid, N.Y.
Ashbrook	Green, Pa.	Resnick
Blanton	Halpern	Reuss
Blatnik	Hanna	Ronan
Bolton	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, Pa.
Brasco	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Heckler, Mass.	Roush
Broomfield	Holland	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Sandman
Broyhill, Va.	Johnson, Pa.	St Germain
Burton, Utah	Karth	St. Onge
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe	Scheuer
Cabell	Kuykendall	Smith, Iowa
Cahill	Leggett	Steiger, Ariz.
Carey	McEwen	Stephens
Clark	Macdonald, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Clausen, Don H.	Madden	Tiernan
Conte	May	Ullman
Conyers	Meskill	Utt
Corbett	Michel	Watkins
Cowger	Minshall	Whalley
Dellenback	Moore	White
Diggs	Moorhead	Williams, Miss.
Dulski	Morse, Mass.	Willis
Esch	Morton	Wilson, Bob
Fallon	Nelsen	Wilson, Charles H.
Fino	Nix	Wyman
Foley	O'Hara, Mch.	Yates
Ford, William D.	O'Konski	Younger
Fraser	Olsen	Zablocki
Fulton, Pa.	O'Neill, Mass.	Zwach
	Patman	
	Pirnie	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts and Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Willis against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fallon with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Broyhill.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Gettys with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. St Germain with Mrs. May.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Foley with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. White with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WIDNALL and Mr. LLOYD changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, to increase by $2 the fee for such stamp."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on H.R. 480 and H.R. 482, the two bills just passed, all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BETTS SEEKS CENSUS QUESTION LIMITATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I bring before the House today a matter of much importance—the upcoming decennial census of population and housing. I call attention to the census because the questions which will be asked can be of great significance to the Congress and all Americans. There are many reasons for concern about the types of questions which may be put to the 200 million people living in the United States, but perhaps the most persuasive argument to me comes from the people who are required by law to record their personal histories and detailed housing information on census forms. This subject has not been one of much concern to the Congress recently, in fact few, if any bills have been introduced in the 90th Congress concerning the questions which may be presented in the 1970 census.

Our Constitution provides that every 10 years there shall be a census of population as directed by Congress for the purpose of determining the apportionment of the House of Representatives. I think everyone agrees that this is a proper requirement to be placed by the National Government on its citizens.

These should be simple, direct questions about each person but what has evolved in recent years is a complicated questionnaire on population, housing, education, and employment. Under penalties of $100 fine or 60 days in jail Americans are required to list the number of walk-in closets, number of times married, and number of weeks worked in the previous year. In 1966 the Director of the Bureau of the Census came before a committee of Congress suggesting that questions asking the respondent's social security number, religious preference, and voting participation should be required. I think these questions are extraneous and have no bearing on the intent of the census of population. Even if someone could justify their being asked, I feel it is outrageous that the citizens should be threatened by imprisonment for failure to comply. Have we no concern for the rights of our citizens?

The rights of privacy of the individual are threatened by this gradually increasing number of prying questions asked by the Bureau of the Census. Such intrusions have been sanctioned by the Congress due to its failure to act positively. By granting the Bureau of the

Census a relatively free hand to formulate its own questionnaires, the number and personal nature of such inquiries have increased, almost unnoticed and unobstructed. Congress has retained only an advisory role giving great discretion to the Director of the Bureau of the Census. It is time Congress asserted its power, and in so doing, assert the rights of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in order to focus attention on the overextension of the Bureau of the Census into the lives of our citizens and the need for Congress to take a positive role in the formulation of the 1970 census of population, I have introduced a bill restricting the questions which may be asked under penalty of law. My bill would render all inquiries optional except for those on population as deemed essential to the constitutional intent of the census. The privacy of the individual will be retained and the final decision on what questions may be asked will be returned to Congress. I would not restrict the Bureau of the Census from undertaking a periodic census of housing, employment, or other assignments deemed desirable. However, compliance by individual citizens would be voluntary.

I anticipate a great hue and cry that all of the questions posed in every census questionnaire are vital to one facet or another of government or the social order in the United States. Let me reply to this concern in two ways. It has been reported in the press that some 5 million persons were missed by enumerators in the 1960 census of population. A new and more thorough method of coverage is planned for 1970; a mail-out/mail-in census. If we want to obtain maximum participation by all the citizens, the number of questions should be limited and stated in the simplest language possible.

Many people will be overwhelmed by the proposed 20-page questionnaire with 50 or more separate inquiries. I cannot see how there will be any different results from the experience of 1960 if this approach is followed.

It is clear that much of the information sought is designed for use by private industry, educational institutions, social agencies and local governments. There are many market research firms in this country with sophisticated techniques for gathering data. Why has such private enterprise been left out of the concept of information gathering such as is undertaken by the Bureau of the Census? The skill and accuracy of these research firms refutes the argument that compulsion is the only way to secure such data. Why abandon volunteerism when it has been tested so little in recent years?

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation determining the scope and authority of the Bureau of the Census is more imminent every day. With the proposed Federal data bank coming closer to reality, it is essential that private rights be protected from possible misuse through government information centers. My bill is not a total solution to the problem by any means, yet it serves as a vehicle for consideration of this subject by Congress. My constituents and I am sure each Member of the House will be grateful if positive action is taken by Congress in asserting its role in the direction of the 1970 decennial census. If we are going to recognize and work on this problem, we must begin now.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we have again witnessed a striking example of the American Legion in action. The recent efforts to clear the name of Maj. Marcus Reno, a U.S. Army officer in General Custer's command, of the stain of a court martial has captured the attention of the Nation. Justice for this brave officer was delayed for 88 years.

It is doubtful that the question of his guilt or innocence would have been raised had it not been for the efforts of the American Legion in assembling and providing the Army Board of Corrections with the data needed to permit it to render its decision. This is but another example of the dedicated service given by the American Legion to our Nation's veterans.

The American Legion will soon be celebrating the 50th anniversary of its founding. Many projects and programs are planned by the Legion to celebrate its founding. These include the striking of a commemorative medal, for which bills have recently been introduced in the Congress, as well as the issuance of a commemorative stamp. The issuance of a commemorative stamp by the Post Office Department is a high and justly deserved honor for the 50 years of service given to the veteran and the country by the American Legion.

An excellent summation of the Major Reno case and the American Legion's part in it recently appeared in the Washington Post as follows:

ARMY BEATS RETREAT, CLEARS CUSTER'S AIDE

(By Phil Casey)

Just 78 years and two months too late, the Army ruled yesterday that Maj. Marcus A. Reno, who fought with Custer in the Battle of Little Big Horn, deserved an honorable discharge, instead of the apparently raw deal he got.

Reno, who died just that long ago to the day, was discharged dishonorably in 1880, an action the Army now feels was unjust.

The decision of the Army Board for Correction of Military Records was announced at a news conference in American Legion headquarters, 1608 K st. nw., by John J. Corcoran, director of the Legion's National Rehabilitation division.

It was the Legion that went to bat for the dead man and represented his grandnephew, Charles Reno, a New York City bartender, in his petition for a change in the discharge.

Reno, a native of Illinois and a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, had been cited for gallantry and had an outstanding record in the Civil War and afterwards. He took part in the Battle of Little Big Horn, "Custer's Last Stand," and accusations of cowardice in that battle made him a notorious and controversial figure. Though a military board of inquiry found him blameless the rumors were unquieted.

He had led three companies that were supposed to join with Custer's forces but were repulsed by Indian warriors that vastly outnumbered them. Custer and the companies under his direct command were annihilated, while Reno's forces suffered severe casualties, with most of them killed or wounded. General of the Army William T. Sherman praised Reno's conduct in the battle in a report to the Secretary of War.

A few years later, Reno was court-martialed and discharged dishonorably on charges of drinking, brawling and peering through a window at a lady he liked. She was fully-clothed, but she was a colonel's daughter.

It was Reno's conviction and the contention of the American Legion nearly a century later that he was the victim of the unfounded rumors and allegations of cowardice at Little Big Horn. His drinking and fighting and generally defensive attitude stemmed from the difficulties caused by the rumors, the Legion contended.

Sam Borzilleri, the Legion's legal consultant, and Gene Fattig, supervisor of the Legion's review and corrections boards, argued in Reno's behalf that the sentence was excessive and unjust, that Reno had not been properly defended and that the court-martial board itself had been confused in its findings.

The Army Board of Correction's decision stated in part: ". . . the recent loss of his wife, his state of bachelorhood in a desolate frontier fort and in the field, and the attendant primitive conditions, were not conducive to producing 'plaster saints'."

Reno, who lived the last decade of his life in Washington and died in Providence Hospital April 1, 1889, at 54, was buried in an unmarked grave at Glenwood Cemetery, a private cemetery at 2219 Lincoln rd. ne. He died a bitter and frustrated man, still trying to clear his name and receive an honorable discharge from the Army he seems to have served bravely and brilliantly.

The Army Board's decision will make it possible for his grandnephew and the Legion to remove his remains for reburial in the Custer Battlefield Cemetery in Montana, near monuments to the officers and men who served with him in the disastrous and impetuous attack led by Custer on June 25, 1876.

There's a certain irony seen in the fact that barrooms hastened Reno's downfall and then brought his somewhat belated rehabilitation. Ret. Army Col. George Walton, who formerly served in the Washington area, had long wanted to clear Reno's name but could find no descendant to file the petition.

He dropped into the Skyline Restaurant on Tenth Avenue, Manhattan, one day last fall and met Charles Reno, 52, serving drinks behind the bar. When Reno learned he could file such a request with the Army, he and Walton enlisted the aid of the American Legion. The petition was filed last October.

Corcoran, the Legion official, told reporters he didn't know whether any benefits would accrue to Reno as a result of the Board's decision.

A FULL-SCALE INVESTIGATION IS NEEDED IN AIR SAFETY TECHNIQUES AND PRACTICES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the

Members of this body have heard much in recent weeks of the need to reduce Federal expenditures. I have become aware of yet another sphere where tax dollars are being spent needlessly, in this case because conditions exist that allow claims against our Government in the millions of dollars.

Because I have had the feeling for quite some time that problems and developments in the field of air safety warrant the attention of Congress, I have endeavored to explore all possible areas of potential consideration by the House and its committees.

Members may remember that after the terrible airplane crashes at Urbana, Ohio, and at New Orleans, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee conducted two mornings of hearings during which the general scope of air safety was discussed by various representatives of Federal and private organizations. The Federal Aviation Agency, the Air Transport Association, the Air Line Pilots Association, and the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association were among those who testified.

Following that, the Administrator of the FAA, Gen. William F. McKee, called for an additional 600 employees to staff air traffic control stations. These are the men who man the "eye in the sky" aircraft tracking facilities for our Nation's airways. This is certainly a step in the direction of increased safety.

But it is just one step.

I recently requested information regarding the cost to the Federal Government of claims arising out of aviation accidents. I was amazed to learn that, since 1959, the U.S. Government has paid, either through compromise settlements or judgments, nearly $16 million to claimants.

What is more serious, not only under present economic circumstances but under any circumstances, is that over $203 million in claims are still pending.

I have in the past called for comprehensive, searching hearings into the many aspects of air safety. In view of the potential cost in dollars and cents as well as the mounting cost in terms of human life of air accidents, I wish once more to call to the attention of the Congress the pressing need for a full-scale investigation of the entire field of air safety techniques and practices.

I include at this point a copy of the letter, containing the figures I have quoted, in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1967.

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Reference is made to your letter of April 18, 1967, addressed to General William F. McKee, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, concerning negligence claims against the Government arising out of aircraft accidents. As General McKee advised you, your letter was forwarded in this Department for reply.

You have requested information as to the total dollar amount of claims that have been paid by the Government. This, of course, encompasses all Federal Tort Claims Act suits asserted against the United States arising out of aviation accidents. Some of these cases have been litigated to judgment whereas many have been settled out of court by means of compromise with the claimants. Our statistical records, which begin with Fiscal Year 1959, indicate that from July 1, 1959, through April 30, 1967, there was a total exposure or potential liability in such aviation cases of $372,331,621.98 and that the Government actually paid through compromise settlement or judgment a total of $15,694,066.69. A breakdown for each fiscal year is attached for your convenience.

You have also requested information as to the total dollar amount of claims pending against the Government. As of April 30, 1967, there were 433 Federal Tort Claims Act suits pending against the Government arising out of aviation accidents. The total dollar figure of the amount claimed in these suits is $203,004,731.00.

Sincerely,

BAREFOOT SANDERS,
Assistant Attorney General.

Claims arising out of aviation accidents and asserted against the Government pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act

	Amount claimed	Amount paid
Fiscal year 1959	$23, 153, 960. 03	$185, 960. 57
Fiscal year 1960	15, 301, 838. 42	911, 879. 65
Fiscal year 1961	7, 754, 449. 53	715, 582. 47
Fiscal year 1962	66, 135, 226. 00	471, 170. 00
Fiscal year 1963	66, 535, 196. 00	2, 015, 789. 00
Fiscal year 1964	44, 049, 923. 00	4, 234, 147. 00
Fiscal year 1965	47, 612, 801. 00	2, 808, 487. 00
Fiscal year 1966	70, 571, 396. 00	808, 759. 00
July 1, 1966, through Apr. 30, 1967	31, 216, 832. 00	3, 542, 292. 00
Total	372, 331, 621. 98	15, 694, 066. 69

TOO FEW HOUSES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a June 9, 1967, editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Too Few Houses." This editorial expressed regret that the House had seen fit to kill the rent supplement program, but then it went on to urge the administration "to turn the other cheek," seek Republican support, and pass the Percy bill to help families buy homes.

In a letter to the editor dated Sunday, June 18, 1967, Secretary Weaver commented on the Post's charge that the administration was "not a willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing" by citing the work done under section 221(d)(3), a program of providing housing by subsidized interest rates.

Like Secretary Weaver and the Washington Post, I regretted that the House recently defeated the rent supplement appropriation. Those who served in the 89th Congress will recall that although I first opposed the rent supplement program on the ground that its regulations permitted its funds to go to persons earning as much as $8,100 and with assets up to $25,000, I changed my position and have supported the program since these regulations were revised and the program directed toward low-income groups.

The present 221(d)(3) program, however, is a poor illustration of how the administration serves as a "willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing." The income limits under the 221(d)(3) program are just as bad, and perhaps worse, as the original rent supplement program in that they permit families in city after city across America to live in subsidized housing, although such families' income frequently exceed $8,000, and even $10,000, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, the National Home Ownership Foundation Act, introduced by Senator PERCY is not a cureall for our housing problems. Senator PERCY admits it does not "reach down to the bottom of the barrel" and, therefore, is no substitute for the rent supplement program. However, it is a means of giving incentive to families in low-income groups to own their own homes, and it will, as the Washington Post suggests, "channel construction funds and purchase subsidies into the slums." It is far superior, in my judgment, to the present program under section 221(d)(3) cited by Secretary Weaver. More important, the Percy bill has widespread support in Congress. The administration would do well to follow the Post's advice and "turn the other cheek," rather than continuing to oppose new housing ideas such as this one.

I include below the Post editorial and Secretary Weaver's letter to the editor for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 1967]

TOO FEW HOUSES

While the country's population has been growing, its housing production has been declining. The number of new houses reached 1.6 million in 1963 and even at that rate, as President Johnson said, the improvement in the housing market failed to reach a great many among the poor, the elderly and the minorities. "By 1970," the President observed three years ago, "we shall have to build at least two million new homes a year to keep up with the growth of our population."

But instead of rising, housing production has fallen each succeeding year until, in 1966, it sank to 1.2 million. With this general tightening of the real estate market, and the general failure of the housing industry to keep up with demand, the Administration's attempts to rehabilitate the city slums become increasingly difficult. The Federal Government's traditional program for providing homes to the poor is public housing, but most American cities now believe that they cannot absorb many more large public housing projects.

Congress has only compounded the confusion. Last month the Republicans in the House voted in very large numbers to defeat the appropriation for rent supplements. It is sad when one thinks of the people who need the supplements; but it is comic when one thinks that most of the Republicans were simultaneously supporting Senator Percy's home ownership bill. Rent supplements mean Federal funds to help families pay rent. The Percy plan means Federal funds to help families buy homes. Both require Federal subsidies, and both encourage private construction. The Republicans insist on damning one as the prelude to socialism and praising the other as an historic vindication of the free enterprise system.

If the Administration is wise, it will turn the other cheek, leave this doctrinaire rhetoric undisturbed, and help Senator Percy pass his bill. Its defects are not small; most serious of all, it follows the Administration's own error of relying on nonprofit corporations. And the Percy plan can never reach

the really poor families who most desperately need help.

But the Percy bill has notable advantages of its own. It would set up a new, specialized Federal mortgage bank (judiciously termed a "home ownership foundation") to channel construction funds and purchase subsidies into the slums. The Federal Housing Administration has not proved a willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing, and the Percy bill offers an alternative method of financing. It cannot take the place of rent supplements in the structure of Federal aid to housing. But it can bring building money into neighborhoods that commercial banks and the FHA are equally reluctant to enter.

Perhaps the most important fact for Congress to keep in mind is the narrow scale of these endeavors. Both the Percy plan and rent supplements can be very useful, but both are highly specialized. Neither can begin to counterbalance the unwholesome social effects of the low rates of housing construction in recent years throughout the Nation.

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1967]

ACTIVE PARTNER

I read with interest your June 9 editorial entitled, "Too Few Houses." Its analysis of the parallels between the rent supplement program and the Percy plan was both accurate and timely. I also was gratified that you recognize that the Percy plan has limitations and defects.

I must, however, take exception to the statement that the Federal Housing Administration is not "a willing partner in low-cost subsidized housing" and is reluctant to function in blighted and slum areas. Historically there is a valid basis for such assertions. But today, as a part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the FHA is an active partner in subsidized housing and is helping to bring money into blighted slum neighborhoods.

In 1961 Section 221(d)(3) was added to the National Housing Act. This new section provided FHA mortgage insurance for a new moderate-income housing program, and authorized special assistance funds from the Federal National Mortgage Association for its financing. This is a subsidized housing program, providing both new and rehabilitated housing.

All of the funds available for this program will be allocated by the close of this fiscal year. As ot April 30, 1967, allocations for 143,000 units had been made. Commitments were issued for 72,400 of these units, and in excess of 40,000 units were occupied.

The rent supplement program, funded initially only a year ago, has moved more rapidly, thanks in large part to our experience with the 221(d)(3) program. By mid-May of this year, the FHA had allocated all of the available appropriation for rent supplements, aside from a contingency fund that must be preserved. These allocations will provide some 35,000 units of housing for low-income families.

These two programs are the most active of all FHA multifamily housing programs and make up most of its multifamily activity. Thus today FHA is not only willingly but successfully playing a prominent role in supplying low- and moderate-income housing.

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.
WASHINGTON.

FOREIGN AID IN OUR NATIONAL POSTURE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail, I received a letter from a constituent who seems to sum up quite clearly the attitude of many thoughtful people of the Sixth Congressional District of Washington State regarding the Middle East situation as it exists today.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the writer, Mr. Frank D. Weeks, Jr., displays a rare understanding of the place of foreign aid in our national posture. He realizes that it plays an important part in our foreign policy, useful as a stabilizing influence in the world.

It is not a complete answer, surely, as both Mr. Weeks and we in this body are well aware; but remains part of the answer, a workable and flexible tool of our foreign policy—infinitely more humanitarian and economically cheaper than bombs. I only wish that more Americans had as firm and intelligent a grasp of the uses of foreign aid as Mr. Weeks, and hope that as time goes on this may be the case.

I commend Mr. Weeks' letter to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH.,
June 14, 1967.

Hon. FLOYD V. HICKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HICKS: I am deeply concerned with impending events in the Near East and U.S. policy in that area.

It appears that Soviet Russia will attempt to salvage whatever prestige she might, by obtaining a censure from the United Nations against Israel and a return to the status quo through collective UN action. Such a course could result in legions of "Volunteers" pouring into Palestine under communist military leadership which would require our forceful opposition or complete withdrawal from the area. Russia must not be permitted to achieve the objectives so violently and conclusively denied the United Arab Republic in the recent war. The Israelis and the Arabs must work out the solution among themselves, which can be done despite seemingly implacable hatred on the part of the Arabs. (A review of history indicates that the two people lived side by side in peace for almost a thousand years.)

As far as the United Arab Republic is concerned, I feel as most Americans do. Reacting to falsehood and insults slammed against us, my first emotion is defensive hostility. In analysis, however, I can see that it is not to our best interest to retaliate in anger against the UAR but it is also not to our best interest to give them aid and comfort at this time. Denial of aid will force the burden of support on the Russians or Chinese, or both—at a time when neither can adequately do the job. Should they attempt to raise economic conditions above starvation level in the Arab countries, it would require far greater expenditures of risk capital than they can afford—or would be willing to gamble, if they could afford it. By our refusal to participate—we have sufficient justification in the eyes of the world to refuse—we would certainly support conditions which would strengthen Israel's position and force a change in leadership and national philosophy in the Arab nations.

As I see it, should we supply massive aid to the Arabs before September, we may stay a revolution which will certainly occur as starvation conditions approach. It is to our best interest to cooperate with Great Britain in achieving a new Government among the Arabs which will agree to co-existence with the Israelis and accept the fact that a better life for their people will begin with education and hard work, not with the false dream that conquest of Palestine will fulfill Mohammed's promise.

I am aware that foreign policy is the domain of the President, but Congress can be very influential—especially in deciding who gets foreign aid and in what amounts. We must not be trapped into supporting conditions which will permit a shooting war to erupt at any time—as has been the case during the past twenty years.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK D. WEEKS, Jr.

FOREIGN IMPORTS STILL PLAGUE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the mainstay of the economy of North Carolina—the textile industry—continues to be sorely plagued and damaged by a flood of imported products from low-wage countries.

A recent survey of 310 North Carolina textile plants which employ over half of the State's total of 250,000 textile workers revealed that only 15 plants—employing 7,200—are now working full time, with the remainder continuing on a curtailed workweek running as low as 2 days per week.

This is a serious situation, one that grows worse almost daily. Not only does this condition have an impact that bodes ill for the industry and its workers, but also adversely affects the many industries and businesses which depend upon a flourishing textile industry.

When labor turnover exceeds 50 percent and prices drop 15 percent as they have in the textile industry, its future is dim indeed.

I wanted to bring this situation to the attention of the Congress for the economic outlook in my home State of North Carolina is dark unless some action is taken in the immediate future to alleviate the conditions now existing. I might point out that one in every two manufacturing employees in North Carolina is employed in a textile plant and many of the workers depend to a large degree upon the circumstances of the textile industry.

Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a friend and one of North Carolina's leading bankers. Mr. Addison H. Reese, of Charlotte, chairman of the board of North Carolina National Bank, is well known and respected throughout the Nation's banking industry. His recent letter to me is an excellent summary of the problems and the progress of the American textile industry.

Mr. Reese has cogently pointed to some of the continuing problems facing the textile industry, problems which are beyond the control of this vital segment of our economy.

So that all may benefit from Mr.

Reese's presentation of the current problems, I include his letter in the RECORD at this point:

NORTH CAROLINA NATIONAL BANK,
Charlotte, N.C., June 9, 1967.

Hon. HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KORNEGAY: Speaking as a banker and a citizen, I am gravely concerned at the apathy that allows an increasing flood of imports to endanger our vital textile industry.

The general public does not realize that other industries are involved. Anything that hurts the textile industry hurts trucking, chemicals, paper, oil, metalworking, and corn growers in the Midwest, to name a few other interests.

For years textile spokesmen have called attention to cheap foreign imports, and justly so. Even in strong textile areas such as the Carolinas, people have grown deaf to their complaints.

Some people in government seem to have the erroneous idea that the textile industry is antiquated. They think that to the extent textile mills can't compete with cheap foreign imports they should be abandoned, their people trained for other jobs, and their plants converted to more productive use. This is certainly not sound thinking.

Textile technology has forged ahead rapidly in the past few years. The industry has spent $5.5 billion on new plants, equipment and modernization since 1960. For example, H. W. Close, president of Springs Mills, Inc., reports that his company's newest plant will cost $63,000 per employee. This compares to about $30,000 per employee for plants built since 1963, and $10,000 for older plants.

Other industries depend on textiles for significant portions of their business. Just three of the nation's better-known textile companies, all operating in the Carolinas, spent approximately $242.7 million for supplies, repair parts, power, fuel and water in 1966. One firm alone—and it is not the largest—stocks 90,000 different items in inventory and deals with 7,000 suppliers. America's textile machinery manufacturers lead the world. In 1967 their output is expected to be about $796 million, 80% of it in domestic sales.

The trucking industry transports 87.8% of the textiles moved in this country (1963 figures), and derives over $100 million in revenue from the industry.

Textiles are a substantial customer of the $17-billion paper industry, buying paper, cartons and countless packaging materials. Petroleum and chemical industries are deeply involved, the latter at about $2.5 billion a year. DuPont gets about a third of its annual volume from sale of man-made fibers. Textiles are the nation's second largest industrial user of cornstarch, buying 315 million pounds annually.

Investors have a huge stake in textiles. In North Carolina alone, textile plants (excluding hosiery and garments) are capitalized at $1.18 billion. Textile properties in this state have an assessed valuation of $983 million, and pay more than $36 million in state taxes. More than 250,000 Tar Heels work in textiles, earning over $1 billion of the state's total manufacturing payroll of $2.5 billion a year. Nationally, some 950,000 people earn $4.6 billion in textile wages.

The suggestion has been made that we increase textile imports from developing nations, and compensate American textiles for their loss. It would be easy to go into developing nations, install subsidized textile machinery, and train their abundance of cheap labor to produce cloth for export to this country. This would make the American textile industry a sacrificial goat. It may help build up other countries, but it would be a heavy blow to the American economy.

Furthermore, the theorists who made that suggestion haven't said what would happen if these countries were to renounce their economic ties with the United States. If we had become dependent in years past on Viet Nam, Cuba or China for our textiles, we'd be spending millions to expand the industry in America right now.

Thank you for your past efforts on behalf of our textile industry. I hope you can convince your colleagues from other states that they, too, have a stake in textiles.

Cordially yours,

ADDISON H. REESE,
Chairman of the Board.

LT. GEN. LEW WALT, U.S. MARINE CORPS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine, on June 9, 1967, contained a very fine comment on Lt. Gen. Lew Walt, U.S. Marine Corps. This article gave some evaluation of the splendid record of service which General Walt has established as he has led our Marine Corps men in Vietnam.

I have had the privilege of witnessing the performance of General Walt on two visits to his area of operations. This has given me a privilege which I shall always value. I have never been more impressed with any military leader than I have been with General Walt. America can be proud of him and the men who have so courageously served under his command.

The Time magazine article is appended hereto as a part of my remarks:

LEADER FOR ALL REASONS

Soon after landing in South Viet Nam with a new second star on his shoulders, Marine General Lewis Walt recognized that the U.S. role there called for qualities of heart and mind that are not defined in military manuals. "In this war," he said, "a soldier has to be much more than a man with a rifle or a man whose only objective is to kill. He has to be part diplomat, part technician, part politician—and 100% a human being." As the top Marine in Viet Nam, facing an array of challenges matched by no other corps commander in the war, Old Pro Lew Walt, 54, proved himself a leader for all reasons. Last week, after two years of unremitting war, Walt headed home to a hero's welcome and a new job as the Marines' deputy chief of staff for manpower.

With a command that embraces 10,440 sq. mi.—all five of the northernmost provinces that comprise I Corps—Walt had the task of stabilizing South Viet Nam's queasiest territory. The region was plagued by the country's most aggressive guerrillas, threatened with the massive cutting edge of well-armed North Vietnamese divisions and abroil with political dissidence. From the outset, Walt gave priority to winning over the civilians and holding the villages.

Hamlet by Hamlet. His humanitarianism made good military sense. "When we realized that 180,000 people lived within 82-mm. mortar range of the Danang Airbase, and when we realized that there would be no way to police every house," said Walt, "we decided that the only way to solve it was to make sure that we had friendlies living around the airfield." The number of Vietnamese now living in secure areas has doubled, to 1,000,000, during Walt's tour.

The husky Kansan, winner of two World War II Navy crosses, was so committed to pacification that the Marines became known as "Walt's Peace Corps." While assault units like the 1st Airmobile Cavalry rode their helicopters to major set-piece battles against big Communist forces in unpopulated areas, Walt's outnumbered Marines, for the most part, had to fight mile by mile, hamlet by hamlet.

The switch in tactics from the gung-ho role in World War II and Korea made Walt a frequent target of criticism. The controversy also pointed up a split between Marine and Army commanders. Army men, pointing to such bloody engagements as Ia Drang, argued that the way to win was to kill the V.C. first and pacify the population later. The Marines replied that search-and-destroy tactics suitable for the wastes of the Central Highlands could not be employed in the populous seacoast of "Eye" corps. Moreover, they pointed out, wherever Army troops pulled out, the Viet Cong flowed back in.

Unfailingly Considerate but . . . Burdened with defense of the major jet bases at Danang and Chu Lao, committed to winning over a skeptical population and handicapped by having only 230 helicopters (v. 430 in one Army airmobile division), Walt fought the kind of war that the terrain demanded and his experience dictated. As popular with his troops as with the Vietnamese urchins he daily fed candy, Walt was known to enlisted men as "our squad leader in the sky" because of his tireless helicopter visits to combat areas. His blue eyes often misted over the sight of wounded Marines; yet they could freeze like an arctic night at the sight of an officer derelict in duty. A general and more than one full colonel were booted out of Viet Nam under the assault of Walt's sharp temper. Yet to those who did their job, he was unfailingly considerate.

General William Westmoreland, who was quick to appreciate Walt's achievements—as was the Pentagon, which awarded him his third star after just nine months in Viet Nam—asked the Marine in the spring of 1966 to extend his one-year tour for six months. Then, after Walt's smashing defeat of a North Vietnamese division last summer, Westy asked him to stay another six months.

Soldier's Soldier. Six weeks ago, with 76,000 Marines and 19,000 soldiers under his command, Walt finally closed with major elements of 71,000 guerrillas and regulars threatening I Corps. Though the Marines pulverized the Communist forces, they took high casualties. Walt's critics cited the U.S. losses as the reason for his surrendering command to Lieut. General Robert E. Cushman Jr. Actually, it was known long before the DMZ battles that Walt, bone-weary from endless rounds of 15-hour days, was leaving Viet Nam at the end of his second year.

Westmoreland, in an unusually warm tribute at change-of-command ceremonies last week in Danang, pinned the Distinguished Service Medal on Walt's barrel chest and said: "My admiration for this man is without bounds. General Walt is a Marine's Marine and a soldier's soldier. He's not only big physically but big morally, a man of almost unique professional abilities, an officer of great courage and outstanding leadership attributes."

Characteristically, Walt's thoughts were not with himself but with his Marines and fallen comrades. "I have a deep feeling of sadness as I recall those young men who have given their lives," he said, "but there is no higher cause than that of freedom."

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in the Middle East have left most of the participants doubtful and startled about recent past actions and uncertain over the future course of events. Indeed in this crisis the only ones who appear confident of themselves, their institutions, and their actions are the Israelis. The people of that small but incredibly brave nation have taught the world a lesson with its skill and determination to survive. Unfortunately, it is not at all certain that the opposing parties concerned have learned this lesson. The Soviet Union, the Arabs, the United Nations and our own leaders seem to believe in the same old myths that created and fed the bitterness of the Middle East that lead to the virtual annihilation of three armies at the hands of an amazing Israel.

Some hard thinking is now in order. I was pleased yesterday to find that some is being done in this country. In the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of June 18, 1967, Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., published an editorial entitled "War of Words." I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Hearst's sentiments and I believe it should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress. Under unanimous consent I place this fine editorial in the RECORD:

WAR OF WORDS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

With almost startling abruptness, the central spotlight of world attention swept during the week from the west bank of the Jordan River in the Mideast to the west bank of the East River in New York. For—thanks to the Soviet Union—the sensational battle of bullets between Israel and the Arab world was followed instantly with the opening of an all-out war of words in the United Nations.

You can bet the war of words will be relatively as long and indecisive as the battle of bullets was short and decisive. The Russians, true to form, have deliberately set out to foul up any chances of achieving early solutions to the many pressing problems left by the recent military showdown.

Despite a lifetime of watching the communists and their dirty work, I find myself literally astonished on occasion by their incredible gall and utter cynicism. There is no moral limit whatever to the Machiavellian maneuvering of which they are capable. What is now going on in the glass and marble home of the Great East River Debating Society is another classic example of their diabolic mischief-making.

As always, the Russians claim they are working for peace and security in the world. Yet, as always, their actions are coldly calculated to disrupt such aims wherever and whenever they think the resultant mess will benefit them. This is precisely what they have been doing in their present drive to have the U.N. brand Israel as an aggressor and to pass a resolution calling on Israel to give back all the Arab territory seized in the war.

What the Soviets are trying to do in the U.N., primarily, is to score a recoup through words the prestige they lost when they failed to come to the rescue of their Arab stooges with military intervention in the war. And in so doing they are encouraging the hate-filled Arabs to hope their war wasn't lost after all—that they can somehow return to the original provocative positions they held before the Israeli blitzkrieg.

I submit it is self-evident that any nation that would do what Russia is doing in the U.N. is a nation whose primary concern is not peace at all. Moscow knows full well that Israel was not the aggressor and that Israel was simply compelled to strike out to save herself from imminent total national destruction. Moscow knows equally well that the U.N. will never be able to force Israel to give up any of the territory she claims as essential to her future self-defense, which indeed much of it is.

The last fact is a good yardstick for showing the utter cynicism of the Russians. They failed to get the 15-member U.N. Security Council to pass the censure resolution they seek against Israel. So now they are trying to get them passed by the 122-member General Assembly, although they have repeatedly in the past insisted that such an action would be illegal. And they have a good chance of success, too, since the Afro-Asian bloc of nations has a controlling balance in the General Assembly—where the vote cast by the representative of 336,000 Gambians is as important as that of the United States.

But—and this is the payoff—the Russians know that the adoption of their resolution by the Assembly will mean just exactly nothing in itself. It would be merely an expression of opinion. Any implementation of such an opinion would have to be made by the Security Council, whose position already has been made clear.

Israel has said that peace terms must be hammered out in face-to-face talks with the Arabs. The Arabs, for their part, have vowed never to participate in such talks with the Israelis although eventually this position will be untenable. The point here is that it will continue to be tenable so long as the Russians encourage the Arabs.

All this once again underscores the limited usefulness of the U.N. in a real crisis. Its fundamental flaw springs from the fact that the great powers never have been willing to arm the so-called peacekeeping organization with the authority of a superstate whose sovereignty would top their own. In the present situation it was further weakened by the incredibly weak secretary general, U Thant, who pulled U.N. forces out of Egypt at the first real sign of trouble. The U.N., in fact, was not even useful in helping our nationals get out of the Arab world when they were ordered to vamoose.

Incidentally, this last point reminds me to give well-earned credit here to Pan American Airways for the superlative but little-known emergency airlift they operated on June 6 and 7—the second and third days of the war. At the request of the State Department, Pan Am evacuated 2,208 Americans, mostly wives and children of diplomatic personnel, in 18 flights out of Beirut. Other emergency airlifts were successfully undertaken by Pan Am from Lagos, in Nigeria, and from fields in Southern Spain. It was a tough job done in superlative fashion. All Americans can be proud of this great American flag airline.

The positive and speedy action taken by the State Department in this matter, unfortunately, is in sorry contrast to the ineffectiveness of our diplomacy throughout the whole Mideast showdown—and since. Before the war broke out, we proclaimed ourselves officially neutral although our national interests would have been vitally and tragically affected by an Arab victory. In effect we were neutral on the side of Israel but even so—thanks to our chicken allies—we were unable to do anything to help Israel break Nasser's illegal blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba.

Now that Israel won the war single-handed, thus relieving us of a tremendous potential responsibility, what have we done? Merely mumbled something about continuing our Mideast policy which calls for honoring the original territorial integrity of ALL the states involved in the conflict.

To me this is all wrong, and even worse than that. In a world of naked power politics, the policies of any nation in its right mind have got to reflect its own selfish interests. When situations are drastically changed, policies must be revised accordingly. This is understood by all of the really hardheaded nations of the world. Unfortunately we too often play politics as if it were a game and expect everybody to play fair and abide by their word and some imaginary rules. The only rule that anybody pays any attention to in diplomacy is the law of self-interest.

Israel has proven herself in sensational and heroic action to be our strong good bastion of Democracy in the Middle East. The Arab land she captured with her blood is all territory whose only use to her will be to prevent easy new attacks on her people—legitimate spoils of war by any definition. On the other hand, and with no cause whatever, seven Arab states have spit in our eye by severing diplomatic relations and encouraging outrages on American property in their midst.

Under these circumstances there is no moral or practical reason whatever for our clinging to a pre-war policy which held that Mideast boundaries should be sacrosanct. It is all well and good to have a policy of neutrality where our interests are not directly threatened. But in the present situation—where the issues of right and wrong are so clear, where our friends and enemies have emerged so unmistakably—it is foolish and meaningless to pretend neutrality any longer.

Now is as good a time as any for the United States to reassert the leadership she has failed to exert in the Mideast crisis.

We can do it by making it crystal clear in a declaration to the world that we believe justice lies with the Israeli cause.

If we don't, we will be helping along the confusion and delay being created deliberately by the communist-inspired war of words on the East River.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, and as an American I am honored to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent speech by the Vice President of the United States.

Addressing the 1967 commencement at the Naval Academy on June 7, 1967, the Vice President offered a bill of rights and responsibilities for the 21st century to the graduating midshipmen, who will soon be among the leaders of our country. This is a bill of rights and responsibilities that has more far-reaching application than to a single graduating class: It is a set of goals and ideals that every American, looking to the future, should memorize and take to heart.

Mr. Speaker, we all know and respect the Vice President as a man of vision and integrity. It is national leaders such as he who keep us looking ahead, toward the longer needs and goals of our country, and who help us put in the proper perspective the temporary national ob-

jectives in order that they may build on one another toward a better way of life. At this point I insert in the RECORD Vice President HUMPHREY's excellent and challenging speech to the Naval Academy graduating class:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AT THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD., JUNE 7, 1967

Gentlemen, I am honored to bring you today this message from the President:

"It is a pleasure for me to extend my best wishes as you complete your college education.

"You are graduating into a society in which you will be warmly welcomed. Our country has never had so great a need for highly educated men and women. Never have young Americans moved from the college campus into a world offering so broad a range of opportunities for individual fulfillment and contribution to the welfare of humanity.

"Your generation of students has been distinguished by its fresh and vigorous concern for the quality of American life and its commitment to American democracy. Perhaps the greatest opportunity awaiting you is the challenge to make this a lifelong commitment.

"Today, Americans from every walk of life are striving together to shape a society that can offer a meaningful and rewarding life to all its members. Never have so many of our countrymen been so deeply dedicated to eradicating the old evils of ignorance, poverty, and bigotry from every corner of the land.

"Through your years of study, you have prepared yourselves for positions of leadership in this quest for a better America.

"I congratulate you, and urge you to take full advantage of that opportunity.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

Gentlemen, in the spirit of that message, I call your attention to the future.

In your generation, only 33 years from now, our familiar 20th century will end and a new century will begin.

There are those who predict that we'll never make it alive through *this* century, much less the next . . . that nuclear Armageddon is bound to come.

But there are others, and I am among them, who believe that the year 2000 can bring not only a new century, but the beginning of a new millennium of human hope and happiness.

It will in large part depend on what we Americans do with our time.

There seems to be general agreement that we in America can be living in streamlined, chromeplated, airconditioned, automated, solid-state, all-electronic comfort in the year 2000.

Discussion of present and future progress almost always seems to be in terms of scientific and technological wonder or horror . . . comfort or cataclysm.

It is also largely in terms of the quantitative: How much? How many? How far? How fast?

For instance, in quantitative terms, we know today that we have a Gross National Product of three-quarters of a trillion dollars . . . the ability to produce a plane which will fly at 2 thousand miles per hour . . . a national inventory of 60 million TV sets . . . more than a half-million scientific papers published each year.

All these facts indicate economic prosperity and growth . . . a greater scientific and technological capacity . . . a wider ownership of material goods.

And we are told that these trends will surely continue.

Yet, if we look more closely we see other things too: That, for instance, in the shading of high-income areas on census maps, the shading never falls on neighborhoods where Negroes live; that, in a time of prosperity in the rich nations, per capita income is going *down* in the poor nations of the world.

And we increasingly feel—I know I do—that it is imperative to apply critical, *qualitative* measures to what we see—that it is necessary to see how change is affecting people and their lives.

We have over 2 thousand institutions of higher education in our country. The question is: What proportion of their students are receiving both a solid technical grounding and the ability to think for themselves?

We have, in our cities, billions of dollars of new investment in office buildings and luxury apartments. The question is: Are the families who live in the shadow of these buildings—that is, the majority of the people who live in our central cities—better-housed or worse-housed today than they were yesterday.

When he visited America a century ago, Thomas Huxley wrote: "I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree impressed by your bigness, or your material resources, as such. Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs the terror of overhanging fate, is *What are you going to do with all these things.*"

Today more and more Americans are asking Huxley's question of themselves: With our power, our resources, and our innovative capacity magnified a thousand times, what *are* we going to do with all these things?

I think the answer is clear.

Our goals are not and must not be confined to improvement in physical conditions and creature comforts. If the achievements of America are to be no more than the hardware of science, the machinery of technology, and the extension of material abundance, we will have made only a minor contribution to mankind.

We must not lose sight of this:

More important than the machines, and the wealth they produce, are the people who inhabit this earth and the rights they possess.

If a future historian set out to trace the preservation and realization of the rights of man in *this* millennium, he would be able to describe a pattern of progress.

He would, of course, note that in the Middle Ages only the ruling sovereign firmly possessed rights to own land.

He would dwell on the significance of the Magna Carta, issued by King John of England in 1215, defining the rights and duties of barons, and becoming a symbol of the rule of law for succeeding kings.

He would note the enactment by Parliament, in 1689, of what the British called the "Bill of Rights," which declared the rights and liberties of British subjects under the Crown.

He would, possibly, give a full page or chapter to the American Constitution adopted in 1789, the amendments added by our first Congress in 1791, and how they became known throughout the country and the world as the American Bill of Rights. They would have to be spelled out on our historian's pages: The right of free exercise of religion, of free speech and press; the right to assemble and petition the government; the right to be secure against unreasonable searches; the right of trial by jury; and more.

That historian of the future would relate two patterns of development which followed: How America itself, through action of Congress and the courts, refined and extended those rights to *all* its citizens, and how other peoples learned of and fought for the same rights.

And what then? What would our future historian report of the role of America in extending the rights of man as this millennium raced to a close?

Permit me to suggest a hopeful, hypothetical paragraph for that future historian. In the bland, detached prose of the scholar, he might write the following words about the United States in the year 1967:

"It was a time of crisis and challenge for the United States. While seeking to improve its own standards and redefine its own rights at home, that nation was tested as never before in its pronouncements and policies to help extend human rights to other areas of the world."

And then, in conclusion, we would hope that the historian would set down this paragraph:

"America met the test."

There are those who say history cannot be made; it must be accepted.

But we Americans have never looked upon human history with fatalism or a sense of despair. We have never written off the future to the winds of chance and the whims of nature.

It is good to know history. It is even better to make it.

But before the act must come the vision.

What are the rights—and what are the corresponding responsibilities—which man may envision in the century ahead, and which he may work toward today?

Man's past rights, as previously defined, have most largely protected him against coercion by his government.

But in a world where destruction is only a half-hour away, as the intercontinental missile flies, we all know that man's rights are affected by forces far beyond those possessed by his own immediate government.

None of us needs to be reminded of that fact this week.

We know that every major event—or trend—taking place on this earth sends ripples outward to all other places.

All this is a way of saying that this truly is one world, and will become even more so.

It is thus clear that, if we wish man's rights to be nourished and not to wither, we must move beyond the goal of merely helping him resist the incursions of his immediate government.

We must, too, move beyond the business of the protection of rights to a more positive doctrine—toward their assertion.

In short, we must help man become not just protected, but liberated.

Does this seem to be new and revolutionary doctrine?

It is revolutionary.

But it is hardly new. It is, in fact, the doctrine of Thomas Jefferson—doctrine that proclaims "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as the inalienable rights of all men.

Life that is more than mere existence.

Liberty that is not only proclaimed, but practiced.

Happiness that is found in only the full and rich life of men who are both secure *and* free.

We know through our own experience that the rights of man are never real unless they are constantly reasserted. We have seen what happens to them when they are left to fend for themselves.

We know in our hearts that the rights of man are a never-ending unfinished business, just as America, is a nation never-finished, a destination never quite reached.

The quest for the rights of man can never end at our own doorway. Nor can it be pursued in any narrow, protective sense.

Therefore, I hope you will not consider me presumptuous if I say that, here and now, we as Americans must dedicate ourselves to a new Bill of Rights and Responsibilities for the 21st Century—rights and responsibilities which fit new times and circumstances.

Let us raise our sights beyond the past and present. Let us declare ourselves for the future rights which one day all men share:

The right to peace—so that man may live and hope free from the threat of those who would march to power.

The right to justice—so that man may

stand before his peers and his society on truly just and equal basis with his neighbor.

The right to free expression—so that man may speak and be heard, despite the decisions and beliefs of any temporary compact majority.

The right to the search for knowledge—so that no man may remain another's slave through the denial of skill or education.

The right to public accountability—so that man may remain the master of the state, rather than the state become the master of man.

The right to a meaningful role in society—so that man may follow his own cadence and live with self-respect and dignity among his fellow citizens.

The right to full opportunity—so that man may lift himself to the limit of his ability, no matter what the color of his skin, the tenets of his religion, or his so-called social class.

The right to public compassion—so that man may live with the knowledge that his health, his well-being, his old-age and loneliness are the concern of his society.

The right to movement and free association—so that man may freely move and choose his friends without coercive restraints.

The right to privacy—so that man may be free of the heavy hand of the watchers and listeners.

The right to rest and recreation—so that the necessity of labor not be permitted to cripple human development.

These are the rights we seek—and must continue to seek—to make alive and real in our own nation. These are the rights, I believe, which we can do no less than seek for our brothers in mankind.

These rights will not be achieved at home, or in the world, without the exercise of consonant responsiblity by men who would possess them.

Then what are the responsibilities of modern man?

The responsibility to participate—lest critical initiatives and decisions be left to those who would bend them to their own use.

The responsibility to participate—lest silence in the face of injustice be interpreted as its acceptance.

The responsibility of public service—lest service be to self rather than fellow man.

The responsibility to support the rule of law—lest the law of the jungle become the law of human behavior.

The responsibility to protect ideals in the face of force—lest ideals be lost and violence be spread.

The responsibility to respect and defend the rights of others—lest freedom become license, and opportunity become coercion.

And these latter responsibilities, I might add, are nowhere more clearly spelled out than in two remarkable documents for the future: The Charter of the United Nations and the recent Encyclical of his Holiness, Pope Paul VI.

Both of these documents point the way to the future responsibilities in this world of the United States and other free nations. They point the way to the creative, constructive work that will be necessary if peace with freedom is ever to be achieved—the work of nation-building, of peace-keeping, of self-sacrifice in the cause of fellow man.

I know there are certain "realists" who believe both the United Nations Charter and the Pope's Encyclical to be the documents of dreamers. That they may be. But they are also realistic.

For I believe it is most unrealistic to expect man to survive through the years ahead if these documents are not heeded, and in the specific.

It is clear: The rights of each man must by necessity be limited by the rights of others and by the just-demands of the general welfare. Yet, within those limits, the possibilities of making men truly free are today but barely touched.

The first step is to have a vision of the rights we seek. The second step is to resourcefully find the means to their attainment. The third step is to have the courage to use those means to their attainment. The third step is to have the courage to use those means until the vision is achieved.

I have faith that America has within itself vision . . . and resourcefulness . . . and courage.

I give you the words of Woodrow Wilson: "This is not America because it is rich. This is not America because it has set up for a great population great opportunities for material prosperity. America is a name which sounds in the ears of men everywhere as a synonym with individual opportunity because it is a synonym of individual liberty."

I have faith that we shall not be diverted, at home or in the world, by the temporary crises and distractions which tempt men to infringe on the rights of others or to abandon their responsibilities.

And I have faith that the year 2000 will dawn on a world not of emptiness and devastation . . . not of oppression and conformity . . . not of self-indulgence and materialism . . . but a world in which each man stands free and equal in his search for the happier, better life that can be his.

That is the promise of the 21st century. And that is the promise of America.

AMERICAN BUSINESS CAN HELP WIN THE COLD WAR

Mr. BIESTER. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the American Security Council recently conducted national competition for essays on the role of business in the cold war. Amongst the winning essays was a particularly forceful presentation by Dr. Richard V. Allen, a senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace. Dr. Allen has long enjoyed an international reputation for scholastic excellence and vital perception of the relationship between East and West. His valuable views on the role of American business in this relationship follow:

ON WINNING THE COLD WAR: THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN BUSINESS COMPANY

(By Richard V. Allen)

Of all the characteristics of the American people, perhaps the most striking is their inexhaustible optimism in the belief that the country can "get the job done." This optimism is adequately justified by the history of the Republic; it abounds with examples of challenges to which we have responded successfully. Our experience in cooperative efforts in overcoming domestic difficulties, repulsing internal and external threats, and clearing the way for the pursuit of happiness and securing the general welfare are positive proof that our political and economic systems work, and work well.

The fruits of the American experience are not merely those of material well-being. Prosperity alone is meaningless without liberty, and it is precisely because we are both prosperous and free that we have survived and flourished. The unique heritage of political democracy and individual enterprise has produced the most powerful, and at the same time, the most benevolent nation known to history.

In the past, the United States has been pragmatic in all its domestic and external affairs. Unfettered by ideology, utopianism, or clichés, we have sought to apply the rules of common sense in our dealings, and have come off fairly well. The logic of everyday affairs, applied automatically by force of habit, has been the product of our pragmatism and our optimism.

Today, the American character is on trial. Ideological clichés have become a dominant feature of the public dialogue; no longer do the rules of common sense apply universally in our dealings with the world; simple logic, often yielding uncomfortable and threatening answers, has become "unrealistic" and "outdated." And nowhere does the trial of the American character stand out more vividly than the conduct of the Cold War.

The Cold War has been the central feature of our lives for twenty years. It has been uncomfortable, expensive, and exhausting. It has also been a very real war, the nature of which we have thus far been either unwilling or unable to identify. Why?

In the past century, the major wars which the United States has fought were conventional in every sense of the word. Two or more nations opposed one another on a battlefield, and one side won a victory. Wars, which are always fought for political goals, were sufficiently convincing to defeated nations, and the limited aims for which they were fought often were accomplished on the strength of the victory alone.

In the three major wars of this century which the United States has fought—World Wars I, and II, and the Korean War—their political aims were improperly perceived, and in each case reliance upon military strength alone, and disregard for the long-term political consequences, yielded either stalemate or, eventually, conditions leading to another war. Thus viewed, the war in Vietnam is the product of our failure to secure both the political military victories which should have been ours in Korea; and should the war in Vietnam be inconclusively terminated, it is virtually certain that in the future we will become embroiled in other wars, similar in kind, at times and places not of our own choosing.

But it is in the uncertain arena of the Cold War that we perform most poorly, There are reasons for the poor performance, many of which stem from a contemporary unwillingness to acknowledge that we are faced with an implacable and self-declared enemy whose aims are unlimited, with an enemy who seeks the destruction of the American way of life.

For years there has been a substantial body of opinion which has held that, with the passage of time, the reasons for the fundamental conflict issues between East and West will gradually disappear. Of late, that body of opinion has grown to include some of the nation's policymakers and many of those in the academic community whose opinions influence our official policy. Those who believe that conflict will "whither away" hold one essential point in common, whatever their differences on specific policies may be, and that is that as the Soviet Union increases its industrial capability, and as it gradually acquires a better standard of living, it will inevitably relinquish the revolutionary demands it has made for the reorganization of the world along Marxist-Leninist lines. Since Marxism-Leninism has largely been "disproved" as a functioning political and economic system, they argue, it is in our own national interest to demonstrate that American capitalism and the techniques of individual enterprise are best suited to the interests of industrialized nations. Once the acceptance of capitalism has

become inevitable, it is held that the Soviet union will at last enter the family of nations, and will abide by the rules governing the relations of civilized and peaceful countries.

Thus, it is argued, as the United States and the Soviet Union gradually recognize the important interests they hold in common, the causes of conflict will disappear as the two nations "converge." Once having reached a common footing, the senselessness of conflict and hostility will become sufficiently clear to force both countries to act together to preserve world peace.

That Communists everywhere scoff at and repudiate the theory of convergence is alleged to be of no consequence. On the contrary, the proponents of the theory claim that Communist hostility to it stems basically from their anger in being "trapped by the inevitable" and unable to do anything about it.

We have described this influential attitude at length for a specific purpose: because it is so unrepresentative of the American character. Yet its appeal is obvious, for it offers an apparently logical and quite painless "way out" of our present difficulties. Nor does this attitude reflect faithfully the traditional business-like way in which we have viewed our own affairs.

That business-like realism is a missing ingredient in our conduct of the Cold War is both surprising and dangerous. It has been the genius of American business that has made the United States a powerful nation, and ultimately it will be American capitalism upon which we shall have to rely if we wish to preserve our way of life, our strength, and our honor.

It is frequently said that the techniques of business are inapplicable in the world of international affairs, where there are never "black and white," but only "shades of grey." On this basis, businessmen are said to be incapable of comprehending the complexities of international affairs, because they invariably suffer from "black-and-white" attitudes and from the "profit-loss syndromes." Thus, businessmen are said to be better off running their enterprises than mixing in the affairs of state.

There is no "natural inferiority" of the American capitalist; on the contrary, his training and his inclinations provide him with an ability to ask basic questions, and his concern about profits and losses may be precisely the missing ingredient of our Cold War policy-making.

The businessman is one who must make decisions and then face the consequences of those decisions. He cannot procrastinate, he cannot argue that conditions are momentarily too complex to come to a conclusion. On the contrary, he must devise policies and execute them, because indecision can mean disaster or ruin. Even when faced with multiple options, he must discard the unprofitable, uncertain, and unrealistic ones in favor of the practical ones. He must be willing to take risks, for risk is inherent in every venture. And, most importantly, he must be prepared to change his policies if current ones are unworkable and unprofitable. Clearly, the businessman must be practical and alert to change, while at the same time bending his every effort to the attainment of conclusive and positive results. These are qualities which can secure for us a meaningful victory in the Cold War if given the opportunity and the responsibility to make a positive contribution. The time for ideological clichés is past; the ideologues have had their turn at trying to end the Cold War and have brought us no closer to victory. In fact, they have stated clearly that to speak of Cold War victory is "irresponsible" and "unrealistic." Meanwhile, the Communists continue to affirm daily that their objective is a complete "victory of socialism on a worldwide basis."

It is not argued here that one need only turn over the reins of government to businessmen in order to solve the world's problems, for in the business community itself there are gaps which must be filled. The most important of these gaps is the fact that not all business leaders have made the effort to acquaint themselves with the issues of the Cold War, its causes, and its peculiar battle plan. Another is the dearth of information and the profusion of misinformation about the responsibility of business in protecting the nation's strategic and security interests.

While it is the responsibility of business to interact with government and not stand aloof from it, business has a higher and more ultimate responsibility to enhance our national security. Opinions differ as to what actions enhance our national security, and governmental declarations of what contributes to the national security are not necessarily the final word on the subject.

The case in point is the expansion of East-West trade, which the Government considers a policy designed to reduce Cold War tensions. In many respects, the promotion of East-West trade is but a component part of the policy based upon the convergence theory.

While influential opinion may hold that the Cold War is diminishing and even dying out, the evidence clearly indicates the contrary. Apart from the war in Vietnam, itself a burning issue, Communist aggression and subversion are being intensified in all parts of the world. The Communists, who change tactics as conditions dictate, have frankly stated that the key to future success in expanding the domain of their control is in the vigorous and multi-faceted support of "wars of national liberation." As Nikita Khrushchev put it in his famous speech of January 6, 1961, "Liberation wars will continue to exist as long as imperialism exists . . . Communists fully support such just wars and march in the front rank with the peoples waging liberation struggles."

For those who read the Communist press and official Communist statements on a regular basis, there can be no doubt about the importance of "wars of national liberation" and the threat they pose to free world security, as well as the expanded role they are being assigned by Communist strategists.

Thus, if wars of national liberation are to be a major vehicle for the Communist offensive, is it in the best security and strategic interests of the United States to trade with Communist nations, all of which have openly declared their moral and material support for such wars? Will not expanded East-West trade only serve to put in jeopardy the unstable and volatile political administrations in the weaker under-developed countries? The answers to such questions do indeed produce uncomfortable answers.

It is certainly reasonable to assume, on the basis of our historical experience in dealing with the Communists, that whatever such totalitarian and expansion-minded countries need and want is of strategic and long-range importance in their over-all planning. Hence, as long as that planning has as its number one item of business the defeat of the United States and the Free World, any decisions to support long-range Communist economic potential will enhance Communist capabilities to achieve their goals. The dilemma in which American business finds itself in this instance is substantial, but is made even more serious by a shorter term, and even more dangerous development—the new developments in Soviet defense capabilities.

By now it is abundantly clear that the Soviet Union, convinced of its inability to attain strategic offensive superiority over the United States, has for the past three years committed enormous sums of money for research and development for, and initial deployment of, an antiballistic missile system. If this defensive system, which is now being installed in key areas of the Soviet Union, is in fact effective, then it takes on a vitally important strategic significance, one that may even serve to alter fundamentally the existing power relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is a fact that the Soviet Union has found it possible to utilize the *détente*, or relaxation of tensions, which has developed since the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. The expansion of East-West trade during the *détente* has allowed the Soviet Union to divert otherwise scarce resources for military purposes, since other industrial and consumer needs were being met by the importation of Western technology, financed largely by long-term credits.

Trade of any kind with the Soviet Union, viewed from this perspective, has enormous short-range importance. American businessmen, perhaps unaware of this strategic relationship, may take comfort from the official assurances they receive that the trade in which they are engaging is purely "peaceful," but a vigorous effort is urgently required to inform them of the true meaning of this trade.

Recently, for example, a Southern chemical company with a patented and unique catalytic process was approached by Soviet representatives with an offer of $1 million in cash for just the technical information on the process. A decision was to be made at a meeting of the Board of Directors, comprised entirely of dedicated and patriotic men. When the matter was tabled, all but one of the Directors agreed to the sale. The lone Director, a relatively young man who had only recently had a discussion on East-West trade with an expert on the subject, was then given an opportunity to present his views. When he inquired of his colleagues how many had sons fighting in Vietnam, he found that there were four. Within ten minutes he was able to demonstrate what the sale of the catalytic process could mean to the Soviet ability to continue its support of the war in Vietnam, and how the continuation and intensification of the war could affect the personal lives of each of the four Directors. Astonished by his own failure to relate the sale of their process to the war, one of the Directors said quite simply, "I just never thought of it that way, and I change my vote to 'no.'" Subsequently, the Directors voted unanimously against the sale. A single knowledgeable and perceptive Director, armed with recent and unmistakable evidence, had managed to reverse a majority decision, and thereby made a personal contribution to his country's security.

In the matter of East-West trade, then, businessmen seem unable to cope with the dilemma in which they are criticized if they do, and criticized if they do not. On the one hand, strong and influential spokesmen for expanded trade attack businessmen for "undercutting" official policy if they refuse to trade with the Communist bloc, and equally vigorous opponents of trade attack businessmen for weakening our strategic and security interests by engaging in trade.

That such a dilemma should exist is a reflection of one of the more serious "business gaps" in Cold War education and indicative of the need for a concentrated cooperative effort to expose the American business community to the accumulated evidence.

How, then, are the "business gaps" to be overcome? Can a systematic and comprehensive program to educate and motivate the business community be devised, and can it be implemented effectively with existing resources? What sectors of the American public other than the business community itself should be included in this effort?

In formulating answers to such questions, several important points must be kept in mind. First, the nucleus for a broad-based

cooperative effort must consist at the outset of those who are convinced that there is a Cold War, that it presents a grave danger to the American way of life, that it must be fought with a clear purpose, and that it can either be won meaningfully or that, as a minimum goal, the initiative can be returned to the United States. The process of convincing others will be the main task of the effort itself. Second, those who participate in the cooperative effort must be fully cognizant of the fact that no single program, no particular set of ideas, no rigid and simplified plan of action can accomplish the ultimate objective. In utilizing the unique talents of business for a far-reaching educational venture, one must realize that the results will not be measurable for a long period of time. By the same token, flexibility and variety must be permanent characteristics of the implementation of the cooperative effort: at times the approach will be cold and factual, at times subtle and persuasive. Strategy and tactics must be kept constantly under review. Third, those segments of the business community which participate must appreciate fully the consequences of their efforts, for those who will oppose an effort to overcome the "business gaps" will deliver a steady and relentless attack, and will almost certainly try to injure the reputations of those who participate. Charges of "crusading," preserving personal interests, and others far more damaging will be commonplace, and it is well that cooperating businessmen be warned that they will earn the disfavor of certain segments of opinion.

The first and most important task is to identify *all* potential participants from the business community and to establish a National Business Council on the Cold War. This could be accomplished by utilizing an existing body of motivated individuals, perhaps based upon members of the various advisory boards and committees of the American Security Council. Since these bodies are composed for the most part of busy executives who may not have sufficient time to devote to the initial stages of organizing a representative National Business Council, much of the organizing work would devolve upon a full-time staff of professionals drawn not only from business, but from academic life, the mass media, advertising and public relations. Such a full-time staff would number approximately five to eight persons, and would be apart in its activities from the regular administration staff of the American Security Council.

Once an exhaustive survey of all potential corporate and business cooperators has been completed, the professional staff could be reduced if desired (on the basis of a one-year commitment, which would be the period of time required to complete the organization of a conference of the National Business Council on the Cold War, educators and others would then be able to return to their regular employment).

Having prepared the basic information within a specified time, the temporary steering committee drawn from the group mentioned above would convene the first Congress or meeting of the National Business Council on the Cold War, and would seek to do this with the benefit of maximum publicity (it is at this point that the staff members from the mass media, advertising, and public relations fields, would perform at peak capacity). The format of the first conference would be determined by the temporary steering committee, but would in any case include a select roster of business leaders, lawyers, academicians, and persons with extensive military experience as speakers. In order to avoid the impression that distinguished and busy executives are merely the audience in a massive seminar, extensive preparatory work would be done to assure maximum participation by the invitees, and to this end all addresses would be concise and to the point. In addition, smaller sessions would be held to provide greater in-depth analysis and examination of the issues raised.

From the first congress, certain resolutions would emerge, achieving the broadest possible bipartisan consensus. In addition, empowering resolutions would be passed, authorizing a Standing Committee to proceed with a specified number of educational activities. Ideally, these would include:

a. an effort to bring about organic cooperation with college and university officials, and with state and local educational authorities, to include widespread corporate assistance to the growing number of teacher training institutes designed to equip secondary school teachers with the knowledge and skills required to teach courses about the Communist challenge to the Free World.

b. a long-range program designed to broaden the education of future corporate executives by insuring that adequate attention to world affairs and the issues of the Cold War become a basic part of the "curriculum of business success."

c. specific efforts to assist internal media of communications, such as "house organs," in presenting regular features dealing with foreign affairs and national security. Critical in this effort would be the availability of expert writers with an ability to present complex issues in an easy-to-read and interesting fashion (an example of such presentations would be The Reader's Digest).

d. laying the groundwork for an effective information program designed to demonstrate to the American public the role which private enterprise plays in promoting the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States. In this connection, high priority must be given to a continuing program of counterattack against Communist propaganda which depicts American enterprise abroad as neo-imperialistic and neo-colonialistic. For many years such Communist charges, which are almost exclusively without foundation, have stood unchallenged because only a small number of American companies operating abroad have actually attempted to refute them. Such a program of counterattack must demonstrate clearly that the presence of American enterprise abroad is a factor of stability, progress, and well-being in the economies of other countries. Specific attention must be given to intellectual and university groups in this country and abroad, for these are groups at which Communist propaganda is already aimed, and in which considerable gains have been recorded.

e. encouraging individual corporations to support genuinely informative radio and television programs designed to promote in a positive and stimulating manner the American way of life and the Communist challenge to it. In the author's opinion, the most effective example of the enormous possibilities offered by such programming was the "Up With People" program sponsored by the Schick Safety Razor Company in 1966. Aired at prime times in many cities throughout the country, and in some cases appearing more than once in the same city, this program attracted wide attention and great praise. The success of "Up With People" is in many respects a standard of achievement and excellence in the public interest which can and must be matched by other corporations.

f. give maximum encouragement for increased corporate financial support of existing quality efforts to provide effective Cold War education. Specific attention would be given to both academic and non-academic organizations which provide factual and informative studies dealing with Cold War issues. A more broadly based means of communication with colleges and universities should be supported, perhaps best achieved by a radical expansion in the circulation of short and well-written news-letters, such as the American Security Council Washington Report. Advertisements, offering the Washington Report and other worthy printed matter free of charge, should be taken out in campus magazines and newspapers, and time should be purchased from college radio stations. Consideration should be given to convening a meeting of college and university newspaper and magazine editors to seek more effective ways of communicating with students. In addition, corporations should be encouraged to review carefully the present pattern of their grants and donations, with a view to reducing or eliminating support for educational activities and institutions which excel only in their criticism of the American way of life, and which hold views which by objective standards are inimical to the security and strategic interests of the United States and the Free World.

g. call for the drafting of a basic textbook on free enterprise, to be released under the joint sponsorship of all cooperating corporations and businesses. Such a text would be written by leading economists such as Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago,* David McCord Wright of the University of Georgia, Gottfried Haberler of Harvard, G. Warren Nutter of the University of Virginia, Henry W. Briefs of Georgetown University, and others whom they may designate. Once a basic draft has been presented, it would then be completely rewritten by professional writers in order to reduce the language used to the "lowest common denominator." Once completed and published, the text should be made available at greatly reduced rates (or even free of charge, if possible) to high schools and colleges by means of direct letter to teachers and professors (utilizing existing directories which give specific information on such persons). It should then be translated initially into Spanish and French, and made available at a nominal charge to organizations and institutions abroad, as well as to the United States Information Agency for placement abroad (an example of the success of this technique are the "Student Editions" of classic works on economics and political science published by the Henry Regnery Company and offered at five cents or the equivalent).

h. in the realm of cooperation with government, substantial support should be generated for the establishment of meaningful guarantees for American investment abroad in order to reduce the risks to domestic capital. To this end, government must be motivated to protect with the appropriate means American foreign investments. At the same time, legislative proposals providing tax credits for private foreign aid should be submitted to the Congress. If such efforts were to be successful, the inefficiency of government-to-government aid could be put to a meaningful test.

This list of specific recommendations is by no means exhaustive; numerous other recommendations would be forthcoming from the National Business Council on the Cold War and from other organizations sympathetic to its purposes. But what has been proposed here could be a beginning, on a modest basis, of a vast effort of continuing support for constructive and sound proposals, all of which would have as their central purpose the winning of the Cold War.

Faced with a determined and united counterattack led by the crucial elements of United States strength and power comprised of the American business community, the Communist offensive could be halted and eventually reversed. Our greatest weapon in the Cold War—our economic genius and the power which it has created—has thus far been untried. Now is the time to call it into action on behalf of the cause of freedom and democracy. To hesitate could be a profoundly dangerous, perhaps fatal, mistake.

---

*All names for illustrative purposes only.

SYMPOSIUM IN CONNECTION WITH H.R. 2512, THE REVISION OF COPYRIGHT BILL

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will remember the lengthy debate and discussion on April 6 and 11 in connection with H.R. 2512, the revision of the copyright bill.

The Federal Bar Association in cooperation with the Bureau of National Affairs on June 1 and 2 conducted a symposium on the subject with experts in the field.

I had the honor of participating as the speaker at the luncheon session on Friday, June 2. I was introduced by Samuel W. Tannenbaum, the dean of the New York Copyright Bar, whose late law partner helped to draft the 1909 copyright law presently in existence.

There follows Mr. Tannenbaum's talk as well as the program of the briefing conference so that my colleagues will see that what they wrought cn April 11 is of great interest to a substantial segment of society:

INTRODUCTION BY SAMUEL W. TANNENBAUM, OF CONGRESSMAN THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN AT BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION IN COOPERATION WITH THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, INC., JUNE 2, 1967

You undoubtedly share with me the disappointment that we are, as yet, unable to celebrate the enactment of a new copyright law, despite the untiring efforts of Abraham L. Kamenstein, our Register of Copyrights, and the efficient members of his staff, many of whom are with us—George Cary, the Deputy Register, Barbara Ringer, the Assistant Register, Abraham A. Goldman, General Counsel, and many members of our copyright bar who have contributed so generously their time and energy.

In retrospect, have we been mindful of the Elizabethan bard's observation "What is past is prologue"?

It is trite that history repeats itself. Have we profited from the disappointing experiences which plagued Thorvald Solberg, the eminent Register of Copyrights and his loyal supporters, who contributed their expert knowledge and untiring efforts in directing the program which resulted in the passage of the 1909 Copyright Law?

Let us briefly refer to some of the events which preceded the enactment of the 1909 Copyright Act.

Twenty-five official prints of the proposed bill were presented to Congress, which remained dormant in the House Committee on Patents, Trademark and Copyright, of which Currier was chairman.

After prodding by President Theodore Roosevelt, himself a prolific author of works on history, biography, wild life and politics, and the President's threat to oppose Currier's reelection to Congress if he did not report the bill out of his committee, Chairman Currier in the short period prior to adjournment did have his committee report on the fused bill.

The dilatory practices of Currier irked the late Isidor Witmark, a member of the established music publishing firm, who complained "No sooner would they get out a copyright bill with some changes in it when along would come Currier with the same changes, plus a joker. Then they would have to get out another bill to take care of that bill, until there was no end of copyright bills floating around."

The leading trade paper the Publishers Weekly, of July 3, 1909 commented on the Copyright Bill:

"It was in some respects unfortunate that in his (Chairman Currier of the House Committee on Patents) desire to assure the passage of the bill without jeopardy, he carried compromise with insistent interests such as the pirates and the representatives of the Typographical Unions, almost to the point of surrender of private rights."

In the same vein, Register of Copyrights Solberg, in Copyright Law Reform, Yale Law Review, Nov. 1925 on page 65 stated:

"It is unquestionable because of this surrender in 1909 to the urgency of the special interests benefited by the compromises then made that now in 1925 Congress has to face again the same problems."

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes cautioned us:

"The life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience. . . .

"We must alternately consult history and existing theories of legislation."

Difficult as it may be, there comes a time when we lawyers of that most learned branch of the law, should exert every effort to effect reasonable compromises to produce a copyright bill upon which so much effort has already been expended.

When George Cary, The Deputy Register of Copyrights invited me to act as Toastmaster and to introduce Congressman Theodore Roosevelt Kupferman, I accepted the honor.

When Teddy's parents named him after the 26th President of the United States, they had the premonition that Teddy would emulate the noble qualities of that great President, who preached and practiced the "strenuous life."

Judging from the public press, Teddy has already given us some incidents of his strenuous life.

In the brief period allotted to me, I will endeavor to present, as succinctly as possible, some facets of his busy career.

I met Teddy, when he, as attorney for Warner Bros. Pictures, he appeared before me when I was an Arbitrator under the Federal Consent Decree which had jurisdiction of the practice of clearance of motion pictures at that time.

This is not a campaign speech in support of Teddy's reelection to Congress, even though we are fairly close to election. However, I can't resist referring to Teddy's strenuous career as a student, professor of law, and his activities in copyright and his public career.

Teddy was a Kent Scholar at the Columbia University Law School and Editor of the Columbia Law Review, Secretary to Presiding Justice David W. Peck of the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court, General Counsel of Cinerama, a member of the legal staff of the National Broadcasting Co., and President of the City Club, the oldest civic organization in New York City, and President of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut.

Through Teddy's efforts, under the sponsorship of the Federal Bar Association of N.Y., N.J. & Conn., the lectures on Copyright delivered by seven recognized authorities of the law of copyright, were published as "Seven Copyright Problems Analyzed", which contributions have been favorably cited by the U.S. Supreme Court, and are still being favorably cited in the Federal Courts and in law reviews and copyright treatises.

In the landmark copyright case of Ballentine v. DeSylva, the United States Supreme Court referred to Teddy as a "qualified commentator" in the law of copyright.

I believe that Teddy is the first Congressman who was an active practicing copyright lawyer, whose lectures and extensive articles have demonstrated his profound knowledge in the highly specialized field of copyright and in the law of the entertainment field.

As the Copyright bar now has a friend in Congress in Teddy, let us hope that through his efforts the new Copyright Law will have early passage and that we may soon experience the fulfillment of the hope of President Theodore Roosevelt, as expressed in his message to Congress in 1905 in commenting upon the inadequate proposed copyright acts, when he stated; "Attempts to improve them (i.e. our copyright laws) by amendment have been frequent; no less than twelve acts for the purpose having been passed since the Revised Statutes. To perfect them by further amendment seems impracticable, a complete revision of them is essential."

It gives me great pleasure to present the Hon. Theodore Roosevelt Kupferman—member of Congress.

BRIEFING CONFERENCE ON COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION

(Sponsored by the Federal Bar Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, in cooperation with the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.)

Conference LXXXIX On April 11, 1967, the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote, passed H.R. 2512, the first general revision of the copyright law in over half a century. The bill, which was the result of meticulous preparation over a prolonged period of years and thus is generally noncontroversial in nature, faces a careful scrutiny by the Senate with respect to several important issues.

It is the purpose of this conference to review briefly the bill in its entirety and to articulate the various aspects of the most controversial of the remaining few issues of educational television, community antenna television, and information systems by providing some of the outstanding experts from the field of government, industry, private practice and the academic world, to illuminate both sides of such issues. The availability of these spokesmen offers an unsurpassed opportunity for obtaining a first hand answer to pressing inquiries by registrants.

Copies of H.R. 2512 which is the pending business of the Senate, will be supplied to all registrants.

PROGRAM

Thursday, June 1, 1967

8:00 a.m. Registration.

8:45 a.m. Welcome.

Vincent A. Doyle, Attorney, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; for the Federal Bar Association.

Mollie E. Strum, Empire State Chapter; District Vice President, the Federal Bar Association.

9:00 a.m. Opening remarks.

George D. Cary, Chairman, Subcommittee on Copyrights, Committee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights, Federal Bar Association.

9:15 a.m. Brief summary of H.R. 2512.

Subject matter and scope of copyright; ownership, transfer and duration; notice, registration, infringement remedies; manufacturing requirements, and Copyright Office procedures.

Walter J. Derenberg, Moderator, Professor of Law, New York University; von Maltitz, Derenberg, Kunin & Janssen, New York, New York.

A. A. Goldman, General Counsel, U. S. Copyright Office, Washington, D. C.

Waldo H. Moore, Chief, Reference Division, U. S. Copyright Office, Washington, D. C.

Arthur Levine, Assistant Chief, Examining

Division, U. S. Copyright Office, Washington, D. C.

10:45 a.m. The revision bill and educational television.

John B. Farmakides, Moderator, Office of General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D. C.

Eugene Aleinikoff, General Counsel, National Educational Television, New York, New York.

August W. Steinhilber, Office of Legislation, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Lee Deighton, Chairman of the Board, The Macmillan Company, New York, New York.

Stuart Feldstein, Attorney, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

12:30 p. m. Luncheon.

John Schulman, Toastmaster, New York, New York.

William Jovanovich, Speaker, President, Harcourt, Brace & World Publishing Co., New York, New York.

2:15 p.m. The revision bill and community antenna television.

Morton D. Goldberg, Moderator, Ginsberg, Schwab & Goldberg, New York, New York.

Louis Nizer, Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin, Krim & Ballon, New York, New York.

E. Stratford Smith, Smith & Pepper, Washington, D. C.

Richard Jencks, Deputy General Counsel, Columbia Broadcasting System, New York, New York.

4:30 p.m. Pay-as-you-go-reception.

Friday, June 2, 1967

9:00 a.m. Information storage and retrieval. The impact of an exploding technology upon copyright principles.

Alan Latman, Moderator, Cowan, Liebowitz & Latman, New York, New York.

Dr. J. C. R. Licklider, Special Consultant to IBM; Visiting Professor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Julius Marke, Professor of Law and Law Librarian, New York University, New York, New York.

W. Brown Morton, McLean, Morton & Boustead, Washington, D.C.

Bella L. Linden, Linden & Deutsch, New York, New York.

William M. Passano, President, and Lyle Lodwick, Director of Marketing, the Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore, Maryland.

12:30 p.m. Luncheon.

Samuel W. Tannenbaum, Toastmaster, Johnson & Tannenbaum, New York, New York.

Hon. Theodore R. Kupferman, Speaker, Member of Congress, 17th District, New York.

2:15 p.m. Information storage and retrieval (Continued).

George Eltgroth, Information Systems Division, General Electric Company, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Andrew A. Aines, Acting Chairman, Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, Federal Council on Science and Technology, Washington, D.C.

Irwin Karp, Hays, St. John, Abramson & Heilbron, New York, New York.

Gerald J. Sophar, Executive Secretary, Committee to Investigate Copyright Problems, Inc., Washington, D.C.

WE MUST REDEDICATE TO STRESS AND SUPPORT THE CASE FOR BALTIC FREEDOM

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 27th sad anniversary of the massive deportations and executions of citizens of the Baltic States at the hands of the Soviet authorities. In June 1940, the army of the Soviet Union invaded the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The Soviets have since been bent on the systematic destruction of the national identity of the Baltic peoples. Tens of thousands of innocent and helpless citizens have been deported to live in exile in the remote areas of Siberia. And yet, throughout all this physical terrorization, the Baltic peoples have persistently retained their will to resist communism. The United States has never recognized the seizure and occupation of the Baltic States and has continuously restated this position.

In 1966, House Concurrent Resolution 416 was unanimously adopted by both the House and Senate. This resolution called on the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question for consideration before the United Nations, that these people might be freed from Soviet domination to shape their own destinies once again. The President has not followed this course.

There are many Americans in the United States who work diligently on behalf of their brothers in the Baltic States. We must continue to support these people in their unceasing efforts to free their homeland. At this time we must rededicate ourselves to this cause and continue to stress and support the case for Baltic freedom by urging the President to carry out House Concurrent Resolution 416.

Mr. Speaker, I so urge.

EQUAL BENEFITS FOR WOMEN UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend many of the provisions of the Social Security Act which now discriminate against wives and widows who work. My bill is similar to the legislation introduced earlier by our colleague, Hon. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Existing law requires that a retired working wife or widow draw social security benefits either as a wife—or widow—or as a worker—whichever is greater. In application, this provision of the law operates so that couples in which both husband and wife have worked can, and often do, draw lower social security benefits than couples with identical earnings in which only the husband has worked. The present law also functions so that a widow with two minor children who draws the highest amount of social security loses $1,296 in benefits if she works and earns the mean average wage for women in covered employment—$3,600. When this is added to the social security and income taxes she must pay, she is left with less than $2,000 a year before transportation costs, lunches, and clothes. In addition, current law denies the families of workingwomen many benefits which the families of men workers can now receive. This distinction exists even though the man and woman paid the same amount in social security taxes. My bill would correct these injustices. It provides:

First, that working couples be permitted to pool their social security credits and draw higher benefits on the basis of these combined credits, if they choose to do so.

Second, that widows with minor children who draw social security benefits be permitted to earn income without reducing their monthly benefits—a separate bill which I have introduced, H.R. 297, would permit unlimited earnings for all under social security.

Third, that the husbands, widowers, and children of workingwomen be entitled to the same benefits which the wives, widows, and children of men workers can now receive.

It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will give this matter early and favorable consideration.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN HUNGARIAN FEDERATION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today when Communist-inspired demonstrations want to denigrate our traditional American values of freedom and the defense of the victims of totalitarian aggression, and when a small minority of our students themselves believe the Communist and anarchist agitators, it is heartwarming to see the devotion of the national leadership of one of our ethnic groups to the principles of our Constitution and the American way of life and to the old-fashioned virtue of patriotism.

I am talking about the American Hungarian Federation which is now celebrating the 60th anniversary of its charter, which was registered in the State of Ohio.

In the past I had opportunity to work with some of the leaders of this organization, including its secretary for foreign relations, Prof. Z. Michael Szaz, of the Department of Political Science of Seton Hall University. Their devotion to the cause of freedom was always unequivocal, and often they appear as Casandras when they warn that without a solution of the problems of foreign occupation and totalitarian oppression by armed minorities who call themselves "governments," we will never know peace and the observ-

ance of human rights in Europe or, indeed, in the world. But history and even recent political events, show that their position, not extreme, but firm and well-reasoned on the basis of the aims and tactics of international communism, are more realistic than those of the eternal dupes who see a silver lining in any Communist action.

Recently the federation also made a statement for the hearings before the House Judiciary Committee on my bill and the bill of my colleague from New York [Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY] pointing out the seditious intent of the flagburners and supporting legislations as submitted by us. They are actively expressing their views of problems of American policy toward Hungary, but never forgetting that while their sympathies may lie with the oppressed Hungarians in Hungary and Rumania, they are representing the United States and its interests.

It is indeed with pleasure that I am joining my colleagues in commemorating this anniversary, and hope that the federation will continue to grow not only in numbers, but in effectiveness as far as their recommendations to the administration are concerned, for they are standing foursquare behind the true interests of our country and of the oppressed people in the world.

FAIRPLAY FOR OTEPKA

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a number of remarks and insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within the last 2 weeks by various Members of the House have called attention to the case of Otto Otepka, the chief of the Division of Evaluations of the State Department's Office of Security, whose case is now being tried behind closed doors at the State Department. Described were such underhanded and undiplomatic practices as wiretapping, ransacking of files, mutilation of documents, and testifying falsely before a congressional subcommittee on the part of employees of State in an effort to discredit Otepka. Recently, 10 of the 13 charges against Otepka were dropped, some of which charged him with the mutilation of documents, thereby violating a Federal statute. The mutilation charges were dropped, according to the Government Employees' Exchange, for fear that Otepka knew the names of the actual mutilators, would divulge their names at the hearing, and these persons, in turn, have indicated that they would give the names of "top" persons who had ordered the mutilation and planting of documents in Otepka's burn bag.

To complicate matters, the historic battle between the executive branch and Congress over "executive privilege" militates against Otepka. At times it has been like pulling teeth for Congress to get pertinent information from the various agencies of the executive branch, especially on matters which might prove embarrassing to the agency involved. Considering the above list of malpractices, one would hardly nominate the State Department for the Department-of-the-Year Award for honest and fair treatment of its employees.

The National Observer of June 12, 1967, carried an article by Gary G. Gerlach on the Otepka case. I insert this article, entitled "Man in the Middle," in the RECORD at this point.

THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON: MAN IN THE MIDDLE

(By Gary G. Gerlach)

Any schoolboy can tell you that the Federal Government consists of three independent branches, namely the judicial, the legislative, and the executive. Any of Uncle Sam's employes—and especially bureaucrat Otto F. Otepka—can tell you that the three branches harbor intense institutional jealousies. Mr. Otepka is a husky, 52-year-old career civil servant in the State Department, and he knows about the intense jealousy, because for the past 3½ years he has been a near-helpless pawn in a seemingly endless bureaucratic battle between Congress and the Administration.

Last week a little daylight finally appeared at the end of the long tunnel of the Otepka case. The State Department hearing on why Mr. Otepka was fired in 1963 finally began, behind closed doors. The only public development so far: State quietly dropped 10 charges, minor ones, of the 13 pending against Mr. Otepka.

For a decade prior to September 1963, Mr. Otepka was State's chief security evaluator. His job was to sift the backgrounds of hundreds of employes in search of breaches of loyalty. Then he was fired. Secretary of State Dean Rusk is charging him with conduct "unbecoming an officer" of State for having made classified documents available to the Senate's Internal Security subcommittee without his superior's authorization. Mr. Otepka was formally dismissed from his post Nov. 5, 1963.

Behind the firing is the historic squabble between Congress and the executive branch of Government over the doctrine of "executive privilege." From George Washington's day until now, the issue has never been resolved. The doctrine includes the concept that no Administration official shall give information about his department to any other agency or branch of Government—even Congress—without his superior's permission. And that, in a nutshell, is precisely what Mr. Otepka did.

Congress, on the other hand, jealously guards what it calls the basic right of the people's representatives to know what's going on in a democracy. And when the Senate subcommittee began to investigate communism in the Administration, Mr. Otepka readily supplied the committee with information on some highly placed Americans.

Some contend, in fact, that this is the real heart of the dispute: That Communist influences in Government marked Mr. Otepka for removal because he was a zealous patriot trying to do his duty by exposing Reds.

Anyway, the battle was on. Secretary Rusk, fired Mr. Otepka specifically for violating a 1948 executive-privilege directive by President Truman ordering that the files of the Government's loyalty programs be kept confidential. A howl went through Congress over the Otepka dismissal—a howl so loud that Foggy Bottom backed down a bit. Mr. Otepka was allowed to stay on at State pending a hearing. Still, he was stripped of all important duties. Today he remains in bureaucratic limbo at a make-work job in which he earns $20,400 a year clipping the Congressional Record in his State cubbyhole.

The brunt of Mr. Otepka's defense is there is a "higher loyalty" in Government service to the "highest moral principles, which rise above loyalty to persons, party, or Government departments."

Secretary Rusk counters that no one can run State effectively without sole control of security. Actions like those of Mr. Otepka, he says, cause "an erosion of confidence among people who work at adjoining desks." He paints a vivid word picture of frightened hordes of nameless bureaucrats going about even the most insignificant tasks in a cold sweat plotting to protect themselves and incriminate their associates.

Since 1963 hundreds of headlines, 20 volumes of congressional testimony, and thousands of taxpayers' dollars have failed to resolve the case. Even the current hearing isn't likely to resolve it; Secretary Rusk will make the final decision arising out of the hearing, but Mr. Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, says he may try to take the case into a Federal court on grounds he has yet to disclose.

All along, the quietly firm Mr. Otepka has continued to live at his Wheaton, Md., home in suburban Washington, holding his tedious make-work job and bowling in the State employees' league, where occasionally he meets Secretary Rusk on the alleys. For all his determination Mr. Otepka remains a mostly helpless victim of one of the republic's basic principles—the strict, jealously guarded division of powers among the Government's three branches.

PROUD OF TEENAGE SERVICEMEN

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have received two letters from teenage servicemen which make me proud to be an American.

These men, one from Wyoming and the other a Texan, already are serving overseas, but they want combat duty. They both wrote that they would extend their tours of duty if they could have combat assignments.

This is positive proof, Mr. Speaker, that not all young Americans condone the actions of the draft card burners and others who would have this country abandon our commitments.

The 19-year-old Wyoming man now is working as a mechanic. He wrote to me that he feels "that if I get into the infantry I might save a married man with children" from combat duty. The Texan indicated a similar sentiment. The Wyoming man said he does not want to "go home feeling that what I did on my tour over here did not help the United States to win the war."

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether these young men will be granted their requests, but I do know that their genuine desire to serve our country in a more significant way makes me very proud of both of them.

ANTIRIOT BILL

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would make it a Federal offense to travel in or use a facility of interstate commerce with the intent of inciting a riot or other violent civil disturbance.

This bill would make the instigation of riots a Federal crime punishable by a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment for a period up to 5 years, or both.

The recent violent civil disturbances in numerous locations throughout the Nation attest to the urgent need for this legislation.

Our law enforcement officials need a legal weapon such as this to more effectively cope with and deter those who would incite riots such as these. A government under law cannot afford to tolerate violence of this kind.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SOUND BLUEPRINT FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has provided a sound blueprint for peace in the Middle East in his speech this morning. I believe that if the nations of the Middle East would focus their attention on the five fundamental points outlined by the President, peace in the region would be assured.

The President rightly noted that peace rests on the recognized right of national life; on justice for Palestinian refugees; on the right of free maritime passage; on limiting the arms race; and on political independence and territorial integrity for all.

I commend the President for both his statesmanship and his deft analysis for easing the tensions and dangers of this troubled area of the world.

I hope that all of the member nations of the United Nations will endorse President Johnson's call for U.N. reports on all shipments of military arms to the Middle East area. This is a vitally important proposal—one that can help to provide necessary safeguards until political solutions can be found to reduce the hostile, explosive atmosphere in the area.

I believe that all Americans will stand firmly with the President on the policies he outlined this morning. For our people know that there must be a settlement of differences in the Middle East that is based on equity, humanitarianism, and mutual respect, if the world is to avoid future and even more dangerous confrontations in the region.

I insert into the RECORD President Johnson's remarks to the Foreign Policy Conference for Educators, at the State Department, today:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE FOR EDUCATORS—STATE DEPARTMENT

I welcome the chance to share with you this morning a few reflections on American foreign policy, as I have shared my thoughts in recent weeks with representatives of business and labor, and with other leaders of our free society.

During this past weekend at Camp David—where I met and talked with America's good friend, Prime Minister Holt of Australia, I thought of the General Assembly debate on the Middle East, that opens today in New York.

But I thought also of the events of the past year in other continents. I thought of the future—both in the Middle East, and in other areas of American interest and world concern.

This morning I want to give you my estimate of the prospects for peace, and the hopes for progress, in several regions of the world.

I shall speak first of our own hemisphere, then of Europe, the Soviet Union, Africa and Asia, and lastly of the two areas that concern us most at this hour—Vietnam and the Middle East.

Let me begin with the Americas.

Last April I met with my fellow American Presidents in Punta del Este. It was an encouraging experience for me, as I believe it was for the leaders of Latin America. For they made the historic decision to move toward the economic integration of Latin America.

In my judgment their decision is as important as any they have taken since they became independent more than a century and a half ago.

The men I met with know that the needs of their two hundred and twenty million people require them to modernize their economies and expand their trade. I promised that I would ask our people to cooperate in those efforts, and in giving new force to our great common enterprise—the Alliance for Progress.

One meeting of chiefs of state cannot transform a continent. But where leaders are willing to face their problems candidly, and where they are ready to join in meeting them responsibly, there can only be hope for the future.

The nations of the developed world—and I am speaking principally of the Atlantic Alliance and Japan—have in this past year made good progress in meeting their common problems and responsibilities.

I have met with a number of statesmen—Prime Minister Lester Pearson in Canada only a few days ago, and the leaders of Europe shortly before that. We discussed many of the great issues that we face together.

We are consulting to good effect on how to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

We have completed the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations, in a healthy spirit of partnership, and we are examining together the vital question of monetary reform.

We have reorganized the integrated NATO defense, with its headquarters in Belgium.

We have reached agreement on the crucial question of maintaining allied military strength in Germany.

Finally, we have worked together—although not yet with sufficient resources—to help the less developed countries deal with hunger and overpopulation.

We have not, by any means, settled all the issues that face us, either among ourselves or with other nations. But there is less cause to lament what has not been done, than to take heart from what has.

You know of my personal interest in improving relations between the Western world and the nations of Eastern Europe.

I believe the patient course we are pursuing toward those nations is vital to the security of our country.

Through cultural exchanges and civil air agreements; through consular and outer space treaties; through what we hope will soon become a treaty for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and also, if they will join us, an agreement on anti-ballistic missiles.

We have tried to enlarge, and have made great progress in enlarging, the arena of common action with the Soviet Union.

Our purpose is to narrow our differences where they can be narrowed, and thus to help to secure peace in the world for future generations. It will be a long slow task, with many setbacks and discouragements. But it is the only rational policy for them and for us.

In Africa, as in Asia, we have encouraged the nations of the region in their efforts to join in cooperative attacks on the problems each of them faces: economic stagnation, poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance. Under Secretary Katzenbach reported to me last week on his recent trip through Africa. He described the many problems and opportunities in that continent.

Africa is moving rapidly from the colonial past toward freedom and dignity. She is in the long and difficult travail of building nations. Her proud people are determined to make a new Africa, according to their own lights.

They are creating institutions for political and economic cooperation. They have set great tasks for themselves—whose accomplishment will require years of struggle and sacrifice.

We want that struggle to succeed, and we want to be responsive to the efforts they are making on their own behalf.

I can give personal testimony to the new spirit that is abroad throughout Asia. It is a spirit of confidence, born of growing security. Everywhere I travelled last Autumn—from the conference in Manila to five other countries of the region—I found the conviction that Asians can work with Asians to create better conditions of life in every country. fear has given way to hope in millions of hearts.

Asia's immense human problems remain, of course. Not all countries have moved ahead as rapidly as Thailand, Korea, and the Republic of China. But most of them are on a promising track, and Japan is taking a welcome role in helping her fellow Asians toward more rapid development.

A free Indonesia—the world's fifth largest nation, a land of more than one hundred million people—is struggling to rebuild, to reconstruct and reform its national life. This will require the understanding and support of the international community.

We maintain our dialogue with the authorities in Peking, in preparation for the day when they will be ready to live at peace with the rest of the world.

I regret that I cannot report any major progress toward peace in Vietnam

I can promise you that we have tried every possible way to bring about either discussions between the opposing sides, or a practical de-escalation of the violence itself.

Thus far there has been no serious response from the other side.

We are ready—and we have long been ready—to engage in a mutual de-escalation of the fighting. But we cannot stop only half the war, nor can we abandon our commitment to the people of South Vietnam. And so long as North Vietnam attempts to seize South Vietnam by force, we must, and we will, block its efforts—so that the people of South Vietnam can determine their future in peace.

We would like to see the day come—and soon—when we can cooperate with all the nations of the region, including North Viet-

nam, in healing the wounds of a war that has continued for too long. When the aggression ends, that day will follow.

Now, finally, let me turn to the Middle East—and to the tumultuous events of the past months.

Those events have proved the wisdom of five great principles of peace in the region.

The first and greatest principle is that every nation in the area has a fundamental right to live, and to have this right respected by its neighbors.

For the people of the Middle East, the path to hope does not lie in threats to end the life of any other nation. Such threats have become a burden to the peace not only of the region, but of the world.

In the same way, no nation would be true to the U.N. Charter, or to its own true interests, if it should permit military success to blind it to the fact that its neighbors have rights and interests of their own. Each nation must accept the right of others to life.

Second, this last month shows us another basic requirement for settlement. It is a human requirement: justice for the refugees.

A new conflict has brought new homelessness. The nations of the Middle East must at last address themselves to the plight of those who have been displaced by wars. In the past both sides have resisted the best efforts of outside mediators to restore the victims of conflict to their homes, or to find them other proper places to live and work. There will be no peace for any party in the Middle East unless this problem is attacked with new energy by all, and primarily by those immediately concerned.

A third lesson from this last month is that maritime rights must be respected. Our nation has long been committed to free maritime passage through international waterways, and we, along with other nations, were taking the necessary steps to implement this principle when hostilities exploded. If a single act of folly was more responsible for this explosion than any other, it was the arbitrary and dangerous announced decision that the Straits of Tiran would be closed. The right of innocent maritime passage must be preserved for all nations.

Fourth, this last conflict has demonstrated the danger of the Middle Eastern arms race of the last twelve years. Here the responsibility must rest not only on those in the area—but upon the larger states outside it. We believe that scarce resources are better used for technical and economic development. We have always opposed this arms race, and our own military shipments to the area have been severely limited.

Now the waste and futility of the arms race are apparent to all. And now there is another moment of choice. The United States, for its part, will use every resource of diplomacy, and every counsel of reason and prudence, to find a better course.

As a beginning, we propose that the United Nations should call upon its members to report all shipments of military arms to the area.

Fifth, the crisis underlines the critical importance of respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of all the states in the area. We reaffirmed that principle at the height of the crisis. We reaffirm it today, on behalf of all.

This principle can be effective in the Middle East only on the basis of peace between the parties. The nations of the region have had only fragile and violated truce lines for twenty years. What they now need are recognized boundaries and other arrangements that will give security against terror, destruction, and war. Further, there must be adequate recognition of the special interest of three great religions in the Holy Places of Jerusalem.

These five principles are not new, but they are fundamental. Taken together they point the way from uncertain armistice to durable peace. We believe there must be progress toward all of them if there is to be progress toward any.

There are some who have urged, as a single, simple solution, an immediate return to the situation as it was on June 4. As our distinguished Ambassador Goldberg has already said, this is not a prescription for peace, but for renewed hostilities.

Certainly troops must be withdrawn, but there must also be recognized rights of national life—progress in solving the refugee problem—freedom of innocent maritime passage—limitation of the arms race—and respect for political independence and territorial integrity.

But who will make this peace where all have failed for twenty years?

Clearly the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace. Sooner or later it is they who must make a settlement in the area. It is hard to see how it is possible for nations to live together in peace if they cannot learn to reason together.

But we must still ask, who can help them? Some say, it should be the U.N., and some call for the use of other parties. We have been first in our support of effective peacekeeping in the U.N., and we also recognize the values of mediation.

We are ready to see any method tried, and we believe that none should be excluded altogether. Perhaps all will be needed.

I appeal to all to adopt no rigid view on these matters. I offer assurance to all that the Government of the United States will do its part for peace in every forum, and at every level, and at every hour.

Yet there is no escape from this fact: the main responsibility for the peace of the region depends upon its own peoples and leaders. What will be truly decisive in the Middle East will be what is said and done by those who live there.

They can seek another arms race if they want. But they will seek it at a terrible cost to their own people—and to their long-neglected human needs. They can live on a diet of hate—though only at the cost of hatred in return. Or they can move toward peace with one another.

The world is watching, for the peace of the world is at stake. It will look for patience and justice—humility—and moral courage. It will look for signs of movement from prejudice and the emotional choas of conflict—to the gradual shaping of peace.

The Middle East is rich in history, in people, and in resources. It has no need to live in permanent civil war. It has the power to build its own life, as one of the prosperous regions of the world.

If the nations of the Middle East turn toward the works of peace, they can count with confidence upon the friendship, and the help, of the people of the United States.

In a climate of peace, we will do our full share to help with a solution for the refugees. We will do our share in support of regional cooperation. We will do our share, and more, to see that the peaceful promise of nuclear energy is applied to the critical problem of desalting water.

Our country is committed—and we reiterate that commitment today—to a peace based on five principles: first, the recognized right of national life; second, justice for the refugees; third, innocent maritime passage; fourth, limits on the wasteful and destructive arms race; and fifth, political independence and territorial integrity for all.

This is not a time for malice, but for magnanimity: not for propaganda, but for patience: not for vituperation, but for vision.

On the basis of peace, we offer our help to the people of the Middle East. That land, known to everyone of us since childhood as the birthplace of great religions and learning for all mankind, can flourish once again in our time. We shall do all in our power to help make it so.

THE PRESIDENT'S WISE WORDS FOR A MIDDLE EAST SOLUTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has strongly urged the nations of the Middle East to come together and work out a settlement of differences that is based on justice and mutual regard for political rights.

I think the American people will strongly support the President. And I fervently hope that the nations involved will realize the wisdom of the President's words.

The President made clear that the policy of the United States is based on the recognition of the rights of all Middle Eastern nations. He also made it clear that there should be no immediate return to the boundary lines that existed in the area on June 4. But he urged a return to reason and reality that can produce a political settlement that is fair to all.

I warmly support the President's call for limiting the arms race in the area. I congratulate him for his recognition of the plight of the refugees. The nations of the world must cooperate in both of these vital matters.

In articulating a five-point plan for peace, President Johnson came to grips with the difficult, stubborn, and complex problems that beset the nations of the Middle East.

We must hope that ways can be found to act on all of these five points—each of which is indispensable to a real and lasting peace.

I hope also that those participating in the United Nations General Assembly debate on the Middle East will heed the President's words that—

> This is not a time for malice, but for magnanimity; not for propaganda, but for patience; not for vituperation, but for vision.

If these words are heeded, then a real beginning to a Middle East settlement will be underway.

WISE WORDS FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has injected a healthy dose of wisdom and reason into the emotional, hate-filled atmosphere surrounding the problems of the Middle East.

The President's speech, in direct contrast to Premier Kosygin's, proposes just and honorable principles upon which a

lasting peace can be achieved in this troubled area of the world.

I strongly support the President's plea for an end to an arms race in the Middle East. I hope that the members of the United Nations will quickly endorse the President's proposal for U.N. reports on all arms shipments into the area.

Most important, I believe that the American people stand solidly with the President's five points necessary to achieve a just settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

But, as the President rightly noted, any progress in the search for peace in the Middle East must come about through direct negotiations between the nations involved. This point is at the heart of any true and meaningful settlement of differences.

I endorse the President's enunciation of American policy in the Middle East. It is a policy that would lead to a new era of understanding and progress for all nations concerned.

We can only hope that the nations involved will heed the wisdom of the President's words.

CRISIS IN OUR MERCHANT MARINE FLEET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the United States begin to immediately assert itself in the commercial development of the international waters of the world on a scale that will restore this country to its traditional first-rank maritime importance. It is time we dramatize the declining position of the U.S. maritime industry and the U.S. fishing industry in relation to that of other nations, that we call attention to our embarrassing lack of an aggressive, comprehensive national policy on the oceans, and emphasize the neglect of the ocean potential in general and the fisheries and living resources of the oceans and our merchant marine in particular at the highest levels of Government. The Nation's oldest industries concerning the merchant marine and fisheries are in their hour of crisis.

Last Tuesday, this House passed a measure designed to give a small boost to our sorely depressed shipbuilding industry. An amendment to the Department of Defense appropriation bill which provides that seven of our 16 new minesweepers will be built in this country serves to accentuate a grave problem that this Nation is long overdue in solving. I speak, of the Nation's decline to disaster levels in its fishery and merchant marine areas.

As you are all aware, there has recently been proposed a new maritime program by the new Secretary of Transportation. While the Secretary insists that this is in reality not an official administration program, it nevertheless is represented as the thinking of the Secretary and his staff on the maritime problems which now face the Nation. There are many facets of this program which need to be explained more fully before they can hope to obtain industrywide support.

There is one portion of the program that seems to me to be particularly shortsighted. This is the recommendation to upgrade and to pour huge sums of money into the reconstruction of hundreds of national defense reserve vessels. As you know we have broken out 172 of these ships for the present Vietnam conflict at astronomical costs. Each one of these vessels has cost the Government an average of $550,000 to be fitted back into service. After they have been placed into service many of them have been plagued with mechanical failures which have resulted in the loss of valuable sailing days.

The average age of our reserve fleet vessels is around 23 years. How much longer can these obsolete rust buckets be used for defense purposes without damaging our military efforts? Vessels from the reserve fleet have been used on several occasions. They were used during the Korean conflict and in the Suez incident. However, at the beginning of the Korean conflict in 1950 the average age of the vessels was only 7 years and during the Suez crisis only 10 years. In 1950 only 5 to 7 days were required to reactivate a vessel and the cost was approximately $156,000. Today, reactivation of one national defense reserve fleet vessels costs about three times as much and requires 40 days, or eight times longer to reactivate. Thus, the use of vessels in the reserve fleet for future military and commercial emergencies is becoming less and less feasible from a cost and time standpoint.

It seems the need for new construction was made painfully clear by the recent testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Paul Ignatius, before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee in April. While not pleading the case for new construction, Mr. Ignatius presented testimony which can only bear evidence to the precarious position we would find ourselves in should another conflict develop at the same time as we are fighting in Vietnam. The very recent Near East war would have made our inadequacy painfully clear had the United States been compelled to provide any substantial maritime shipping capacity. Secretary Ignatius indicated that around 35 percent of our total potential carrying capacity was being utilized in the Vietnam conflict. This 35 percent includes 100 percent of the MSTS nucleus fleet and 40 percent of our privately owned fleet. How then can we hope to have enough shipping capacity to meet another crisis without completely abdicating our commercial trades posture or placing ourselves in the precarious position of depending upon foreign-flag vessels to meet our military needs. Indeed, it would appear to me that we have reached the breaking point, and if more new vessels are not constructed we will be faced with the dilemma of giving up our valuable commercial carriage or relying on foreign-flag interests. I might add that these interests have on several occasions declined to carry our military cargoes to Vietnam.

We have been told that the desire to pour millions of dollars into the upgrading of the reserve fleet is a Defense Department decision—the same Defense Department that seeks to build fast deployment logistic ships as a panacea to our shipbuilding problems. I do not believe that the vast appropriation of money should be made toward supporting an obsolete and antiquated reserve fleet without careful examination of our defense needs, and a full discussion of the merits of reserve fleet conversion as opposed to new construction. If the Defense Department is convinced that their proposal is in the best interests of the country, then they should not hesitate in making avaliable to us the cost-effectiveness studies which have gone into the making of this decision.

A low-level domestic ship construction program, coupled with building abroad, is loaded with danger. It poses the threat of an ever-increasing flight of American capital abroad, adversely affecting our balance of payments. It could leave our own shipbuilding industry with a limited number of vessels to build and hold forth no hope whatsoever of reducing unit cost through multiple production. Yet, this same opportunity denied to our own industry would be offered to foreign yards so as to possibly widen—not close—the price gap between domestic and foreign construction. The ultimate effect could be further pressure to increase our ship construction-differential subsidy rate. We already are encountering congressional opposition to further extension of the present temporary ceiling of 55 percent. An increase above 55 percent might be wholly unacceptable and could jeopardize the entire subsidy program.

A very basic issue is being swept under the rug by improvising such a program—whether or not it is essential for us to maintain in a state of readiness the facilities and the skilled labor to build merchant ships in this country. If it is essential, as I believe it to be, then to propose the construction of only 15 ships a year, or even 30, coupled with the modernization of some old "crocks," is to mock and to insult the intelligence of both the industry and the Congress.

Before we embark upon any decisions involving our national defense reserve fleet, I hope that we will take a long hard look at the total effect this will have on our merchant marine and upon our defense capabilities. The prime area of concentration today must be upon the redevelopment of a strong, privately owned merchant marine. Only when this is accomplished will we be able to have a vital nucleus upon which to base our future commercial and defense needs.

And the problems do not only lie with our merchant marine program but also with our commercial fishing fleet.

While the exploitation of the world's ocean resources is being aggressively pursued by other nations, the Johnson administration either does not understand what is happening or ignores the situation as unimportant.

It is my belief that it will be necessary for the United States to make a heavy Government commitment if this country is to attain a standing of first-rank im-

portance in international ocean development, and this commitment should be in the form of a partnership with industry, as is done in Japan. Japanese fishing operations are not Government owned, but the Government works very closely with the fishing industry, backing it up with education, research, and diplomatic efforts on a far greater scale than ours. As a result, the Japanese take almost a fifth of all the marine food landed in the world. The United States must encourage private investment in the utilization of the food resources of the sea.

The United States emerged from World War II with a large and relatively efficient fishing fleet, but now it has fallen into obsolescence, and nothing has been done to keep the American fishing fleet modern, efficient, and competitive. The average age of the documented fleet exceeds 20 years, and many of the vessels in the commercial fishing fleet exceed 50 years of age. We must candidly admit that there exists an overall obsolescence of the U.S. commercial fishing fleet, then decide immediately what must be done about it, and, thereafter implement a workable plan for modernization.

The 1965 world catch of seafoods of all kinds was 115 billion pounds. If per capita consumption remains the same as in 1965, more than 215 billion pounds will be required by the turn of the century. The current rate of increase in consumption, however, is almost double the rate of world population growth. With better preservation of flavor and more attractive processing, it is likely that the per capita consumption of fish products will increase so that by the year 2000, the total could approach 350 billion pounds—three times what it is today. It should be our stated national objective to achieve a greater percentage of this increasing world catch. To do so we obviously must reverse our present trend; that is, we must increase our production and increase the U.S. share of the world fishery catch.

The United States—by far the world's largest market for fish and seafood products—has slipped in the last 10 years from second to fifth place among world fishing nations in production, falling behind Red China, the U.S.S.R., and Peru. The United States also remains behind Japan, whose production is up 40 percent during the past 10 years, while that of the United States is down about 10 percent. The U.S. share of the world fishery catch had dropped from 12.4 percent in 1948 to 5.2 in 1965. While U.S. demand increased from 6 billion pounds in 1949 to 12 billion pounds in 1965. The fact is that this country's relative position has worsened as other nations have continued to accelerate their drive for exploitation of the world's ocean resources.

These nations, Russia, Japan, Red China, Peru, and many others have mounted a massive ocean offensive since World War II, while the fishing industry in the United States continues to decline. They great paradox is that despite unused fisheries resources in our own waters, we do not catch the fish we eat in this country, and today over 63 percent of the American fisheries seafood market is being met by imports. Ten years ago, we imported one-third of our consumption, now we import two-thirds. We are now spending about $600 million a year for fishery product imports, a substantial part of our dollar drain.

A realistic appraisal of the international fisheries situation and the United States in relation to it leads to the inescapable conclusion that our miscellaneous, uncoordinated aid programs will not move us ahead fast enough to significantly improve our position vis-a-vis the leading fishery nations. They are already far ahead, and they are continuing to accelerate their efforts at a much greater rate than we are, and they are consequently expanding their lead. If we really wish to expand the scope of our fleet rebuilding and other activities, we had best wake up and get on with the job.

A recent survey of 14,000 documented U.S. fishing boats reflected the following startling and very disturbing facts: 38 percent have electric plants, 62 percent have not; 16 percent have hydraulic winches, 84 percent have not; 5 percent have hydraulic steering, 95 percent have not; 8 percent have refrigeration, 92 percent have not; 31 percent have automatic pilots, 69 percent have not; 52 percent have radio telephones, 48 percent have not; 23 percent have direction finders, 77 percent have not; −1 percent have salt water evaporators, +99 percent have not; and 16 percent have not had their engines overhauled in the last 8 years.

The new Federal fishing vessel differential subsidy legislation was a commendable step in the right direction, but got off to a slow start because of the complications of getting actual determination of a foreign cost for building the same kind of vessel. Accordingly, it has been recommended that the fishing vessel subsidy program should be modified to allow a fixed subsidy of 50 percent of the cost of the vessel, rather than the present practice of attempting to determine foreign costs on each individual vessel. We need a workable, speedy, efficient procedure. The subsidy program, inadequate in the first place to accommodate fleet modernization rapidly enough to catch up with the other nations, is at least a beginning. But the budget cut by the administration in this area dealt it a heavy blow. An entirely new program should be established to rebuild our commerical fishing fleet, incorporating the vessel subsidy program. The magazine the Fish Boat, has suggested a three-part fleet replacement program well worthy of mention:

1. Vessel trade-in allowances.—Under which the Government would take over existing documented vessels as trade-ins on new vessels, and would dispose of the old vessels taken in trade either by selling them to operators in other countries or by including them in our aid programs to these countries—instead of cash for building new vessels. This procedure would assure the removal of obsolete vessels from the U.S. fisheries, and benefit the commercial fishermen who need the assistance.

2. Construction differential subsidies.—Incorporating a fixed subsidy of 50% of the vessel cost.

3. Low-interest Government loans.—On the balance of the cost of the vessels to be built, to be repaid by the operators on the basis of a percentage of the value of their catches. Under this proposal, processors would agree to withhold and remit to the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries the correct percentage of the value of the fisherman's catches in payment on his loan, in return for which the processors would be getting the increased production of up-to-date vessels.

The subsidy program would have to have adequate safeguards for preventing inflated prices for the American manufacture of the commercial fishing vessels. Cost-plus-percentage-of-costs contracts should be outlawed, and incentive benefits for reducing contract costs or substantially reducing production time should be inaugurated to enhance the reasonable cost and speedy production of the vessels.

In order to rebuild the documented fleet in 15 or 20 years, the program would have to allow for construction of 300 to 500 vessels per year. The total cost of a comprehensive fleet replacement program would amount to about $60 million per year.

With further regard to our status and responsibility in the field of commercial fisheries, it is my view that we are now compelled to peer seriously into the future and contemplate the development of international fisheries regulations as a necessity for resource preservation. Intensive exploitation of certain high seas resources without regard for future productivity is endangering their existence. To cope with this situation, a body of world fishing regulations must be formulated. Sooner or later, man must come to grips with the problem posed by the common-properties nature of high seas resources. At present any nation is free to exploit these resources as it chooses without regard to future productivity, except to the extent the nation is limited by participation in international agreements. Seventy percent of the ocean's surface belongs to everybody—or to nobody, whichever way you wish to view it. This means that no individual nation, except by force of arms, can exercise control over the exploitation of high seas resources. It is only possible to do this through international institutions. Sooner or later all of the owners of the oceans—everybody—must take a long hard look at the entire fabric of international law as it applies to exploitation of marine resources, and then get together to set up regulations on national management and sustained-yield utilization of high seas resources. This is a matter of immediate and pressing concern to the U.S. fishing industry, which should be recognized by officials here in Washington but apparently is not. The U.S. Government right now should be working on its posture with regard to high seas resources. And, obviously before the complex problems arising from international resources exploitation can be faced and before we can propose and support catch limit regulations for any given species of marine life this Nation must develop its own clearly stated, candidly proposed, unified concept or posture.

Those of us concerned must provide the energetic, imaginative, aggressive leadership so desperately needed in so many areas, and especially in the mari-

time area and that of commercial fishing. We can no longer tolerate the continuing decline of the U.S. maritime and fishing industries among the world's great nations, nor longer accept the complacence and indifference of the Johnson administration to the peril which confronts our maritime and fishing industries in their hour of crisis.

I have touched, then, on some of the problems of our merchant marine and fishing industries. If we are to ever again have a fleet worthy to fly the U.S. flag, we must begin now a crash building program to insure our needs for the future. We must encourage a technological updating of our shipyards, including the introduction of graving, or drydock-type shipyards. These extremely efficient yards are a primary cause of our inability to compete with European shipbuilders.

We must give Government encouragement to the building of new fishing vessels and make the existing ones available to the underprivileged nations, while subsidizing the construction of modern vessels for our own commercial fleets.

But these solutions do not go to the heart of our problem. The fact is, by any means of comparison, our merchant marine and fisheries situations are bad, and getting steadily worse. Nothing short of a full-fledged overhaul of our whole maritime and fisheries program is in order.

Perhaps an imaginative, aggressive approach would be to establish an entirely new Cabinet-level department: a Department of Maritime and Marine Resources. This Department would include all of the farflung agencies and departments, now in existence, such as the Maritime Administration, Federal Maritime Commission, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Merchant Marine Academy, State maritime academies, the Panama Canal, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Water Resources Council, Great Lakes Pilotage Administration, Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, International Pacific Halibut Commission, International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico—Office of Merchant Marine Safety, National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board, the 20-odd agencies working on oceanography, and many others.

Today there is no overall national ocean policy, no definitive national program, no entity capable of implementing such a policy or program, and no national budget for ocean development, particularly pertaining to utilization of the living resources of the sea. There is no comprehensive plan to revitalize the U.S. maritime industry or the U.S. fishing industry, no significant drive to increase fishing exports, no real Government fishing industry understanding or partnership. There is an immediate and vital need for one unified national policy for ocean and fishery development and for the merchant marine. Today in the U.S. Goverment there are some 22 separate agencies engaged in various ocean activities, and each of them must be separately funded. Under the present intense competition for the budget dollar, this situation cannot but hinder our ocean development programs. Thus far I am afraid we must candidly admit that the administration and the Congress have been somewhat indifferent to the present piecemeal, uncoordinated approach.

The effect of such a department would be obvious.

First, all our interests with the sea would be brought together, and coordinated. Currently, these agencies are strewn throughout the Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, Department of Defense, Department of the Treasury, and a host or independent agencies. Many hours and millions of dollars are spent duplicating research and programs. Goals are defined by different department heads, and thus conflict with each other. For instance, much criticism has been voiced recently about Robert McNamara's apparent decision that the merchant marine exists solely for the Department of Defense. The waste in dollars and manpower is enormous.

Second, creating a Cabinet-level Department would insure that our past mistakes in an ailing area will receive top-level attention. Also, hopefully, with the administration more directly concerned at the Cabinet level, we will avoid neglect of our maritime interests in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if we had had such a department 20 years ago we would not be in the trouble we are in today. This kind of department would insure that we are not in the same trouble 20 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, our country needs a new, technologically updated shipbuilding industry capable of greatly increased production.

It needs a program that will get our fishing industry started again. It needs a Cabinet-level department to solve these needs.

Our country needs it now.

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

Mr. POLLOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding so that I may discuss the plight of the American fisheries and the maritime industry. It is a pleasure, of course, for me to serve on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with the gentleman, where we are working diligently to correct the situation in which we find the country today. Administration indecision, however, has left the United States 13th in the merchant marine fleet status of the world, and 14th in shipbuilding. This is a situation we had better correct or face serious consequences of an utter inability to compete, among others, with the Soviet Union, for the merchant marine transportation of world goods. In Vietnam, 80 percent of the war needs are delivered by the merchant marine. However, today, the United States has fewer privately owned merchant ships than in 1936, and 70 percent of our ships are 20 years old or older, and will be due for layup within the next 5 years. Mr. Speaker, this is a national disgrace, and I would like to see the fulfillment of the President's promise of more than 2 years ago, when in the state of the Union message he called for "a new policy for our merchant marine." Mr. Speaker, I have not heard his recommendation for that policy, and the 2 ensuing years have produced nothing but indecision with a devastating result.

As for the American fishermen, like the members of our merchant marine, they suffer because of unwise policies of the Government. Foreign fishing industries have been built up by U.S. foreign aid. Foreign fishing fleets deplete our fishing resources. Foreign nations illegally seize our American fishing vessels on the high seas. Meanwhile, foreign imports produced by low-wage labor are allowed to flood the American market with little or no protection for American products.

I hope in the future to join with the gentleman from Alaska to get needed new policies to correct this situation.

Meanwhile, I believe it is fortunate that the State of Alaska has a Representative in Congress who recognizes what water transportation, shipbuilding, and fisheries mean to the economy of his State and who speaks out so forthrightly on the subject as the gentleman has tonight.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POLLOCK. I thank the gentleman from the State of Washington. He has been a distinguished member of the committee.

I should like at this point to say that while I am sure there are Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle in support of the position I have taken today, candidly I must state that the present administration does not seem to be very friendly to the merchant marine or to the commercial fishing industry.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLLOCK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Alaska shows remarkable insight into a very difficult problem, in the short time he has been here. I want to commend the gentleman for getting into the subject, for understanding the subject, and for coming here today and clearly expressing to us the real problem which confronts this Nation so far as the merchant marine and fisheries industries are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a problem when we start comparing our situation in the merchant marine and fisheries industries with that of Russia, for example, a Communist or socialist country where the state owns and constructs the vessels.

I am sure the gentleman in the well agrees with me when I say I still have great faith in the old American ingenuity, in the free enterprise system. I am convinced that our free enterprise system can, if we will but put our minds to it, find the answers to these problems without having to follow in the footsteps

of our Socialist friends across the sea in solving the problems.

Mr. POLLOCK. I believe the problem in the area of the merchant marine is that we are not talking about small investments but are talking about rather massive investments.

This is an area where I believe the U.S. Government can effectively work in partnership with private industry, such as we see in Japan. The Government there does not own the industry in Japan, but it does provide research facilities and does provide excellent financing. It has incentives for those people in private industry. Together they have a very workable partnership.

I believe our Government thus far has not been sufficiently interested to make this a very satisfactory arrangement so far as industry is concerned.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The gentleman is correct. The big problem is, I believe, that our maritime industry desperately needs a sense of direction. We have been floundering around in the maritime field because there has been no national policy to give us a direction.

As the gentleman from Washington stated a moment ago, we were promised, some 2 years ago or a year and a half ago, that we would receive such a policy or such a direction from the administration, and it has not been forthcoming. We find ourselves today with the Maritime Administration in the Commerce Department, but all the so-called policy and main decisions are being made in the Department of Transportation by the Secretary of Transportation. Obviously this is because the administration wants the Maritime Administration in that Department.

I hope we will find the Maritime Administration eventually an independent agency, where it can do the job that needs to be done.

The gentleman has done a real service to the House, I think, and to the Nation. He serves his State well, and I think he is serving the Nation well in bringing this present problem to the floor here today. I want to commend him for it.

Mr. POLLOCK. I thank the distinguished and very capable gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from the State of Washington. I enjoyed having them participate in this colloquy on the floor today. I think it is time that this information should be brought forth so that all of the Congress and indeed all of America might take a new and fresh look at the problem we have and perhaps consider the possibility of this new approach.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, because I am a Rhode Islander and because the State which I represent has a heritage which has been strongly shaped by the sea, I have a deep and abiding interest in effecting a resurgence of the U.S. merchant marine.

The complex economy of this country demands that the markets and resources of the world be tied to us in a mutually beneficial world trade program. A main link in the chain of this international commercial interdependence is the U.S. merchant marine, and we have allowed this vital link to atrophy.

Since the termination of World War II the United States has fallen from first to fifth in the ranks of the world maritime nations. Our flag fleet has shrunk from 5,500 ships to 900 privately owned active vessels and a similar number of mothballed ships. More alarming still is the fact that 80 percent of these ships are 20 or more years old. The sad truth is that although the United States is the world's leading trading nation, 92 percent of our exports and imports are now carried in foreign bottoms. This fact is indicative of the alarming decline in our merchant marine.

The situation in shipbuilding is no brighter. America has dropped to 14th among the world shipbuilding nations. Guaranteed contracts with inadequate volume have acutely discouraged the modernization of shipbuilding facilities. The consequent lack of capital investment has meant that the necessary living wage paid to shipyard employees has not been compensated for by increased productivity. The lack of profitability and the clouded future of the industry makes it difficult if not impossible for shipbuilders who wish to modernize and automate to obtain the necessary financial support. Each year American shipyards produce fewer ships.

In fiscal 1966, the United States will have built only 13 new deep-sea vessels. This figure is especially disturbing in view of the already mentioned obsolescence of the bulk of our flag fleet.

A combination of obsolete vessels and antiquated cargo handling methods results in American ships spending more time in port loading and disgorging cargo than they spend at sea in transport.

The precarious situation of our merchant marine has been revealed clearly by our Vietnam involvement. Despite a massive increase in air transport, two-thirds of our men and well in excess of 90 percent of our equipment goes to Vietnam by sea. This pipeline to Southeast Asia has forced the most powerful nation in the world to rely on 160 obsolete and breakdown-prone ships demothballed for this emergency. Underscoring the sick state of our merchant marine after 20 years of neglect is the fact that the pool of experienced American merchant seamen has sunk to such an extent that some ships waited weeks after being demothballed before crews could be found to man them, and many were even then forced to sail undermanned. The Vietnam conflict has lain to rest the argument that American-owned ships which are operated under foreign flags are subject to effective American control.

Foreign neutrality laws have prohibited the use of some of these ships to supply our forces in Vietnam. Alien and unreliable crews, often members of foreign-dominated foreign unions, have refused to handle supplies bound to Vietnam. Shockingly enough, there is evidence to suggest that some American-owned foreign-flag ships have actually been used in such a manner as to release Soviet shipping for use in supplying North Vietnam.

While we have closed our eyes to the plight of our merchant marine, the Soviet Union has bent every effort to gain supremacy of the high seas.

The modern Soviet fishing fleet with which we New Englanders have become so familiar is only one aspect of this Soviet drive for maritime supremacy.

While our seagoing flag fleet flounders, Russia is in the process of adding 464 new modern vessels to her seagoing merchant marine. While we abandon sea routes to underdeveloped and emerging nations with their treasure troves of natural resources, the Soviet Union is opening such routes. The warning is plain that if present conditions continue, Russia will dominate the world's sealanes within the coming decade.

Clearly, the time grows late for the American merchant marine; yet hope still remains. America possesses the technology to build modern competitive shipyards and automated vessels, but do we possess the desire?

Maritime unions have had the courage and foresight to encourage modernization and expansion of our fleet, but will we support them? I believe we must; and I offer the following proposals to achieve this end:

First. The "total package contract awards" so successful in our aerospace program should be utilized for naval purchasing. Some promising steps in this area have already been taken by the Navy, and we should support and encourage these steps wherever feasible.

Second. We should explore the possibility of requiring the Maritime Administration to grant a single shipbuilding contract for ships of one design to provide a longer production run and an incentive to automation.

Third. We should encourage Government support in the forms of tax relief, low interest loans, and investment tax credits to shipbuilders and operators seeking to update their facilities.

Fourth. We should work toward the gradual elimination of the existing prohibition against the entrance of foreign-built ships into the American-flag fleet to force our shipbuilders to become competitive.

Fifth. We should investigate the entire subsidy system now used by the Maritime Administration, and suggest changes in this system which will encourage the purchase of modern ships, reward efficiency, and provide American seamen with an acceptable standard of living without penalizing ship operators.

I believe a successful future is possible for the American merchant marine if we have the courage to face its current problems realistically and the willingness and intelligence to devise correct solutions. I am convinced that Rhode Island with our most valuable natural resource, Narragansett Bay, our experienced and willing work force, our close ties to the U.S. Navy and our historic

maritime tradition, can profit greatly from a revitalized merchant marine industry, and what is of greater importance, the economy and the security of our Nation will be enhanced and strengthened by the restoration of the U.S. merchant marine to its once powerful and honored position.

CONFERENCE OF FRIENDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, in 1665—more than a century prior to the founding of this Republic—the first family of Friends arrived in the Carolinas.

Although the early colonists migrated to the Carolinas to seek religious as well as economic freedom in the New World, and although the proprietors and their official representatives in the colony reflected the traditional views of the established Church of England, Quakerism was the first organized religion in the Carolinas.

Quakerism flourished in those early years of this emerging new land and in 1698 was begun the North Carolina yearly meeting of Friends, which has continued to this day.

Next month, more than 1,300 Quakers from 36 countries all over the world will assemble in North Carolina for the Fourth World Conference of Friends. It pleases me that my home community of Greensboro and my neighboring and contiguous community of Guilford College will be host to this international meeting of Friends.

So, from July 24 to August 3, the eyes and ears of world Quakerdom will be on the community which I am proud to represent here in the Congress. And, it pleases me to bring this fact to the attention of the Congress.

It is also noteworthy that the international conclave of Friends will have an ecumenical aspect, for observers from many other religious faiths will participate as delegates to the Friends World Conference. Long noted for their attention to their religious concepts and devotion to peace and brotherhood, the Friends have adopted for their conference theme: "Seek, Find, Share: The Time Is This Present"—a call for individual appraisal and assessment of duty to God and to fellow men.

In the upcoming world conference, which I understand is the first international religious meeting to be held in the State of North Carolina, it is interesting to note that the delegates from throughout the world will be given an opportunity to personally observe family life here in the United States. For, during the weekend of July 29–30, the international delegates will spend the weekend visiting in the homes of Friends across the length and breadth of North Carolina, in a true Friend-to-Friend program of fellowship.

In keeping with their devotion to world peace, the highlight of the conference will come in an interfaith meeting to be attended by a gathering of 8,500 persons the night of July 30. Mr. U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, will be the visiting speaker for that occasion.

As all of you are aware, an undertaking of the magnitude of the forthcoming World Conference of Friends is a difficult one. Although many Friends and friends of Friends have been working diligently now for a period of a year in preparing for this international gathering, I want to personally commend a friend of mine for his dedicated and untiring efforts. He is J. Floyd Moore, a young energetic professor of Biblical literature and religion at Guilford College, one of our finest institutions of higher learning and the scene of most of the program for the week-long conference.

As Dr. Moore and his associates continue to prepare for the ingathering of Friends from throughout the world, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the thought contained in a publication Dr. Moore prepared recently in connection with the upcoming event.

Dr. Moore pointed out that the Friends had encountered difficulties in the past 300 years in this country, then added:

> As a part of the world community, confronted with problems in new and more complicated dimensions, the difficulties ahead will not be less. It is not a time to retire and relax. It is a time to read again the Good News that God loves the world, that He has sent His Son into the world to make that love incarnate. This is still our greatest hope, to make that love incarnate.

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] for bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that my great, great grandfather, Henry Bray, married my great, great grandmother at the New Garden Friends monthly meeting at the Guilford, N.C., courthouse in 1778. They were among the ancestors of many Friends who now reside in Indiana, who led them in the very early 1800's—back in 1804—into northern Indiana.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, my great grandfather belonged to the Deep River monthly meeting of North Carolina, but who came over into Indiana.

My great grandfather, John H. Bray, was the first trustee of the New River Quaker trans-monthly meeting in Washington County, Ind. He was the first trustee of the White Lick monthly meeting to which I still belong. He was the first trustee of the church which was founded in 1823 that is now located in Mooresville, Ind. In fact there are many Friends living in Indiana; in fact, I believe there are more living in the State of Indiana than in any State in the Union with the possible exception of the State of North Carolina, and in the home State of Quakerism, the State of Pennsylvania. But I am proud, and very proud, of the record that they have made in fine citizenship and in projecting the spirit of freedom and dignity of man living in peace and yet with a great loyalty to their government and to their respective parishes.

Mr. Speaker, it is very fine indeed that my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], has brought this matter before this body, because it means a great deal to America due to the heritage that these pioneers have left to those of us who are their descendants and who are still lending their best efforts toward the betterment of the society of our country.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana very much for his splendid contribution on this occasion. I am certainly pleased to know that his ancestors came from the area which I have the honor to represent. In fact, the New Garden Friends meeting is just about 3 miles from my home. The Deep River Friends meeting is perhaps 10 miles from my home and is between the cities of Greensboro and High Point, N.C.

I am very appreciative of the fact that the gentleman from Indiana has placed in the RECORD these historical facts with reference to his family, because I believe the Fourth World Conference of Friends will indeed be a historic occasion, and I welcome his contribution to the discussion.

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

Mr. KORNEGAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is by the merest coincidence that I am in the Chamber at this moment during this special order. I was not aware of the special order which the gentleman from North Carolina has previously obtained. But, after listening to the remarks of my colleagues, I feel it is well and proper to point out the fact that I represent the district to which William Penn came when he came to this country, and that his home of Pennsburg is located in Bucks County, Pa., which it is my honor to represent.

While Quakerism may not flourish as extensively in Pennsylvania as once it did in my county, there are meetings in virtually every town and village, and it is and has been a strong source of religious strength and moral strength in our area.

I commend the gentleman for taking this time to bring this to our attention.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman very much, and I appreciate so much the contribution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT STEEL AND STEEL IMPORTS: RESULTS OF SPECIAL SURVEY OF IMPORTS BY AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE—COMMENTS AND CRITICISMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a comprehensive speech on the problems of the world steel industry and the steel sector of the Kennedy round, on May 1, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages 11320 to

11335, I referred, in the context of a much broader discussion, to the fact that in 1965–66 American steel companies themselves were to some degree importing foreign steel in order to maintain balance in their own steel production, and to continue to supply their customers with finished steel products. I felt that the factor of imports needed further study, analysis, and interpretation, to understand just what the larger foreign competition problems were, what they were not, and what, if anything, needed to be done by the U.S. Government. I did not make the speech just to rebut the claim that steel imports into the United States were creating problems for the domestic steel industry. Above all, at that date, May 1, I wanted to explore the problems that should be emphasized in the Kennedy round negotiations then reaching their final stage in Geneva.

That speech and the suggestion that American steel companies were also importers was hotly denied in press statements by representatives of the steel industry. But, notably, the substantive issues I raised in my May 1 speech were disregarded by the steel industry. I still await their critique, indicating where they agree and where they disagree with the arguments and analysis in that speech.

Willing to continue this discussion, in a speech to the American Importers Association annual meeting in New York on May 12, I backed up my statements on imports as well as other points set forth in the basic paper of May 1. I identified one series of imports by a certain steel company, the name of which I did not mention, by specific references to place, where and times when large tonnages had been imported, and the roundabout methods that had been employed.

The American Iron & Steel Institute and its members have responded to both these points with data of their own. First, the Iron & Steel Institute has supplied me with the results of a questionnaire on imports which was sent to its members and other steel firms on May 2, the day following my speech. Second, the president of the firm alleged to have imported large tonnages by the means I mentioned in the May 12 speech, has shown me data—including computer runs—on his firm's steel purchases during 1965 and 1966, from both domestic and foreign steel mills.

I was pleased to have these responses. They are a beginning of the public discussion of these important problems, a discussion I have waited anxiously to have developed to further the public interest. I encourage its continuation on all aspects of this issue, not just steel companies' imports. This is an important discussion; it directly affects the interests of shareholders of the large companies who have an interest in continued growth in the total use of steel against its competing products; it is of interest to steel users, who must make the decision whether to pay a higher price for steel or shift to a competing material such as plastic, aluminum, or cement; and it is of interest to steel employees, the most productive in the world.

This is a big problem with many aspects, all in need of study. But I am also anxious to pursue this public discussion even for the relatively narrow area of imports in question here. By dealing in specific data on this one point, perhaps we might begin to explore specifics on the other, equally important, points.

My presentation and analysis of the data supplied me by the steel industry follow, in two parts.

First, comment regarding the Iron & Steel Institute questionnaire on steel imports.

The data supplied to me by the institute on Thursday, June 8, may be questioned in several aspects. The Iron & Steel Institute questionnaire and the tabulation of results is as follows: It will be immediately seen that the tabulation of results does not include data on all questions asked by the questionnaire.

AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE SPECIAL SURVEY—STEEL IMPORTS

Special survey on receipts of foreign steel mill products as compiled from replies by 85 companies accounting for 98.5 percent of raw steel production in 1966

I. SURVEY BACKGROUND

	Number
a. Companies asked to participate	124
b. Replies received:	
Integrated and semi-integrated companies	50
Nonintegrated companies	35
Total	85
c. Companies reporting receipts of foreign steel	29

II. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

a. Receipts of foreign-produced steel mill products in 1966 for conversion or processing into further finished products, mill resale shipment, or for own maintenance, repair, operating or construction use—net tons	425,787
b. Amount of tonnage included in item 1 above which was received for conversion or further finishing and for reexport to country of origin—net tons	63,323
c. Net balance for consumption in United States—net tons	362,464
d. Ratio to total U.S. imports of steel mill products in 1966 (10,753,000 n.t.)—Percent	3.4

Special survey on receipts of foreign steel mill products and pig iron by institute reporting companies in 1966

(Please report the following: Estimate if exact tonnage is not known)

	Net tons
1. Receipts by your U.S. mill operations of foreign-produced steel mill products in 1966 for conversion or processing into further finished products, mill resale shipment, or for own maintenance, repair, operation or construction use	-------
2. Amount of tonnage included in item 1 above which was received for conversion or further finishing and for re-export to country of origin	-------
3. Receipts of foreign-produced pig iron in 1966	-------
4. The foreign-produced steel products were in the form of: (Please identify product form, i.e. wire rods, billets, slabs, hot rolled sheets, etc.)	-------

Man-hours required to complete this questionnaire ------

Name of company

Name of officer reporting

Date mailed

STEEL IMPORTS

I have questioned the Iron & Steel Institute on the several points which I discuss, with their responses, below. In summary, my criticisms relate to the questionnaire's coverage of types of imports, the coverage of firms asked to report, and the Institute's comparison of imports by steel mills with total imports.

A. COVERAGE OF PRODUCTS

The tabulation of results is for imports of steel mill products alone. Imports of "pig" iron, which is the basic material for steel, is not presented. Yet the Institute questionnaire—question 3—asked for data on receipts—imports—of foreign-produced pig iron. Nor are finished steel items like nails, wire rope, structural shapes, sashes, frames, signposts, bolts, nuts, rivets, pipe and tube fittings, and so forth.

PIG IRON IMPORTS

The response of the Iron & Steel Institute is that the answers to the question on pig iron imports were too incomplete to allow results to be published.

Pig iron imports of about 1.2 million tons in 1966 were likely to have been imported both by independent American foundries for conversion to cast products, and also by semi-integrated American steel mills. But the amount of the imports by the latter is unknown until the Institute can obtain more complete data.

B. COVERAGE OF REPORTING FIRMS' SUBSIDIARIES

The Institute asked for receipts of foreign steel only by "your U.S. mill operations." That is, the question would seem to have eliminated reporting of imports by steel firms' wholly owned warehousing, servicing, and converting subsidiaries, which may have imported large quantities.

The Institute assures that in fact the results of its questionnaire include the purchases of imports by their warehousing and service subsidiaries, and by subsidiaries that convert or fabricate steel. I would raise the further question, however, whether the questionnarie's 85 respondents could have known that by asking for data on imports by "your U.S. mill operations" the Institute intended them to report imports by service and converting subsidiaries as well.

C. COMPARISON OF MILLS' IMPORTS TO TOTAL IMPORTS

The tabulation of the answers to the questionnaire showed that 425,787 net tons of foreign steel mill products were imported by U.S. mill operations. The tabulation then deducts a sum of 63,323 net tons in order to adjust for reexports. The resulting net amount of 362,464 net tons is then compared with total 1966 imports of all steel mill products to arrive at a ratio of 3.4 percent in 1966.

This is like comparing apples and pears. For a more accurate comparison, the total of steel mills' imports should be compared with total U.S. imports, to arrive at a ratio of about 4.3 percent. For an accurate comparison that is adjusted for reexports, steel mills' adjusted imports should, it seems to me, be compared with the Nation's adjusted imports. The Institute agrees with this analysis, and will adjust its data accordingly.

Second, in regard to imports of sub-

stantial quantities of steel by a single U.S. firm, a purchase I described in the speech at the American Importers' Association New York meeting on May 12, I have now received additional substantiating data.

This additional data indicates that the president of the company in question did not present to me, or was not aware of, these large imports. If my data are correct, as they seem certain to be, the accuracy of the Iron & Steel Institute's questionnaire is also in doubt. And, if other companies besides the one in question have used equally mysterious methods of importing, then the Steel Institute's questionnaire cannot be considered at all accurate. I intend to pursue this matter with the company in question.

THE PURPOSE OF THE INQUIRY

Now I would like to try again to put this question of steel imports in proper context, the context I sought to establish in my May 1 paper.

The steel industry supported the Trade Expansion Act in 1962 and the Kennedy round negotiations that began in 1963. Then, in 1966, steel industry representatives came to certain Members of Congress urging extensive revamping of our antidumping law. I was greatly concerned about this because I believed I saw that in our negotiations in Geneva we were going to be able to develop a meaningful and useful international antidumping code which would be of great advantage to the United States, in part because other countries imposed antidumping restrictions on U.S. imports through secretive bureaucratic devices rather than by law, which is the U.S. method. Having the agreement of other countries to regulate their antidumping operations by law rather than by bureaucratic decisions, which are frequently arbitrary and irrational, seemed to me to be a great achievement. As a congressional delegate for trade negotiations, I was pleased that the steel industry seemed to accept this judgment, and to withdraw its efforts stringently to change our antidumping law, which would only have led, I thought, to sharp retaliation by other countries.

Then on February 8, 1967, the steel industry, through a special speech delivered by Leslie B. Worthington of United States Steel as spokesman, demanded of the U.S. Congress, at a congressional breakfast a special type of governmental protection against foreign imports. This demand could have seriously undermined the trade negotiations in Geneva, which after 3 years were then in their final stages. Certainly the steel industry should have had its facts and analyses well in hand before it undertook this serious reversal of position, a reversal which affected all U.S. economic interests, as well as steel, which were involved in the Kennedy round. In light of this February speech one would have expected the industry to have its complete data on its foreign trade problems—problems that have deep ramifications—readily available to support its position.

Thus the lack of a point-by-point substantive steel industry response to my May 1 paper, other than to challenge one item which was understandably emphasized by the press, the purchase of foreign steel by the seel industry itself, is an incongruity that requires explanation. I was supplied on June 14 with copies of speeches, and data, some of which I already had. But a systematic response is not forthcoming, particularly responses to the fundamental problems of pricing and sales policy. Indeed, I have been led to wonder how much study and homework the steel industry had done before it took the drastic step it did in the February 8 congressional breakfast at which the Worthington speech was given.

NEED FOR DISCUSSION BASED ON THE ISSUES

I still await the steel industry's critique of my May 1 paper. I do not regard personal and political attacks on me as a substitute for a response based on a substantive argument. I say this as one who is sympathetic to the domestic steel industry and feel that it probably does have many justified complaints about unfair trade practices of foreign competitors. Furthermore, I might say I believe wage rates are a legitimate cost factor to consider in establishing the rules of international trade on bases of fair economic competition.

In order to make proper judgments in this or in any area, however, I believe that data and analysis that is timely, complete, documented, and public, is necessary.

When the steel industry, or any industry, comes to government, and in this instance the Federal Government, for assistance it should be prepared to discuss the data and analyses fully and openly.

As I said in my May 1 paper, and in my May 12 speech, I will be pleased to give the same public attention to the steel industry's response to my data and analyses, so that the constructive discussion we have begun on this problem can develop on its proper footing.

MONTCLAIR LIONS CLUB

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the contributions to our individual communities which are made by various civic organizations, but I would like to call to the particular attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Montclair Times regarding the Montclair Lions Club.

From personal experience, I know only too well how valuable is our sight, and I want to take this opportunity to commend the Montclair Lions for their fine efforts over the years in aiding the blind and in promoting sight conservation, and to congratulate them on the wonderful gift they made possible for Mrs. Akbar.

LIONS CLUB AIDED IN A MEDICAL MIRACLE

The Montclair Lions Club, which has a long list of accomplishments in aiding the blind and in sight conservation work in Montclair during more than three decades, is to be congratulated for its latest effort in helping a Montclair woman, Mrs. Miriam Haidar-Akbar, regain vision in one eye through a unique and outstanding piece of ocular surgery after a number of years of almost total blindness. The Lions would remind Montclair residents that its work among the blind and in sight conservation is made possible chiefly through its annual townwide sale of electric light bulbs and brooms.

The operation was made possible through the Montclair Lions Club, along with assistance from Lions International, as well as the Eye Bank and Research Foundation of Washington, D.C. Dr. John F. Farinella, chairman of the local Lions Sight Conservation Committee, who has termed the operation a "modern miracle," explained that Lions Club President Donald Theobold drove Mrs. Akbar and her daughter to the Washington University Hospital in early April, and the successful operation was completed a day later. The Lions were advised that the operation—a simultaneous cataract removal and corneal transplant, was unique in ocular surgery and an outstanding surgical accomplishment, thanks to Dr. John McTigue of the Washington University Hospital.

Mrs. Akbar's gratitude is beyond description for the wonderful gift of vision, which is now hers, and the Lions are happy over this almost Cinderellalike outcome of a situation which at first appeared to be out of reach and hopeless.

THE PROPOSED FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in support of H.R. 6611, the bill to establish a Federal Judicial Center which I cosponsored and which was developed by the Judiciary Subcommittee, of which I am a member.

This is one of the measures recommended by President Johnson in his message to Congress on crime, and it stems from long concern and study of the problem of administering justice by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Despite additional judges, we continue to be plagued with serious delays in completing court action. Judicial filings are growing, as is the complexity of many of the issues subject to Federal litigation. And in this scientific era, when work in so many fields of endeavor has been radically improved through use of technological developments, it is appalling to realize that the situation in our Federal courts is now the worst in our history.

With establishment of a Federal Judicial Center we will at last begin to attack the problem through essential programs of research and education and training for judges and the many other categories of officials in the Federal judicial system. The urgent need for efforts in these areas has long been recognized, and the Judicial Conference has endeavored to meet these needs through committee activity. However, it is evident

that what is required is an organization set up specifically to work on the problem of developing more efficient and expeditious procedures.

I believe creation of a Federal Judicial Center such as is proposed in H.R. 6111 will be a most valuable contribution to the administration of justice. I applaud its approval, for while justice is delayed wrong prevails, and it is a capacity for justice which makes democracy possible. A Federal Judicial Center should greatly enhance our efforts to achieve the vital purpose of justice, which the Attorney General has so aptly described as "action, not abstraction."

FULL OPPORTUNITY AND SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ACT

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H.R. 10959, the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act. An identical bill is being introduced by the Congressman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN]. These proposals are in turn identical to S. 843, introduced on February 6 by my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, and 10 other Senators.

As Senator MONDALE stated in the remarks that accompanied his bill's introduction:

> I think it is clear . . . that we need new tools to assess our efforts and progress in the area of social reform, and for better understanding of these efforts and the state of our social health as a nation.

This legislation is designed to accomplish these goals in three ways:

First, creation, in the Executive Office of the President, of a three-member Council of Social Advisers. The council's duties would include compilation and analysis of social indicators; development of program priorities; evaluation of the effectiveness of programs; and advice to the President in establishing national social policies.

Second, an annual report by the President to Congress on the state of the Nation's social health.

Third, creation of a joint congressional committee to review the President's annual report.

While we have made great social progress in recent years, Mr. Speaker, we still have scattered and incomplete means of charting that progress. A comprehensive and cohesive system of keeping track of where we stand is essential to the effective charting of future social progress.

This legislation has attracted considerable national attention since its introduction. Several favorable articles and editorials have appeared in some of our leading newspapers and magazines. One of the latest evaluations of the Mondale bill—and several other pieces of legislation related to the social sciences—appeared in the May issue of Trans-Action magazine. This article follows:

SOCIAL ACCOUNTING FOR THE NATION

We are now witnessing an ever increasing reliance upon a whole range of social sciences as the American style demands constant assessment of national goals. As public officials become increasingly self-conscious about the quality of American life and cloyingly dedicated to spelling out the national purpose, they are adding the use of other social sciences to the already institutionalized use of economics in determining where we are and where we should go. This inclination, tentative as it still remains, is being matched by the escalating interest of even the most academic of social scientists in the possibilities of their work for creating as well as describing society.

The most significant of several recent moves in the direction of institutionalizing social science as a part of the federal government's efforts to assess the state of the nation and our government activity is Senator Walter F. Mondale's Social Accounting Bill. Senator Mondale (D., Minn.) has introduced legislation aimed at reaching three goals:

—establishing a Council of Social Advisors to devise a system of social indicators to advise the President on and to evaluate national social policies;

—requiring the President to transmit to Congress an annual social report on the nation, specifying progress made listing goals for the future, and outlining policies for achieving these objectives;

—and establishing a joint committee of Congress to review the presidential report, just as the joint economic committee exercises supervision and responsibility in economic matters.

On first sight such legislation might appear to simply make more paper work and reports for the government, but if the long experience with the establishment of the Council of Economic Advisors is any guide, Senator Mondale's bill can have a most profound impact both on government operation and on the social state of the nation generally. The bill, if passed, can institutionalize a much more systematic assessment of the social implications of various government actions and of the introduction into the policy-making process of the kind of social considerations that now tend to be either ignored or dealt with in a cavalier manner. Over time the government will begin to face some of the now unrecognized consequences of its actions and will be forced to address as policy issues various social problems which factual ignorance now clouds and conceals.

Although there are strong elitist overtones in establishing yet another group of experts crucial to the policy-making process, Senator Mondale's proposal should eventually result in an extension of democratic policy-making. The most important effect of the bill, as of the increasing importance of the program-planning budget system, will be to compel a clear statement of national goals. Just as in the economic area, this public statement of goals should allow for debate and action, both on the extent to which the goals are being achieved and on the adequacy of the goals framed. For example, the Council of Economic Advisors has taken the lead sometimes shakily in stating that the risk of inflation is a concern that overrides the goal of full employment, making it possible to debate the issue. Were these inclinations only vaguely implied in the economic planning of the nation, it would be much more difficult to formulate a debate on the relative importance of full employment, inflation, and a favorable balance of payments.

The long-range effects of the Mondale legislation on the social sciences themselves would be great. The social sciences are called upon to "put up or shut up" by a program directly calling upon social advisors to work out a social report. Social scientists might experience great internal pressure to move in the direction of more precise and clearly formulated statements about society and about the effects of various kinds of intervention on society. There is certainly no current equivalent of Keynesian programming in the other social sciences. In that sense the establishment of national social policy to some extent precedes and presumes the development of theory adequate to the task. The call for a wider use of social indicators should have the effect of making the development of such theory, along with a spelling out of the indicators themselves, an item of first priority for the social sciences.

In this connection, in order to establish a meaningful set of priorities, we urge that the Council of Social Advisors be enlarged from the present proposed three-member committee to a larger committee. In this way a larger network of advisors from the social science community can be involved. The quantity of information which will be required can be used to expand the type of theoretical horizons that will be needed. The purpose of the Mondale legislation is clearly *not* to build bigger and better mousetraps—for example, bigger and better mental institutions—but rather to show how the use of social indicators can lead first to political policies which might lead to a reduction and finally to an elimination of the need for institutions of this sort.

The legislative career of the act will help make clear that the Senate expects the Council of Economic Advisors and the Council of Social Advisors to cooperate closely and to mutually influence each other. Otherwise, it is likely that one will get two sets of perspectives: an economic advisor's perspective that orients itself mainly to the general health of the economy and a social advisor's perspective that orients itself mainly to all the kinds of troubles that are left over. In the long run, it would probably be desirable to merge the two councils. However, in the beginning, the social advisors probably need the protection of an autonomous agency until they have demonstrated their worth to carry real weight in any kind of combined council.

Much of the data that a council would use are currently collected in the various departments (HEW, OEO, Labor, and Commerce). However, this information is invariably tailored to the particular mission and policy commitments of the department concerned. Over time, the council should be in a position to offer guidance on developing information series which are less biased in terms of particular departmental perspectives. Only a group outside the given interests of each agency will be in a position to gain flexibility in developing and assessing methods for achieving national goals that cross departmental aims.

It is encouraging to find Congress taking leadership in the effort to make the social sciences policy relevant in the broadest possible way. Senator Mondale's bill, along with the proposal by Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff (D., Conn.) for an Office of Legislative Evaluation to determine the extent to which Congress' legislation accomplishes its intended goals, can provide crucial elements in developing a more rational, humane society.

Nor can Senator Mondale's proposed legislation on social accounting be isolated from companion legislation being introduced by Senator Fred R. Harris (D., Okla.) on the estalishment of a National Social Science Foundation. For the emerging recognition of the worth of social science information comes at a time when there is a corresponding legislative concern over the moral behavior of social scientists. Therefore, the allocation of funds for the kinds of non-policy-oriented research that in the past (and present) have

never received much government support or even encouragement is a necessary correlate to the social-indicators approach. For without free and imaginative research, the constructive role of a continuing evaluation of social indicators would be seriously impaired from the outset.

What these social science bills must help ensure is the growth of a wider network of politically relevant groups whose interests can be articulated and represented in federal planning councils. In the absence of this representation, there exists a danger that the planning agencies can become spokesmen for special interests masquerading as the voice of the total society. Experience with this process can serve as a means for educating otherwise inarticulate publics within American society, and for helping them to translate their passions into programs.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of H.R. 10959:

H.R. 10959

A bill to create a council of social advisers, to require the President to submit an annual social report, to create a joint committee on the social report, and to promote the general welfare

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 "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In order to promote the general welfare, the Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government, consistent with the primary responsibilities of State and local governments and the private sector, to promote and encourage such conditions as will give every American the opportunity to live in decency and dignity, and to provide a clear and precise picture of whether such conditions are promoted and encouraged in such areas as health, education, and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the mentally ill and retarded, the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal, and by measuring progress in meeting such needs.

SOCIAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress not later than March 20 of each year a report to be known as the "social report," setting forth (1) the overall progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts designed to carry out the policy declared in section 2 with particular emphasis upon the manner in which such efforts serve to meet national social needs in such areas as health, education and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the mentally ill and retarded, the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal; (2) a review of State, local, and private efforts designed to create the conditions specified in section 2; (3) current and foreseeable needs in the areas served by such efforts and the progress of development of plans to meet such needs; and (4) programs and policies for carrying out the policy declared in section 2, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports and supplementary to the social report, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy declared in section 2.

(c) The social report, and all supplementary reports transmitted under subsection (b) of this section, shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the joint committee created by section 5.

COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Social Advisers (hereinafter called the Council). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend programs to carry out such policy. Each member of the Council, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule by section 5315 of title 5 of the United States Code. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of such Schedule.

(b) The Chairman of the Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and is authorized, subject to such provisions, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of such chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53.

(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the social report;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information and statistical data concerning developments and programs designed to carry out the policy declared in section 2, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information and data in the light of the policy declared in section 2 and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and programs;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2 of this Act for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities contribute to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to develop priorities for programs designed to carry out the policy declared in section 2 and recommend to the President the most efficient way to allocate Federal resources and the level of government—Federal, State, or local—best suited to carry out such programs; and

(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to programs, activities, and legislation to carry out the policy declared in section 2 as the President may request.

(d) Whenever the President determines that information or data developed by the Council pursuant to subsection (c) of this section should be made available to the States and localities he shall provide for the timely dissemination of such information and data to such States and localities.

(e) The Council shall make an annual report to the President in February of each year.

(f) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this Act—

(1) the Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, organizations, and individuals as it deems advisable;

(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, use the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

(g) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the members and salaries of officers and employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $ in the aggregate for each fiscal year.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL REPORT

SEC. 5. (a) There is established a Joint Committee on the Social Report, to be composed of eight Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each case, the majority party shall be represented by five Members and the minority party shall be represented by three Members.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of all matters relating to the social report; and

(2) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the social report, not later than June 1 of each year to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the social report, and from time to time make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Government, and private research agencies.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year the sum of $, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this section to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICIAL QUITS WITH BLAST AT SYSTEM

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may ex-

tend 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there have been many reports of the drift and indecision in the government of the District of Columbia. Much of this weakness is due to deficiencies in the present District government which the President's reorganization plan is designed to correct.

The latest resignation is Mr. George W. Grier, Director of Washington's Office of Program Coordination, who left the District government last week. In his letter of resignation, Mr. Grier said that the District of Columbia government, "this most unworkable of governmental structures," is in "imminent danger of disintegration."

He further wrote:

My experiences in preparation of the Model Cities planning grant application convinced me that the present structure of District government is sorely inadequate to permit the decisive and coordinated action which the Model Cities program requires.

I place the newspaper articles on Mr. Grier's resignation in the RECORD at this point:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICIAL QUITS WITH BLAST AT SYSTEM—GRIER CALLS SETUP UNWORKABLE

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

George W. Grier, director of Washington's office of program coordination and a man responsible for many recent innovations in city policy, announced his resignation yesterday with a fierce critique of the city's administration.

In his letter of resignation, Grier said he feared that Washington's government is in "imminent danger of disintegration."

Grier wrote that he regretted leaving "this most unworkable of governmental structures,"as he described the city government, but that he saw no real purpose in staying on.

Grier's office has been responsible for coordinating city programs with the United Planning Organization's war on poverty. It has also been the key city agency in planning summer recreation programs. Grier spent much of the last six months writing the city's application for Model Cities aid.

Since arriving at the District Building in January, 1965, Grier has been outspoken in his views on city government.

Grier's outspoken ways apparently prompted Gen. Robert E. Mathe, the Engineer Commissioner, to suggest a new rule for District employes prohibiting any discussion of sensitive topics with the press or public before consulting with a superior. The Board of Commissioners rejected this idea in a closed-door meeting Wednesday.

Mathe and his assistants had been among Grier's principal frustrations in recent months. Much of his work was parallel to and in obvious competition with the work of the Community Renewal staff, which is under Mathe.

Regarding perhaps his most important job, an overseer of the city's young Model Cities program, Grier wrote in his four-page resignation letter: "My experiences in preparation of the Model Cities planning grant application convinced me that the present structure of District government is sorely inadequate to permit the decisive and coordinated action which the Model Cities program requires."

OFFICIAL QUITS, BLAMES STATE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RULE

(By Betty James)

George W. Grier, director of the District's office of Program Coordination, resigned yesterday because "the District government is in a state of complete disorganization and I think it's going to remain that way for months to come."

Grier was the architect of the District's proposal for a model cities planning grant, and his office is responsible for many other efforts.

They included summer programs with the cooperation of the Washington Council for Children and Youth, development of neighborhood planning councils, coordination between the District government and poverty programs in the city, and work with government departments and community organizations on a variety of activities in social welfare and higher education.

In a four-page letter of resignation submitted to Kenneth Back, acting director of the Department of General Administration, Grier stressed that President Johnson's proposed reorganization of the District government under a single strong executive would eliminate many problems. He noted that, should Congress approve reorganization, implementation would still be months away.

"Quite frankly, I also feel that without home rule, which now seems out of the question for years to come, the potential of even the most sweeping reorganization to achieve responsive government is severely limited," he said.

ACTION SEEN IMMINENT

Action on the model cities planning request by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development is believed to be imminent. The present three-man Board of Commissioners adopted a restructuring within the present governmental framework for the purpose of applying for planning funds. Grier has deep reservations about this restructuring, which the commissioners presumably would put into effect when model cities planning money is assured.

The three-man board is itself a "three-headed creature," Grier said in an interview. "Each separately is attractive. But when you put it together it's a monster."

The restructuring outlined in the model cities proposal would make matters even worse, Grier believes. In a letter to Back, he said "a government with three heads is bad enough; one which has two bodies as well is in even more imminent danger of distintegration."

The "two bodies" to which Grier referred would be the Office of Program Development and the present Department of General Administration. The latter has responsibility now for planning, budgeting and administration, but in the future all planning would be under the Office of Program Development.

OFFICE SHIFT

Grier's office would be removed from the Department of General Administration and placed with others, including one for model cities, under the Office of Program Development.

He told Back "it is my belief that this administrative reorganization will largely destroy the effectiveness of this office by removing it from the mainstream of administrative and financial control. It will relegate the office, like most 'planning' agencies, to a position of ostensibly high stature but virtual impotence."

Grier also expressed concern about the model cities program being in the new office, away from the department that controls the budget.

"VALID ROLE" SOUGHT

"I wouldn't want to give the impression I'm saying if I don't get to run the model cities program I want out," Grier said, adding that it would be enough to have a "valid role" in the effort. But under the proposed restructuring, model cities would be one division and his office another, even though both affect every facet of city life. "I just don't understand how it fits."

Grier believes a single strong commissioner might be able to make the restructuring mesh. He would have been willing to stay, with the thought that the commissioner would decide that the program coordination office was valuable to him—if it were not for uncertainty that the reorganization plan will become a reality and the time it will take to implement it if it does. "It will be a miracle if it is ready by the end of the year," he said.

The internal reorganization plan approved by the commissioners was one of two that they considered.

OTHER REJECTED

The other, proposed by Schuyler Lowe, former director of the Department of General Administration, was rejected. Lowe has since resigned.

Lowe was Grier's boss. A clash developed between Lowe and Grier and the engineer commissioner, Brig. Gen. Robert E. Mathe, over control of model cities, a fight Mathe appears to have won.

Grier said yesterday of Mathe, "I have great admiration for Gen. Mathe. He is a very able and dynamic man. But he happens also to be a general in the Army, and I don't think a general should be in charge of civilian programs."

Grier stressed that he wasn't going away mad at anyone but instead has thrown up his hands at the system.

Grier is returning to the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, where, he wrote Back, "I expect to be involved in a number of activities of direct relevance to the problems of governing the District." His resignation is effective June 30, or earlier if Back feels he can be released.

Grier, who lives in the District, is moving to Maryland next month. He said he and his wife "made a decision a few weeks ago we lived in a non-democracy. I want to get back where I can have a vote."

BILL FOR CARE AND CONTROL OF ALCOHOLISM

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill, to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism.

Alcoholism has become a national problem, affecting citizens in all regions of the United States. An effective nationwide program of treatment for this disease is needed.

To assure that the program is reaching those afflicted, it is necessary that we have adequate and up-to-date information on care and control. Thus, a major provision of this bill would establish a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control within the office of the Surgeon General.

Among the principal duties of this new Bureau would be to serve as an information clearinghouse and, further, to direct basic research on cause, prevention, and treatment. Such duties are of limited value, however, unless coordinated with other Federal efforts and in turn passed

along to State and local governments. This Bureau will be responsible for these communicative duties.

In addition, this Bureau would be authorized to make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies for demonstration projects such as treatment and rehabilitation centers, and programs for postinstitutional services. Projects having the greatest promise of contributing to combating the problems of alcoholism would be accorded grant preferences.

To assure widespread citizen participation in this program, the bill provides for a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism Care and Control. This committee will be comprised of members knowledgeable in the varied problems of alcoholism. It will be their function to advise and consult with the Director of the Bureau previously cited.

Mr. Speaker, alcoholism is a national plague which requires much hard work and understanding if we are to effectively combat it. I believe this measure offers us the means through which to carry out this work.

FULL OPPORTUNITY AND SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ACT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, Representative DONALD FRASER today, in introducing the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act. The purpose of this far-reaching legislation is to establish a system of social account in an effort to improve public decisionmaking. More specifically, it creates a Council of Social Advisers to the President, and calls upon the Chief Executive to make an annual "social report" to the Congress. In addition, it creates a Joint Committee on the Social Report within the Congress to act in conjunction with and as sort of a devil's advocate to the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Speaker, the last decade has found our society becoming more committed to solving the social problems of our time. Poverty, education, elder citizens, urban blight, and civil rights are just a few of the areas in which social legislation has been adopted. Yet, we have no system through which to measure the direction and results of these social changes. As a nation, we have begun to perfect our economic reporting system and to establish economic indicators that measure national performance, but gross national product and economic data are limited as instruments for measuring social change.

Economic and census statistics tell us little about pockets of poverty, depressed communities, and disadvantaged social groups. It is hoped that a system of social accounts would give us a broader, more balanced assessment of social needs and progress.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not meant as an end in itself, for our experience with and understanding of a system of social accounts is in its very infancy. However, I do believe that this proposal is a concrete step in the right direction.

There is one area though, in which this legislation is deficient, and I would like to briefly comment on it without admittedly offering any real solution. Social problems are often national in scope and require national involvement, but solutions to these social ills must be attained on the local level where the need exists. I firmly believe that an effective system of social relations between the Federal, State, and local communities must be evolved in order to assure a system which is responsive to local needs and social change.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring this legislation to the attention of my colleagues in the House. I ask that they give serious consideration to this proposal and encourage their participation in this debate.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—A MAN OF BOLDNESS AND COURAGE

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, those who are quick to criticize the decisions of our outstanding President, Lyndon B. Johnson, are amazingly slow when it comes to considering the awesome responsibilities which rest on his shoulders as leader of the greatest nation in the world.

They are equally slow at crediting our distinguished and hard-working President for his boldness, his courage, his determination, and his imaginative solutions to the great economic, social, educational, and political issues which confront our society.

I was delighted, therefore, to read Carl T. Rowan's forthright column, "Johnson as a Man of Boldness and Courage," which appeared in the Washington Star.

In his column, Mr. Rowan examines our President's impressive accomplishments, and concludes that when all is said and done, historians will regard President Lyndon B. Johnson as a man of boldness and courage who accomplished some of the greatest political feats of all time.

It is a pleasure to insert Mr. Rowan's article in the RECORD. The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 12,1967]

JOHNSON AS A MAN OF BOLDNESS AND COURAGE

Whatever the historians say about Lyndon Baines Johnson, they will not conclude that he was a lazy, or unimaginative, or gutless President.

Never, even in those feverish early days of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, has a President flooded the Congress with so many messages and bills that affected the well-being of so many people.

Whatever his contemporaries think of Johnson's "style" or "grace" or "personality," the record is going to show that no President ever defied so many taboos, challenged so many prejudices, corralled so many sacred cows or sought to abridge so many special privileges.

His recent proposals to alter our Selective Service System, so as to wipe out injustices that have been nurtured by the privileged for 104 years, is but the latest of an endless stream of such proposals.

Maybe our country isn't really much more egalitarian than it was in 1863 when Congress enacted a conscription program under which a man could buy his way out of the draft by paying the government $300. Maybe a majority of our people still believes that a nation must preserve its elite (meaning those fortunate enough to be born to parents who value and can afford college) and use its "lesser" mortals as cannon fodder. So perhaps the lottery draft that the President has called for will be blocked by Congress. But the President has had the courage to put the challenge before the nation.

Just as he had the courage, in his message on Children and Youth, to ask that states be compelled to pay to dependent children on welfare the amount of money that the states themselves have said is the minimum needed.

Just as he had the fortitude to go back to a stubborn, "blacklashish" Congress with far-reaching civil rights proposals in the fields of racial discrimination in housing, and in the selection of juries.

Just as he fought publicly, and apparently with success, for a consular treaty with the Soviet Union at a time when some congressmen preferred the emotional cliches that give the illusion of advanced anti-Communism and a higher patriotism.

Just as he courted the enmity of the food and other industries by pressing for "truth in packaging," and "truth in lending" laws and other measures to protect the consumer from myriad merchandising tricks.

Just as he aroused the ire of the automobile industry with his auto safety proposals; and is antagonizing for a wider spectrum of industry by asking nationwide standards to combat air pollution; and has irritated the textile industry by seeking restraints on flammable materials; and the natural gas industry by attacking the pipelines that move gas at dangerously high pressures; and the medical industry by seeking Food and Drug Agency safeguards against such devices as X-ray equipment that gives overdoses of radiation, or defective screws that are used to hook up hips, or artificial eyes that are improperly made.

And Mr. Johnson had the forthrightness to tell Americans how much they would have to surrender in money and old prejudices if they want to reduce crime and make their streets safe—even though the public might have preferred a promise of a "cheaper" panacea, such as "tougher police action."

With newspapers, television and the car radio constantly reminding us of Vietnam and other things that arouse tempers and fears, it is hard to maintain a perspective where this man Johnson is concerned.

But it may be reckoned as one of the great political feats of all time that he moved so boldly against custom and vested interest in areas of business, race, public welfare and social philosophy without producing an embittered army of Johnson-haters comparable to the Roosevelt-haters of the 1930s.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO WELCOMES ITALIAN AMBASSADOR EGIDIO ORTONA TO WASHINGTON

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, Egidio Ortona, Secretary General of the Italian Foreign Ministry, was named as Italian Ambassador to the United States, and last week, the new Ambassador and Mrs. Ortona arrived in Washington.

As Ambassador Ortona assumes his new responsibilities in Washington, I want to congratulate him on his appointment and officially welcome him and his charming wife to the Nation's Capital.

Ambassador Ortona's impressive background has equipped him admirably for his new position. He is 56 years old and already well known in American diplomatic circles. He served as counselor and Minister of the Italian Embassy from 1945 to 1958, when he was appointed Italy's Permanent Representative at the United Nations. He left that position to become Director General of Economic Affairs in the Foreign Ministry in 1961.

Signor Ortona, who was born at Casale Monferrato, in the Piedmont, was educated in northern Italy and abroad. He took a degree of doctor of laws at the University of Turin in 1931 and studied at the London School of Economics.

Shortly thereafter, he began his career in the Italian Foreign Service, and among the posts he has held have been first secretary of the Embassy in London, head of the Office of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs in Rome, head of an economic mission to the United States, Minister of the Italian Embassy in Washington, and Italy's Permanent Representative at the United Nations.

It is evident from the foregoing that Ambassador Ortona brings to his new position a wealth of experience which I know will help to further enhance the friendly and productive relationship that the people of America and the people of Italy are enjoying. This wonderful relationship, I know, will continue to serve as a common basis from which our two nations will move resolutely forward toward advancing the cause of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, as he joins the diplomatic corps in Washington, I extend to the distinguished Ambassador Ortona a hearty welcome and my best wishes for his abundant good health and ever-increasing success in his career.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON PROPOSES A NEW START FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be commended and applauded for asking the Congress to share the honor of bringing 20th-century government to the District of Columbia.

Our Nation's Capital has too long labored under archaic forms of government.

Its millions of metropolitan residents have seen the city go backwards in health, economic development, and education for many years. The major cause is the lack of a government organization able to respond quickly and efficiently to the pressing needs of a modern community.

We now have President Johnson's reorganization plan to remedy this situation. Hardly anyone can disagree with it. It provides for a unified executive to administer programs, balanced by the powers of a council. It would eliminate conflicting assignments. And it would provide for efficient day-to-day operation of District government.

In short, it is just what the District has needed for a hundred years.

Yet, we find voices opposed to it. I am afraid the opposition is not to the plan or to its provisions, but rather to it being accomplished as the President's plan rather than as a District Committee proposal.

Washington, D.C., awaits the President's plan for action.

It is a plan which begins a new day for our Capital City.

We ought to disavow the disapproval resolution introduced by those more interested in protocol than progress.

The Congress should permit President Johnson's reorganization plan to take effect. We must share with him the challenge and responsibility of making Washington the best managed, most progressive city in the country.

This plan has the support of the people. Many organizations have spoken out in favor of it. Typical of such support is a recent letter to the President from the Jewish War Veterans. Under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1967.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America pledges its support for the reorganization plan for the Government of the District of Columbia as submitted to the Congress on June 1, 1967.

Your plan is especially noteworthy for the greater involvement it will bring individual citizens in the activities of municipal government.

We are convinced that major problems flowing from the need for more effective law enforcement in the fight on crime require the most effective local government procedures before necessary progress can be made. We believe that your recommendations will in the long run provide the most effective tools in this effort.

As an organization of war veterans, we are also impressed by the effect of your recommendation in freeing the United States Army from its present superfluous obligation of performing a civil function in the person of the present Engineer Commissioner. Indeed, there are surely many important military functions that take priority for the services of a trained military man.

While there are many facets of your message that are of great importance to D.C. citizens as well as the country at large, we have limited ourselves to those above of manifest interest to a veterans organization. Mr. President, please be assured of our enthusiastic commitment to your reorganization plan.

Respectfully,

MALCOLM A. TARLOV,
National Commander.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GUIDELINES ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Department of Justice issued a comprehensive set of guidelines to Federal departments and agencies on the new Freedom of Information Act which goes into effect on Independence Day. In my opinion, the guidelines are positive and workable, and they convey to the officials of the executive branch the basic objective of the law—which is to define the right of access to official records of the Government, and to broaden the availability of all Government information to the public.

It is not by chance that the guidelines give impetus and a meaning to the law as intended by Congress. They were carefully worked out by the office of the Legal Office of the Justice Department in close consultation with the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, over a period of many months. Assistant Attorney General Frank M. Wozencraft and his assistants, Mr. Anthony L. Mondello and Mr. Webster P. Maxon, were especially helpful in developing the guidelines in harmony with congressional intent.

The affirmative approach toward implementing the act is emphasized by the tone of the guideline's foreword by Attorney General Ramsey Clark which reads as follows:

If government is to be truly of, by, and for the people, the people must know in detail the activities of government. Nothing so diminishes democracy as secrecy. Self government, the maximum participation of the citizenry in affairs of state, is meaningful only with an informed public. How can we govern ourselves if we know not how we govern? Never was it more important than in our times of mass society, when government affects each individual in so many ways, that the right of the people to know the actions of their government be secure.

Beginning July 4, a most appropriate day, every executive agency, by direction of the Congress, shall meet in spirit as well as practice the obligations of the Public Information Act of 1966. President Johnson has instructed every official of the executive branch to cooperate fully in achieving the public's right to know.

Public Law 89-487 is the product of prolonged deliberation. It reflects the balancing of competing principles within our democratic order. It is not a mere recodification of existing practices in records management and in providing individual access to Government documents. Nor is it a mere statement of objectives or an expression of intent.

Rather this statute imposes on the execu-

tive branch an affirmative obligation to adopt new standards and practices for publication and availability of information. It leaves no doubt that disclosure is a transcendent goal, yielding only to such compelling considerations as those provided for in the exemptions of the act.

This memorandum is intended to assist every agency to fulfill this obligation, and to develop common and constructive methods of implementation.

No review of an area as diverse and intricate as this one can anticipate all possible points of strain or difficulty. This is particularly true when vital and deeply held commitments in our democratic system, such as privacy and the right to know, inevitably impinge one against another. Law is not wholly self-explanatory or self-executing. Its efficacy is heavily dependent on the sound judgment and faithful execution of those who direct and administer our agencies of Government.

It is the President's conviction, shared by those who participated in its formulation and passage, that this act is not an unreasonable encumbrance. If intelligent and purposeful action is taken, it can serve the highest ideals of a free society as well as the goals of a well-administered government.

This law was initiated by Congress and signed by the President with several key concerns:

—that disclosure be the general rule not the exception;

—that all individuals have equal rights of access;

—that the burden be on the Government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person who requests it;

—that individuals improperly denied access to documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the courts;

—that there be a change in Government policy and attitude.

It is important therefore that each agency of Government use this opportunity for critical self-analysis and close review. Indeed this law can have positive and beneficial influence on administration itself—in better records management; in seeking the adoption of better methods of search, retrieval, and copying; and in making sure that documentary classification is not stretched beyond the limits of demonstrable need.

At the same time, this law gives assurance to the individual citizen that his private rights will not be violated. The individual deals with the Government in a number of protected relationships which could be destroyed if the right know were not modulated by principles of confidentiality and privacy. Such materials as tax reports, medical and personnel files, and trade secrets must remain outside the zone of accessibility.

This memorandum represents a conscientious effort to correlate the text of the act with its relevant legislative history. Some of the statutory provisions allow room for more than one interpretation, and definitive answers may have to await court rulings. However, the Department of Justice believes this memorandum provides a sound working basis for all agencies and is thoroughly consonant with the intent of Congress. Each agency, of course, must determine for itself the applicability of the general principles expressed in this memorandum to the particular records in its custody.

This law can demonstrate anew the ability of our branches of Government, working together, to vitalize the basic principles of our democracy. It is a balanced approach to one of those principles. As the President stressed in signing the law:

"* * * a democracy works best when the people have all the information that the security of the Nation permits. No one should be able to pull curtains of secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public interest * * *. I signed this measure with a deep sense of pride that the United States is an open society in which the people's right to know is cherished and guarded."

This memorandum is offered in the hope that it will assist the agencies in developing a uniform and constructive implementation of Public Law 89–487 in line with its spirit and purpose and the President's instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the officials of Government read the Attorney General's message with care and take it to heart.

The guidelines are a fine step forward, but the real test of the effectiveness of the act will depend on the implementing regulations issued by the departments and agencies within the framework of the guidelines.

The subcommittee will monitor these regulations with care, and whenever they appear not to measure up to the spirit or the intent of the law, appropriate remedial steps will be taken including public hearings, if that seems desirable.

THE CATHOLIC SUN

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take these few moments to share with you and with our distinguished colleagues some observations relating to the nature of the Catholic press in America, with specific regard to the Catholic Sun, a weekly newspaper published in the diocese of Syracuse, part of which diocese comprises my constituency.

It is noteworthy indeed that this particular newspaper is soon to celebrate the 75th year of its publication as the only Catholic journal published in central New York, and the only officially recognized member of the Catholic press in America which is owned and operated completely by laymen.

Begun just before the turn of the century—June 24, 1892—amid a burst of expansion in the Catholic diocese of Syracuse, the Catholic Sun has served as the chronicler of the church's life and growth and as the public repository and disseminator of church news and views.

However, in that dreary wilderness which was central New York 200 years ago, "when nothing was heard but the roar of wild beasts and the war cries of Indians," the French Jesuit missionaries who erected the first Christian chapel in New York State, at Indian Hill in 1655, had no need for written communication with their converted congregations.

Even with the restoration of the church in the Syracuse area around 1836, there was no real need felt by the Catholic community for its own sectarian press to serve the relatively small parish populations which resided in fairly close proximity.

It was only after the formal creation of the diocese of Syracuse by Pope Leo XIII in November 20, 1886, after the appointment of the Right Reverend Patrick A. Ludden in December of that year, that any real consideration was given to the establishment of a Catholic newspaper.

Although the last of seven dioceses into which the State was divided, this diocese included the vast territory first proselytized by men such as the Jesuit Fathers le Moyne, Chaumonot, Dablon, le Mercier, the de Lambervilles, and de l'Huc. In this vast historical setting and faced with the logistical problem of coordinating the works of widely separated parishes and with the ever-burgeoning congregations of Catholic immigrants, the diocese soon sanctioned the formation of the Catholic Sun.

Thus, James K. McGuire, president of the Syracuse Printing and Publishing Co., and Harvey B. Cassidy, secretary-treasurer and manager of that same firm, began in June 1892 to publish the Sun for the nearly 40,000 parishioners of the diocese.

From the first days of that 2-penny paper published in the small pressroom at 117 Market Street in Syracuse, the church in central New York has had its history and growth recorded and reported by the Sun. And what has become so welcome a feature of Sunday mornings began its still continuing struggle of financial security and took its first steps toward active participation in the life of the church.

This editorial excerpt from the July 9, 1911, issue of the Sun bears eloquent testimony to the intent of the paper's first publishers and gives us a glimpse into the early optimism and spirit which has enabled the paper to persevere.

WE ARE PROUD

We feel certain we shall be forgiven if we blow our own horn just a little bit. The Catholic Sun was started with a purpose. To found a Catholic paper is not an easy undertaking. It requires careful management and the most rigid economy. It calls for an endless amount of sticktoativeness, and, even under most favorable conditions, frequently success does not come, so far as the latter is concerned, we are free to admit that this paper has been a success. To be sure, it encountered all the infantile diseases of the newspaper world, but by careful nursing it has survived them all and is now a pretty healthy member of the newspaper family, and, please God, will so remain. . . .

It has always been our aim . . . to put out a paper Catholic to the core; a paper of high moral tone; one that is not afraid to criticize wrong whether it is found in our own ranks or outside; a paper first of all Catholic.

Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the Catholic Sun and its owner-manager, Lawrence Vieu, on the attainment of this landmark in the paper's history, may I express the hope for its continued success as an integral and meaningful segment of the church's "life of grace" in the world and in our homes.

DEBT LIMIT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include letters and enclosures which I have received today from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on the relationship of Federal expenditures to the national economy and on some of the major benefits which have been forthcoming from Federal programs.

I would recommend to the Members of the House that they carefully study these documents and weigh the facts which they contain before casting their votes on the bill to increase the debt limit on Wednesday next.

The documents to which I refer follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1967.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALBERT: On the day after tomorrow the House of Representatives has an important responsibility to discharge. On June 30 the present authority of the Treasury to borrow money will expire. The House will be called upon to vote up or down a bill dealing with the debt limit. That bill has the following purposes, and those purposes only: It is designed to enable the Treasury to pay the government's bills, meet its debt obligations in an orderly and economical way, and avoid a damaging and wholly unnecessary and unprecedented disruption of all government activities, including a vital and expensive armed conflict.

The Treasury cannot spend one red cent that the Congress does not *previously* authorize. The Congress controls the purse. It authorizes programs; it appropriates specific amounts to be spent on these programs.

The debt limit cannot regulate spending. It can paralyze the Treasury's ability to meet the obligations Congress itself creates. If Congress wants to influence the course and amount of spending by the government, it can do so by its action on appropriations or recissions of specific spending authority—and that is the proper way for Congress to regulate spending.

The debt limit bill which the Congress will be asked to approve is recommended *unanimously* by the fifteen Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee, under the Chairmanship of Congressman Wilbur Mills. Their record for fiscal responsibility will stand favorable comparison with any group of legislators anywhere. That is why they are chosen by their colleagues to serve on this distinguished Committee.

They, as would the Secretary of the Treasury, greatly prefer surpluses to deficits, dislike paying large outlays for interest on the national debt, and would enjoy reducing the debt.

But, as responsible legislators, they do not see the sense in withholding adequate authority to borrow money to pay the bills that Congress itself prescribes.

They believe, for reasons spelled out in the report of the Democratic majority, that the debt limit action incorporated in the bill they recommend is the course of fiscal responsibility. They believe it is the most effective way to extend borrowing authority so as to permit orderly and economical financing and, at the same time, encourage prudence and restraint in budget making by the Executive Department and the authorization and appropriating processes by the Congress.

Nearly two weeks ago a majority of the House, including every Republican member voting, defeated a previous proposal to extend the Treasury borrowing authority. From the debate, it would seem that the underlying factor was an erroneous impression that increases in nondefense expenditures are the root cause of deficits in President Johnson's budgets, resulting in an increase in the national debt dangerous to the economy.

Given my departmental and personal bias, customarily I welcome the emphasis on priorities and fiscal responsibility that any in the Congress and the public choose to give. In the past, I have applauded and solicited the support of leaders of the minority for these policies.

But I cannot stand silently by when potentially constructive criticism fails to reflect all the facts, creating an erroneous impression that, if left unanswered and incomplete, might provide the basis for legislative action on the debt limit that would shake confidence in the economy and imperil the essential processes of government.

I invite all those who voted against the provision of additional Treasury borrowing authority week before last, all those who may have believed sincerely that it is necessary to deprive the government of the means of orderly and economical financial management in order to get at Federal spending, and all those who may have done so out of party loyalty but against their real convictions, to consider the facts about Federal spending that follow.

Let us go over the factual record:

The *first and foremost* fact, that the record will support fully, is that, far from being out of control, Federal spending under President Johnson has been subjected to tight, effective and sustained control—even under the stress of war and even in the face of huge increases in revenues—*that were it not for the special costs of resisting Communist aggression in Southeast Asia, the administrative budgets would provide surpluses—not deficits—in fiscal 1966, 1967 and 1968.*

The *second* general fact worth noting is that our deficits in 1965 and 1966 declined to insignificant fractions of gross national product, that even in this fiscal year, when Vietnam spending more than tripled, the deficit will be less than one and a half percent of GNP, and that the best currently available estimate for the coming fiscal year is that the deficit will remain far below the 2.7 percent of GNP figure reached in fiscal 1959 when there was no armed conflict.

The *third* general fact I want to bring out is that during the years in the 1950s when the Republicans were in office, Federal spending was substantially larger in relation to the size of our economy than it has been since, and that in the Johnson years Federal spending has continued to decline as a percent of GNP, *despite and including the addition of Vietnam costs.* The argument that the Budget is a danger to our free enterprise system is, like the notion that our deficits are increasing in real terms, altogether untrue, for *Federal spending was a bigger proportion of the economy in the 1950s than it has been since.*

Finally, since the debt limit is the matter at stake here—however wrongly—let me note that far from increasing, *the Federal debt is continuing to decline* in real per capita terms.

As a real per capita debt, it stood at $1,823 per man, woman and child in 1951, held about steady during the Korean War and has declined steadily since, even into the years of the conflict in Vietnam.

Having made these general observations, I want to go over the record with you.

I challenge those who assert that the Johnson Administration has let spending get out of hand, to answer the following questions, on the basis of the factual record, not of political fantasy:

1. Do those who assert that Federal spending is not under effective control mean that too much is being spent for the defense against communist aggression in Southeast Asia?

2. Or, do they claim that during the four fiscal years for which President Johnson has been fully responsible non-Vietnam spending has gotten out of control?

I want them to face up to these two questions on the basis of these administrative budget facts for fiscal years already complete or nearly complete—Fiscal 1965, 1966 and 1967.

Let me say immediately that by looking at the budget results without the special Vietnam revenues and costs, I emphatically am not trying to wave those costs aside. They are facts of life. What I am getting at is the following: *In the portion of the budget where there is some freedom of choice the President has exercised very strict and effective control of Federal spending.* This can only be seen when the special budget effects of Vietnam are taken into account. Thus, it is necessary to consider the Budget without the Vietnam costs and revenues to get an undistorted view of what has really transpired in the budget in President Johnson's Administration.

During the three complete or nearly complete fiscal years covered by budgets originally prepared and executed by President Johnson (fiscal years 1965, 1966 and 1967) the administrative budget expenditures have increased from $97.7 billion in fiscal 1964 to approximately $127.5 billion. But of that increase in Federal outlays of $29.8 billion, somewhat over $20 billion results from the special costs of resisting aggression in Southeast Asia.

In other words, all non-Vietnam expenditures have increased by some $9.5 billion in three years. That is an increase of a little over $3 billion—or only 3¼ percent—a year. This should be compared to the 7½ percent a year growth of the national economy, and of state and local expenditures averaging 8 percent a year, in this period.

Now let me note these further points, to put the Federal Budget into true perspective:

Of the nearly $9½ billion increase in non-Vietnam expenditures in the three fiscal years for which President Johnson has budgeted, and which are complete or nearly complete, $5 billion is accounted for by three items where increases were beyond Presidential control: interest in the public debt, increased civilian pay, and veterans benefits.

All the other programs of the Federal Government taken together have risen in these years by only 4½ billion, or about $1½ billion per year.

When the Budget for Fiscal Year 1968, which has not yet started, is added, non-Vietnam expenditures are projected to rise $15.5 billion over the four fiscal years.

Of this, the three items not within Presidential control account for $6 billion. That means that all other non-Vietnam programs rise by $9.5 billion. That is less than 3 percent a year. Even if the effect on the budget of sales of financial assets is discounted, the increase is well under 4 percent a year.

Excluding the costs of Vietnam, Federal expenditures in the administrative budget were 16 percent of Gross National Product in 1964. This will drop to 14 percent in the fiscal year about to end.

This compares to an average of 16.3 percent during the last six years of the last Republican Administration—*after* Korean War outlays were ended.

You will receive from the Director of the Budget an account of some of the benefits achieved by these modest and careful increases in non-Vietnam outlays under President Johnson.

In order that you and your colleagues may have the budgetary facts on income and outgo, the deficits, the impact of special costs of the armed conflict in Southeast Asia, and the debt burden, for the years in which President Johnson has had full budgetary responsibility, there is attached a more de-

tailed analysis of these years, with pertinent tables.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

THE JOHNSON BUDGET RECORD

In order to understand fully the picture of budgets, income and outgo, deficits and debt burden, it is necessary to examine the record of the years of the Johnson Administration under those headings.

For this purpose several tables are provided. They contain the principal budget facts as they appear in all three types of the Budgets in use—administrative, cash and national income accounts. But for simplicity of discussion reference will be made only to the administrative budget, with 1967 and 1968 estimates revised according to our latest information. Generally similar results are to be seen in the cash or the national income account budget.

The record for fiscal years 1965 through 1968 that is under examination is not only that of the Johnson Presidency. It is also the record of the Government's income and outgo in the four fiscal years since the passage of the Revenue Act of 1964. This record shows how the potentials of the 1964 Revenue Act for economic growth, economic stability and control of Federal spending have been handled by the Johnson Administration.

Stepped up outlays in Vietnam began in Fiscal 1966. Thus only one of the fiscal years under discussion—1965—is not influenced in a major way by the special costs of the Vietnam conflict. Where the uncertainties of war make comparisons of current estimates for Fiscal 1968 with other years inappropriate, only 1965 through 1967 will be considered.

Section 1—the opening words—of the Revenue Act of 1964 laid a commitment to fiscal responsibility upon both the Executive and the Congress. The Johnson Administration sponsored and heartily agreed to that responsibility, in advance. Section 1 reads:

"It is the sense of Congress that the tax reduction provided by this Act through stimulation of the economy, will, after a brief transitional period, raise (rather than lower) revenues and that *such revenue increases should first be used to eliminate the deficits in the administrative budgets and then to reduce the public debt.* To further the objective of obtaining balanced budgets in the near future, Congress, by this action, recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending and urges the President to declare his accord with this objective. (Emphasis supplied.)

Furthermore, this Act gave a new direction to the uses of fiscal policy that has been described by Chairman Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee:

"There are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road . . . The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government . . . The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector . . .

"Section I of the bill is a firm, positive assertion of the preference of the United States for the tax reduction road to a bigger, more progressive economy."

In his signing statement, President Johnson embraced the objective of stimulating the economy by lightening its tax load and simultaneously controlling increased spending.

Here is the spending and income record that shows how faithfully and effectively he has put that principle into practice. It is summarized in Table 1.

THE INCOME AND OUTGO RECORD

Before Vietnam

Fiscal 1965

The economy responded so quickly to the tax reductions for individuals and businesses that went into effect five months before this fiscal year began that *revenues rose* by $3.6 billion over the year before, to $93.1 billion.

But Federal *spending declined,* by $1.2 billion, to $96.5 billion.

The Vietnam years

Fiscal 1966

Due chiefly to the continued quickening of the economy following the 1964 tax cut *revenues climbed* in Fiscal 1966 by no less than $11.6 billion.

Even in the face of such a bounty, *the President continued to hold spending below* the rise in the government's income, and it was due only to the inclusion of $6.1 billion of special Vietnam outlays that in Fiscal 1966 spending increased by as much as $10.5 billion.

In Fiscal 1966 revenues raised especially to pay the costs of Vietnam came to $1.2 billion. The special costs of Vietnam that year came to $6.1 billion. Thus, without Vietnam, the record would have been about as follows—give or take a little for indirect effects that can only be guessed—as seen in Table 2:

Non-Vietnam revenues up by $10.4 billion, but *non-Vietnam spending up by less than half as much,* or some $4.4 billion.

Fiscal 1967

In this fiscal year the costs of Vietnam rose so swiftly that total Federal spending rose much faster than revenues.

It is the only year in which this is so. While the original Budget was planned to keep these expenditure increases roughly in line with revenues, the accelerated pace of the war, special expenditures made necessary because of tight money and high interest rates, and outlays voted by this Congress over and above the levels of the President's Budget all contributed to a spending total well over $15 billion in excess of that planned. Here is the 1967 record, as it is estimated at this time:

Total revenues will be up by some $11.8 billion, but total spending will rise by $20.5 billion.

If special Vietnam revenues and outlays are set aside, the comparison with non-Vietnam income and outgo of the year before is:

Non-Vietnam revenues up in Fiscal 1967 by $8.4 billion,

But, again, non-Vietnam expenditures up by substantially less than revenues, at about $6 billion.

Fiscal 1968

Here, of course, only estimates are available, for a year of more than the usual uncertainties, that begins a month from now. Both Budget Director Schultze and the Secretary of the Treasury emphasized in testimony to the House Ways and Means Committee on May 15 the fact that Fiscal 1968 estimates, although they are based on the best current information, are vulnerable to the incalculable uncertainties of war. These estimates, nevertheless, are the best that can currently be made.

Total revenues in Fiscal 1968 are expected to increase some $9.0 billion.

Total spending, on the basis of the best current information, are expected also to increase $9.0.

With Vietnam revenues and outlays set aside, however, the changes from the comparable 1967 totals would be:

Non-Vietnam revenues up $8.6 billion, but—

Non-Vietnam spending up by approximately $7 billion, once again well under the rise of revenues.

Now one further and very important fact that is never mentioned by critics of the Administration's Budgets:

During the final six fiscal years of the last Republican Administration—*which were not burdened by any special defense costs*—the Administrative Budget averaged 16.3 percent of Gross National Product.

But, in the seven complete or nearly complete Democratic fiscal years that have followed, *including* the $20 billion rise in Vietnam costs of fiscal 1966 and 1967, the Budget has averaged only 15.6 percent of GNP.

And, in the three Johnson fiscal years 1965, 1966 and 1967, *in which the Vietnam costs are concentrated, the average is nevertheless still lower:* 15.5 percent:

THE DEFICIT RECORD

This control of Federal expenditures has had an effect upon our deficits that is not reflected in many comments about the Administration's fiscal record. Once again, let us look at the administrative budget record. Tables 1, 3 and 4 are of interest here.

Including the effect of Vietnam on both spending and revenues, the control over spending exercised by the President has reduced the deficit in two out of the three fiscal years for which he has had full budgetary responsibility and that are nearly completed.

Excluding Vietnam revenues and outlays, there has been but one deficit, and there would have been two surpluses, in the Fiscal Years 1965 through 1967. Without Vietnam, the Fiscal 1968 estimates would show a third surplus, out of four years, for the Johnson Administration, and the size of the surpluses would be growing.

Here are the figures, *with* Vietnam:

In Fiscal Year 1965, the deficit declined by more than half, to $3.4 billion.

In Fiscal 1966, the deficit shrank further to $2.3 billion despite an addition to spending due to Vietnam—net of special revenues raised to defray the costs of Vietnam—amounting to $4.9 billion.

In Fiscal 1967 the deficit rose to $11 billion as now estimated. This results from an increase in spending due to Vietnam of some $15½ billion, net of special Vietnam revenues.

And in the Fiscal 1968 Budget, information currently available indicates a substantially unchanged deficit, despite a further net addition to expenditures, due to Vietnam, of more than $17 billion.

THE DEBT BURDEN RECORD

Another result of the fiscal control exercised by President Johnson is a national debt that—despite the costs of Vietnam—is continuing to move downward in relation to the economy of which it is a part. Here, again, is the record, which can be seen in Table 4, and, for Fiscal Years 1964 to 1967, in Table 1.

During the three complete or nearly complete fiscal years—Fiscal 1965, 1966 and 1967—the public debt has grown from $312.5 billion at the end of Fiscal 1964 to the estimate of $327.2 billion for the end of Fiscal 1967.

That is a growth of $14.7 billion, or approximately 4.7 percent, in the public debt.

In the same three years, the gross national product will rise according to current estimates by approximately 25 percent—or, five times as much as the public debt.

Or, to put it another way, when Fiscal 1964 ended, the national debt was 51 percent of the gross national product.

But by the end Fiscal 1967, the national debt is expected to be down to 43 percent of the gross national product. That is a very big drop in only three years.

TABLE 1.—*The spending and income record, fiscal years 1964–68*

[Dollars in billions]

Budget	Fiscal years	Revenues	Revenues (+) or (−)	Spending	Spending (+) or (−)	Deficit	Deficit (+) or (−)	Public debt,[1] end of year	Percent of GNP
Administrative budget	1964	$89.5	+$3.1	$97.7	+$5.0	$8.2	+$2.0	$312.5	51
	1965	93.1	+3.6	96.5	−1.2	3.4	−4.8	317.9	49
	1966	104.7	+11.6	107.0	+10.5	2.3	−1.2	320.4	45
	1967 [2]	116.5	+11.8	127.5	+20.5	11.0	+8.8	327.2	43
	1968 [2]	125.5	+9.0	136.5	+9.0	11.0	=NC		
	1966–68 [2]		+32.4		+40.0				
Cash budget	1964	115.5	+5.8	120.3	+6.6	4.8	+.8		
	1965	119.7	+4.2	122.4	+2.1	2.7	−2.1		
	1966	134.5	+14.8	137.8	+15.4	3.3	+.6		
	1967	154.7	+20.2	160.9	+23.1	6.2	+2.9		
	1968	168.1	+13.4	172.4	+11.5	4.2	−1.9		
	1966–68		+48.4		+50.0				
NIA budget	1964	115.5	+5.3	116.9	+5.5	1.4	+.2		
	1965	120.6	+5.1	118.3	+1.4	[2] 2.3	−3.7		
	1966	132.6	+12.0	132.3	+14.0	[3] .3	+(4)		
	1967	149.8	+17.2	153.6	+21.3	3.8	[5] +4.1		
	1968	167.1	+17.3	169.2	+15.6	2.1	−1.7		
	1966–68		+46.5		+50.9				

[1] Includes Government enterprise debt guaranteed by U.S. Treasury.
[2] Gives effect to revisions by Treasury Secretary Fowler and Budget Director Schultze to House Ways and Means Committee, May 15, 1967.
[3] Surplus.
[4] Reduction of surplus.
[5] Surplus of 0.3 to deficit of 3.8.

TABLE 2.—*Administrative budget results, fiscal years 1964 through 1968 with and without special Vietnam costs and revenues*

[Dollars in billions]

Administrative budget	Fiscal years										
	1964	1965	1966	1967 [1]	1968 [1]	Change, 1965–67 (Johnson administration years, complete or nearly complete)		Change, 1965–68 (Johnson administration budgets)		Change, 1966–67 (Vietnam years, complete or nearly complete)	
						Amount [1]	Percent	Amount [1]	Percent	Amount [1]	Percent
Total outlays	$97.7	$96.5	$107.0	$127.5	$136.5						
Total revenues	89.5	93.1	104.7	116.5	125.5						
Deficit (−)	−8.2	−3.4	−2.3	−11.0	−11.0						
Total outlays	97.7	96.5	107.0	127.5	136.5	$29.8	30	$38.8	40	$31.0	32
Vietnam outlays			6.1	20.0+	22.0+	20.0+		22.0+		20.0+	
Non-Vietnam outlays	97.7	96.5	100.9	107.0+	114.0+	9.0+	10	16.0+	17	10.0+	11
Revenues	89.5	93.1	104.7	116.5	125.5	27.0	30	36.0	40	23.4	25
Vietnam revenues			1.2	4.6	5.0	4.6		5.0		4.6	
Non-Vietnam revenues	89.5	93.1	103.5	111.9	120.5	22.4	25	31.0	35	18.8	20
Non-Vietnam outlays	97.7	96.5	100.9	107.0+	114.0+						
Non-Vietnam revenues	89.5	93.1	103.5	112.0	120.5						
Surpluses (+) or deficits (−)	−8.2	−3.4	+2.6	[2] +5.0	[2] +6.0						

[1] Gives effect to budget revisions estimated May 15 by Secretary of the Treasury Fowler and Budget Director Schultze in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.
[2] Estimated.

TABLE 3.—*Summary*

Budget	Years in which deficit declined or there was a surplus	Years when there was no change	Years when deficit increased
Administrative [1]	1965, 1966	1968	1967.
Cash	1965, 1968		1966, 1967.
NIA	1965,[2] 1966,[2] 1968		1967.

Budget	Rise of revenues (billions)	Rise of outlays (billions)
Administrative: [1]		
1965	+$3.6	−$1.2
1966–68	+32.4	+40.0
1965–68	+36.0	+38.8
Cash:		
1965	+4.2	+2.1
1966–68	48.4	50.0
1965–68	52.6	+52.1
NIA:		
1965	5.1	1.4
1966–68	46.5	50.9
1965–58	51.6	52.3

[1] Gives effect to revisions in fiscal year 1967 and 1968 budgets in testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Fowler and Budget Director Schultze to House Ways and Means Committee, May 15, 1967.
[2] Surplus.

TABLE 4.—*Public debt, deficits, and surpluses*

End of fiscal year	Public debt (billions)	Public debt as percent of GNP	Real per capita public debt	Surplus (+) or deficit (−) (billions)	Surplus (+) or deficit (−) as percent of GNP	Real economic growth rates after Korea and before Vietnam (percent)
World War II:						
1940	$48.5	51.1	$783	−$3.9		
1946	269.9	133.9	2,544	−20.7		
1950	257.4	97.7	1,946	−3.1	1.2	
Korea:						
1951	255.3	82.2	1,823	+3.5	+1.1	
1952	259.2	76.8	1,824	−4.0	1.2	
1953	266.1	74.1	1,826	−9.5	2.6	
1954	271.3	74.9	1,821	−3.1	.9	
Peacetime:						
1955	274.4	72.5	1,802	−4.2	1.1	
1956	272.8	66.6	1,706	+1.6	+.4	
1957	270.6	62.7	1,611	+1.6	+.4	2.2
1958	276.4	62.8	1,598	−2.8	.7	
1959	284.8	60.7	1,593	−12.4	2.7	
1960	286.5	57.8	1,540	+1.2	+.2	
1961	289.2	57.1	1,532	−3.9	.8	
1962	298.6	55.1	1,528	−6.4	1.2	4.7
1963	306.5	53.4	1,515	−6.3	1.1	
1964	312.5	51.5	1,518	−8.2	1.3	
1965	317.9	48.8	1,478	−3.4	.5	5.9
Vietnam:						
1966	320.4	45.0	1,452	−2.2	.3	
1967	328.6	43.2		−11.0	1.4	

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1967.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALBERT: In his letter to you of June 19, Secretary Fowler states that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will provide you with additional information about the relationship of Federal expenditures to the national economy and about some of the major benefits which have been forthcoming from Federal programs.

I am enclosing a statement which covers both of these matters.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director.

(Enclosure.)

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO THE FEDERAL BUDGET SINCE 1964

In explaining the 1964 tax cut, House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills stated:

"There are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road . . . The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government . . . The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector . . ."

Expenditure data clearly show that the Government has followed the road outlined by Chairman Mills—*Federal activity is not taking a larger share of economic activity—indeed quite to the contrary.*

1. *Excluding the costs of Vietnam,* Federal expenditures in the administrative budget were 16% of gross national product in 1964—they will be 14% in fiscal 1967 and 1968. Taking all four years of the Johnson Administration together, Federal non-Vietnam expenditures averaged 14.2% of the gross national product, compared to 16.3% for the last six years of President Eisenhower's Administration, the period after the end of the Korean War.

2. *Even including the costs of Vietnam*—which are running in excess of $20 billion—the ratio of Federal expenditures to GNP, in both fiscal 1967 and 1968, will be 16.8%, less than in 1955 and 1959 (years in which there were no war expenditures), and far below the 21% reached during the Korean War. Finally, taking all four years of the Johnson Administration together, Federal expenditures, *including the costs of Vietnam,* averaged 15.8% of GNP—compared to the 16.3% ratio for the last six Eisenhower years.

3. In absolute amounts, non-Vietnam expenditures will have risen by some $9½ billion *between fiscal 1964 and 1967.* This is an increase of only 3½% per year—compared to increases in the national economy averaging about 7½% a year and in State and local expenditures, averaging 8% a year. If we add 1968, the rise in non-Vietnam expenditures over the past four years equals about $15½ billion, or still less than 4% per year.

4. Of the $9½ billion increase in non-Vietnam expenditures between 1964 and 1967, $5 billion is accounted for by three uncontrollable items: interest on the public debt, increased civilian pay, and veterans' benefits. *All other programs of the Federal Government taken together, have risen by only $4½ billion—about $1½ billion per year.*

5. *Taking 1968 into account,* we find non-Vietnam expenditures rising $15½ billion, of which interest, civilian pay raises, and veterans account for $6 billion. All other programs rise by $9½ billion—*less than 3% per year.* Even if we discount the effect on the budget of sales of financial assets, the increase is well under 4% per year.

6. If we use *the more comprehensive national income accounts budget, non-Vietnam expenditures fall from 19.1% of GNP in 1964 to 17.6% in 1967.* The ratio increases to about 18% in 1968. The NIA budget (as a percentage of GNP) declines less than the administrative budget primarily because of the rapidly rising expenditures of the self-financed *trust funds.* But these funds are running a substantial surplus—revenues have risen faster than expenditures.

7. In the past four years sound fiscal and economic policies have produced an unparalleled economic growth. Because of this we have been able to launch an attack on some of the Nation's most urgent social problems *without* enlarging the share of the Federal Government in the Nation's economy. In fiscal 1968 our gross national product will be $190 to $200 billion higher than in 1964. The expansion of the Federal Government's major social programs will have taken some 6% of this increase. Put another way, the major advances being made to meet pressing national needs—in education, health, welfare, regional economic development, pollution control, housing and community development, and the war on poverty—*all of these will absorb only one-sixteenth of the increase in our national output.*

On any measure, non-Vietnam expenditures have risen less rapidly than the national economy. They account for a smaller—not a larger share of our national income. We have kept to the path chosen at the time the 1964 tax reduction was adopted. Charges have been made that Federal spending is out of control and is taking an even larger share of the Nation's income. The facts I have recited clearly show these charges to be incorrect in fact and misleading in implication.

All this is not to deny the obvious fact that Federal spending, outside of Vietnam, has risen; but

—the gross national product is on the rise

—the population is on the rise

—the standard of living of the American people is on the rise

—the services demanded of the Federal Government are on the rise.

What does this mean?

Let me quote former President Eisenhower:

"We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Between July 1964 and July 1968, our population increase is estimated at more than 9½ million. This *increase alone,* is equal to the entire population of Portugal or Belgium, and of Denmark and Finland combined. National income and output have risen even faster than population. In fact, the mere *increase* in U.S. gross national product between 1964 and 1968, in dollars of constant purchasing power, is half again as large as the entire output of Canada and Mexico combined.

This rise in population and income has naturally had an impact on the Federal budget but its impact has been even larger on the budgets of State and local governments and on the budgets of our corporations, businesses and consumers.

There is a companion story that should always be published directly opposite the column of budget figures . . . it is the output of the budget—what we have bought with our budget outlays.

As I indicated earlier, outside of civilian pay increases, interest on the debt, and veterans' benefits, non-Vietnam expenditures will have risen by less than 3% per year between 1964 and 1968.

If you want to account for the less than 3% per year rise since 1964, here are some of the reasons:

Visitors to our national parks and forests will have increased by more than 50%.

The number of aircraft landings and take-

offs monitored and controlled by FAA will have increased nearly 70%.

The volume of mail will have risen by nearly 20%.

Most important, however, the 1968 budget includes funds for major new efforts in the fields of health, education, community development, the war on poverty, and pollution control. For instance, by 1968—

8,500,000 children and 20,000 school districts will be aided by grants under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

More than 330 *community mental health centers* will be established through direct Federal aid.

The number of *medical and nursing students* aided will rise by over 40,000.

The number of Federally assisted *public housing units* will have grown by nearly 30 percent.

More than 1.9 million additional grants and loans will be made to *undergraduate and college students.*

The number of *rehabilitations* under the Vocational Rehabilitation Program will increase over 80%.

The number of active *urban renewal projects* will have risen by nearly 45%.

Over 1,000,000 persons will have been approved for *training* under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

32 *medical schools* will be constructed or improved by direct Federal aid.

This is what the Federal budget is all about—people, productivity, and progress. *Yet, with all this, administrative budget expenditures, excluding Vietnam, have been declining during the past four years as a percent of the gross national product—from 16 percent in 1964 to 14 percent in 1968.*

JOHN E. FOGARTY PUBLIC PERSONNEL AWARD

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the announcement that Mr. Morris Leonhard, director of the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission, will receive the John E. Fogarty Public Personnel Award from the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Mr. Leonhard is a distinguished public servant. I have had many dealings with him over the years and have always been impressed by his work and his concern for handicapped persons.

I think it is particularly fitting that this annual award has been renamed in honor of our late colleague, John E. Fogarty, and there could be no more deserving recipient than Morris Leonhard.

Oklahomans have long been aware of Mr. Leonhard's great contributions, and I am glad that he has now been so recognized by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

The announcement follows:

MORRIS LEONHARD TO RECEIVE JOHN E. FOGARTY PUBLIC PERSONNEL AWARD

Morris Leonhard, Director of the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission, has been selected to receive the "John E. Fogarty Public Personnel Award," it was announced today by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Presentation of the award will be by Harold Russell, Chairman of the President's Committee, at an appropriate meeting to be decided later.

The award, a Distinguished Service Plaque with a plate bearing the words "John E. Fogarty Public Personnel Award" and the signature of the President of the United States, is given annually to a personnel official in a Federal, State, or municipal public agency who makes an outstanding contribution to employment of the handicapped in the agency in which he is employed. The selection was made by a group of judges under the direction of Patrick Healy, Executive Director, National League of Cities, and Chairman of the Public Service Committee of the President's Committee.

Mr. Leonhard has set a personal example in his agency by promulgation of policies concerning handicapped employees. Not only have these policies provided for hiring the qualified handicapped persons, they have also provided for continuing employment of personnel who became handicapped during their tenure of employment. He has retained and reassigned employees disabled by injury or disease to other jobs commensurate with their ability, and has re-evaluated or re-designed jobs to compensate for disabilities so that the employee's abilities could be fully utilized without loss of self-respect.

At the time of his nomination, 65.6 percent, or 417 of the total agency staff of 635 have some type of disability and perform their jobs satisfactorily.

In addition, Mr. Leonhard has initiated special agency programs to assist the handicapped in becoming employed, such as assigning special representatives for the handicapped in each of the 31 offices located in 24 cities. The success of Mr. Leonhard's efforts in behalf of the handicapped worker is evidenced by the fact that Oklahoma, in 1965, although 27th in population, ranked fifth in the Nation in total number of handicapped applicants placed in jobs.

Mr. Leonhard began his public service career in the employment field with the National Re-employment Service Office at Anadarko, Oklahoma. In January 1937, when the Oklahoma State Employment Service was created, he became a member of the administrative staff and served as Assistant to the State Director. In 1946 he was named Director of the Agency, which is now known as the Oklahoma Employment Security Commission.

Mr. Leonhard earlier received the Public Personnel Award from the Oklahoma City Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and the 1966 State Public Personnel Award from the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. He was nominated for the President's Committee Award by the Oklahoma Governor's Committee.

Although the Public Personnel Award has been presented annually by the President's Committee since 1954, this year it was renamed the John E. Fogarty Public Personnel Award as a tribute to the late Congressman Fogarty of Rhode Island. As Chairman of the United States House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of health, education, welfare and labor appropriations bills, Congressman Fogarty was one of the strongest champions of handicapped people, giving them hope and encouragement and inspiring others to do more in easing their load.

EXTEND AND IMPROVE MEDICARE

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the social security medicare program has now been in operation for nearly a year. It is, without doubt, an unqualified success. But, as with any new program, medicare can be strengthened and improved. It is in this spirit, therefore, that I am today introducing five bills to extend and improve medicare coverage for the Nation's older citizens.

One of these bills would go far to remedy what I consider to be one of the most inexcusable situations confronting the ill: their inability to meet the excessively high costs of drugs. Millions of our older citizens, living on fixed incomes, cannot afford the fruits of our scientific progress. This is inexcusable. The recent disclosures of vast price spreads between brand name drugs and drugs sold by generic name attests to the crying need for remedial legislation.

The bill I am introducing will enable persons enrolled in part B of medicare to receive, beginning January 1969, benefit allowances toward the cost of drugs requiring a prescription, after they have first paid an initial $25 toward their cost. The schedule of allowances will be so drawn up as to encourage doctors to prescribe by generic name rather than by brand name. This, I feel, will be to the advantage of all.

My second bill, more modest in scope, also addresses itself to the financial difficulties of medicare beneficiaries. Under existing law, patients of doctors who refuse to accept medicare assignments must pay their doctor's bills in their entirety before they can claim reimbursement from medicare. This places an intolerable financial burden on many patients and, in some cases, forces them to seek care from doctors not of their first choice. To correct that situation, the bill would allow a patient to file for his claim with an unpaid bill, thus allowing him to defer payment to the doctor until he can pay the entire amount.

The third bill provides for the reimbursement of medicare patients for their transportation to a hospital or rehabilitation center to receive the care of a physical therapist. Quite simply, the bill would strike out language in the Medicare Act—title XVIII, section 1861, m. 7—which states that expenses can be paid "but not including transportation of the individual in connection with any such item or service."

Because of the statute's present wording, therapists must travel to patients' homes or to distant extended care facilities, thus dissipating their time and reducing their availability to other patients. We should eliminate this difficulty by providing reimbursement for travel to the patients themselves.

My fourth bill is designed to remedy some of the inadequacies which have become apparent in the Nation's nursing home program. Sixty percent of all patients in nursing homes across the country are recipients of Federal assistance—some $280 million a year. Yet, we have little assurance that this money is efficiently and well spent.

Federal medical assistance programs have clearly overemphasized institutional medical services. The bill calls on the States to provide home health services where these will fit the patient's needs. Not only will this free much-needed space in the nursing homes, but it will be more economical and more responsive to the individual needs of our citizens.

In those cases where patients do require nursing home care, the bill assures them the kind of professional care they need. At this moment, almost half of the nursing homes in the United States have no registered nurse associated with the institution, and only a few have rehabilitative or restorative services for their patients. The bill would correct these deficiencies.

This legislation also requires that the States conduct periodic reviews of nursing home care to assure that facilities are used to the optimum and that patients are provided with the most appropriate services. Also, it requires them to keep accurate and easily verifiable records of medical services rendered to assure that patients receiving Federal assistance get what they pay for. Finally, the bill provides that payments to nursing homes and home health agencies fully reflect the reasonable cost of services rendered.

The fifth bill would extend medicare coverage to the 2.6 million State and local employees who are not eligible under existing law. Many of them would like to be covered, but cannot be as long as the law also requires them to be under the social security retirement system, of which most State and local governments are not a part.

Quite simply, this bill would permit State and local government employees to obtain medical insurance without also having to participate in the retirement system. Since these two insurance programs are administered separately anyway, this should not be difficult to accomplish. State and local governments and their employees would pay for their medicare coverage according to the schedule now set out in the law—that is, 0.5 percent of salary up to $6,600 per employee and employer, rising to 0.85 percent in 1987. In short, these new participants would fully pay their share of insurance coverage. I see every reason that they should be included.

Each of the five bills I introduce here today sets out to fill gaps in existing medicare legislation. The original law was, indeed, precedent breaking and effectively responsive to a desperate social need. But the work of Congress is never done. We have a continuing responsibility to insure that medicare meets the needs of all our elderly citizens, that it is well administered, and that it remains open to essential improvements. In fulfilling that responsibility, let us give these bills the favorable attention they deserve.

LOUIS AZRAEL TELLS HOW TO TALK ABOUT MARYLAND

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are justly proud of our beautiful city of Washington, the Capital of our great Nation. Yet many people do not know that the District of Columbia was a gift of my State of Maryland to the United States as a seat of the Federal Government.

Therefore, it would appear to be obvious that more people should know something about the Free State, which is the first State south of the Mason-Dixon line. Maryland has been a political entity for over three centuries and its capitol—the State House—which is still in use, was built in 1772, and is where Gen. George Washington resigned his commission.

From the days when it was first a British colony in 1634, to the present, the State of Maryland has always played an important role in American history, in science, culture, education, commerce, and industry. How then shall we talk of this place that has produced many truly great men? What shall we say of its amazing growth and its vitality? I call my colleagues' attention to an excellently written article by Louis Azrael entitled "How To Talk About Maryland," which appeared in the News American of Baltimore on Sunday, June 18, 1967.

Mr. Azrael, a regular columnist for that important newspaper, is not only a gifted writer with a fluent pen, but he also possesses a keen intellect and incisive mind as evidenced in his daily column. What he says is always of interest. Under unanimous consent I include his article about Maryland—America in miniature—at this point in the RECORD:

HOW TO TALK ABOUT MARYLAND

(By Louis Azrael)

Before summer ends you'll probably go somewhere outside Maryland, or you'll talk with people who visit Maryland, and you'll be asked questions.

What's your state like, they will ask. Tell me about it.

The usual response to such questions is to talk about Maryland's variety, ("America in Miniature") and the Chesapeake Bay, about fish and crabs, and sailboats, about Fort McHenry, and Johns Hopkins, about Western Maryland's mountains and the Eastern Shore's traditions—whatever they may be.

But maybe, at this point, you'll need some help.

What you tell about your state should depend, of course, on whom you're talking to; on what interests your hearer.

Is he interested in vital statistics? You can tell him that Maryland has about 3,700,000 inhabitants and gets 228 more each average day. And that the state has 6.3 million acres of land, one-half of which is used for 20,670 farms.

You can say that over 800 islands, not counting the hundreds which are less than ten acres large, lie within Maryland waters. (Some have amusing names: Pone, Tizzard, Shelldrake, Tippity-Witchy, etc.)

And you can sadly add that over 300 acres of Maryland soil disappear every year, washed into the waters by erosion which proper management could greatly reduce.

Is your hearer interested in business? You can boast that 38 corporations, chartered in Maryland, are listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Only eight states have more (Delaware leads with 443) though Maryland ranks twenty-first in population. And add that there are 172 banks, which have 516 branches, in the state.

Do you like to use big figures? Tell the folks that Maryland's state roads cover land which, at book values, is worth almost two billion dollars. Or say the state's 5,000 dairy farms produce 178 million gallons of milk per year.

You might be able to surprise some persons by dropping the remark that one-fourth of all Marylanders are involved in the school system, either as pupils, faculty members or service employees . . . And that the biggest transportation system in the state is the school bus system, which operates almost 5,000 buses and two boats.

Is your hearer impressed by "firsts" and "onlys"? Tell him the oldest railroad station in the world, which still serves trains, is on the B. and O. main line at Ellicott City . . . And that the biggest water wheel in the world is near Chesapeake City at the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. Unused now, it was equipped with huge buckets that scooped water out of Back Creek and dumped it into the canal to retain its water level.

You can tell him about the oldest grist mill in operation in the United States. It is the Linchester Mill near Preston in Caroline County . . . and about the oldest Protestant Church in the United States, which is Trinity Church near Cambridge . . . and about the first National Cathedral Shrine, a replica of the shrine at the Grotto of Lourdes, which is on a mountain side near Emmitsburg in Frederick County.

And speaking of "only," you can tell him that Maryland is the only state in the country which still has a Motion Picture Censor Board. (Though it has been shorn of almost all its power.)

You can talk about strange places. For instance, the Craneville Swamp in Garrett County. It is freakish because much of its vegetation and some of its animals are the kind that should be several hundred miles north, even as far as Canada.

Somehow, as the Ice Age passed, this swamp's elevation and drainage facilities created a "frost pocket." In that pocket, such far-north plants as the tamarack, such animals as the Snowshoe Hare, such birds as the slate-colored Snowbird, remain and reproduce.

You can talk of the wildlife refuge at Blackwater Park in Dorchester County which teems, in season, with thousands of ducks and geese and rare song birds.

SECURE EXISTENCE

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are focused today on the United Nations General Assembly as it starts its emergency session to discuss recent events in the Middle East, at the request of Soviet Russia.

It is strange indeed for Communist Russia to charge the small State of Israel with "aggression" against its Arab neighbors when it is a well-known fact that Russia has backed Nasser for years in her ambition to destroy Israel. One need only to review the lineup of forces on both

sides to realize that in numbers, geography and resources, the Arabs have a huge advantage over Israel. It is unrealistic to believe that Israel, with her population of 2.7 million, would commit aggression against the Arab countries with a population of 54 million.

It is also a fact that the Arabs have been belligerent for decades and that the attitude of Russia has been one of hostility toward Israel; that the entire history of Russia has been one of terror and aggression.

In the treaty that will eventually be signed to bring peace to the Middle East, I submit that Israel must be permitted to use the Suez Canal, which the United Nations and the great powers promised as a condition of the 1957 armistice, but which the Arabs never allowed.

Israel must also be able to use the Gulf of Aqaba—an international waterway, without hindrance. And, in all justice and fairness, that ancient land which was reborn 19 years ago should not be required to withdraw from the territory which is rightly hers.

Because of the timeliness and importance to the peace of the world in solving the Middle East situation, I invite my colleagues' attention to an editorial in the influential Baltimore Sun entitled "Secure Existence," which appeared on Sunday, June 18, 1967. It is as follows:

"SECURE EXISTENCE"

President Johnson's statement at Austin—"The first and greatest requirement is that each nation must accept the right of its neighbors to stable and secure existence"—starts the United States in the right direction in the discussion of the Middle East which now has moved to the United Nations General Assembly. This is the relevant point. If it were accepted by Egypt and the other Arab states, plus the Soviet Union, progress could be made towards solutions of such matters as passage through the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal, the possible internationalizing of Jerusalem and the resettlement of the Arab refugees.

Israel cannot be expected to pull back its troops from their present positions—and least of all to return to the conditions which prevailed as of June 4—without solid assurances that it will not henceforth be compelled to fight almost continuously for its existence against states pledged to its destruction. Assurances of this kind must come from its Arab state neighbors, but the two big powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, can do much to help guide developments in that direction.

President Johnson's point should be followed up, and amplified, in the General Assembly on Monday. A restrained, forward-looking position by the United States would put us on the right side in the United Nations debate. Moreover, it would help to expose the weakness of the Soviet Union's position if, as thus far indicated, the big Russian delegation came to this country primarily to put on a propaganda show against Israel and the United States.

ELEMENTS OF CONFLICT BETWEEN THE SEC PROPOSALS AND THE GOVERNMENT'S SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Philip F. Hack, of New Orleans, La., I am calling to your attention the following article by one of his associates, Mr. Robert B. Lacoste:

ELEMENTS OF CONFLICT BETWEEN THE SEC PROPOSALS AND THE GOVERNMENT'S SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

Analysis of the NASD Study undertaken by Booz-Allen Applied Research, Inc., covering the probable effect of implementing proposals of the SEC in its report to the Congress, entitled *Public Policy Implications of Investment Company Growth,* calling for legislative and other action, reveals that the proposals would bring about effects directly opposed to the main thrust of the Government's intervention in American Business and industry over the past several decades.

A juxtaposition of the elements in this pattern of cross-currents will serve to bring out this contradiction:

1. Bigness, tending toward monopoly, has been fought by the Government under anti-trust laws for many years; the SEC proposals, in going far toward making it impossible for small securities firms to survive, would concentrate the securities business in the hands of a few big houses.

2. One of the capital sins in the SEC decalog is the churning of investments; the development of the mutual fund investment is the greatest anti-churning device ever invented. The SEC would nevertheless not hesitate to cripple its expansion by eliminating the small dealer and representative (through non-profitability growing out of the proposed restrictions) who are the grass roots of its distribution.

3. Government programs and subsidies in support of small business have long been the order of the day and are currently being pushed with dizzying fervor; the SEC proposals would tend to eliminate small business in the securities field.

4. The trend of Government over the years has been toward an increased democratization of society in all of its institutions; the SEC proposals tend toward a return to plutocracy in the investment field, both as to the seller of securities and as to the investor in that, legislated, these proposals would eliminate the contact between little representative and little investor, a confrontation which, in the past, has contributed heavily to the growth of mutual fund investment to $37 Billion.

5. Beginning with Social Security and continuing down through the years to Medicare legislation, the Government has deplored the lot of the indigent old and put expensive programs into being to mitigate their condition; it is a proven fact that the mass of the people can provide for their own old age *only* by a systematic, long range program of salvaging small sums from current spending and investing it in a medium which accepts small sums; the availability of investment in American industry to the little man through the medium of Mutual Funds, sold by little men as a vehicle for accumulating adequate retirement funds, is in the very spirit of the Government's concern. But the SEC proposals, in curtailing the sale of Mutual Funds for reasons clearly delineated in the NASD study, strikes at the Government's own objectives.

6. The Government has spent vast sums of money over the years in an effort to persuade the American people to work together toward the realization of a Great Society with a feeling of pride and oneness of purpose—what other philosophical basis could there be to labor laws, management-labor arbitration, adoption of standards of quality, social legislation, government regulation in the utilities and transportation fields etc.?—and the ownership in common of American industry through Mutual Fund investment (no other vehicle makes this common ownership possible for the mass of the people) is one sure means of giving everybody a stake in America's future and motivating the desired National esprit-de-corps; viewed in this light, the SEC proposals are deplorably anti-American and anti-democratic.

No doubt many additional cross-currents could be invoked but these few are sufficient to show that the SEC proposals are out of step with the times.

One cannot help feeling that at the very bottom of this contradiction lies a deep-seated antagonism to the operation of the profit motive which has been the catalyst in the development of America's gigantic economic position. Only people who are bemused by this bias can be blind to the fact that Mutual Funds, like Life Insurance, are not bought but sold, that they will not be sold if the representatives and dealers cannot make a living selling them and the small investor will be deprived of the many advantages they hold for him. It is as simple as the scriptural injunction "Muzzle not the ox that grindeth out the corn."

In the effect that they would have on the distribution of Mutual Funds, these SEC proposals are anti-people measures, and anti-little people at that. The big security houses and the big investors will continue to handle big deals in an atmosphere of expensive cigar smoke but the dream of the little man that he too can grow along with American industry *as an owner* will be shattered. This is not Democracy at work.

The poor man's Wall Street must be saved.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION RELATING TO PRIVATE AND FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues here know, the Second Congressional District of California contains more than 12½ million acres of national forest lands. In many instances the U.S. Government, through the Forest Service, owns and controls up to 75 percent of the total land area in some of my counties.

Developed communities, while located on private lands, are completely surrounded by Federal lands and in many cases have no opportunity to expand because they are completely boxed in by public lands.

You can, therefore, appreciate the very critical problems which local government face. A short time ago Mr. Arch G. Mahan, a supervisor from Mono County, who is extremely knowledgeable and highly respected throughout the State as the chairman of the resources committee of the County Supervisors Association of California, testified before the Public Land Law Review Commission at hearings held in Fresno, Calif.

Mr. Mahan's testimony and the resolution of the National Association of Counties describe the problems and pro-

posed a realistic solution which I certainly would like to see considered by the Federal Government. So that all of my colleagues could benefit from Mr. Mahan's remarks, I would like to have submitted at this point in the RECORD his remarks and the resolution. They are as follows:

REMARKS BY MR. MAHAN

My name is A. G. Mahan. I am a Supervisor of Mono County and Chairman of the Resources Committee of the County Supervisors Association of California.

In February 1966, the Resources Committee adopted a resolution requesting the County Supervisors Association of California to recommend to the Public Land Law Review Commission that it in turn recommend to Congress the enactment of appropriate legislation that would permit counties and local governments to acquire at nominal prices, and utilize certain Forest Service lands, for health, education, and recreation purposes, only after comprehensive local governmental plans and zoning have been adopted and placed into effect.

This resolution was ratified by the Board of Directors of the County Supervisors Association of California in February 1966.

On July 20, 1966, the 2900 assembled county officials of the National Association of Counties, meeting at the annual conference in New Orleans, adopted this resolution.

I will not read the resolution, but it is attached to this prepared statement.

We find that the Forest Service is most willing to cooperate with local governments in leasing lands needed for local purposes, but their policy requires that the annual rental fee be a percentage of the appraised value of such Forest Service lands.

In counties of large federal ownership, private property is limited and therefore appraisal of both private and federal lands results in such high annual rental fees that it creates a heavy tax burden on the property tax payer who owns property in a community surrounded by Forest Service lands, where the community must rely on Forest Service lands for sewage disposal sites, water works sites, school playgrounds, community parks and playgrounds and other health, education and recreation purposes.

While we, in all levels of government are cognizant of the need to give every relief possible to the over-burdened and overtaxed property owner, and while we in local government recognize that the obligation of the Forest Service is to show that they receive full value for the use of public lands, we feel that their policy on fees charged to local governments and communities, is creating an unnecessary excessive tax-burden on a rural segment of the public.

As a representative of the County Supervisors Association of California, and on behalf of the National Association of Counties, we strongly recommend to your Honorable Commission, that it study and recommend to the Congress the enactment of appropriate legislation which would allow the sale, lease or transfer of Forest Service lands to states, counties and municipalities for the development of said lands for health, education and recreation purposes, at nominal prices and terms which will stimulate, encourage and facilitate the accomplishment of the public purposes involved, with the provision that the use of such lands be restricted to the public purposes enumerated, otherwise, title to such lands shall revert to the United States.

And finally, we earnestly urge that you request the Forest Service to give the local communities and districts immediate relief from the excessive high rental of Forest Service lands now being used for local governmental purposes, pending your study of this proposal.

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES ON SALE AND/OR LEASING OF FOREST SERVICE LANDS

Whereas, the Public Land Sale Act (Public Law 88-608) provides temporary authority for the sale of certain public lands which are administered by the Bureau of Land Management, and

Whereas, the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of June 14, 1926 (as amended) authorizes the acquisition or use of public lands by states, counties, or municipalities for $2.50 an acre or under lease arrangements for 25 cents an acre per year, and

Whereas, one of the objectives of these Acts, both of which pertain to lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, is to make public lands which are either required for the orderly growth and development of a county or community or are required by states, counties, and municipalities for recreation, education, health, and any other valid public purpose, and

Whereas, the sale of such lands under the Public Land Sales Act must be deferred until the local government concerned has adopted and placed into effect comprehensive plans and zoning regulations, and

Whereas, these Acts do not apply to the lands administered by the United States Forest Service, of the Departmnt of Agriculture, although the said Forest Service can exchange lands with private persons under certain definite conditions, and

Whereas, nowhere is there appropriate legislation whereby a county or its political equivalent in other states, is able to purchase or acquire title to Forest Service lands for valid and mutually agreeable local governmental public purposes, and

Whereas, leasing of Forest Service lands is prohibitive because of Forest Service policies which require that the annual rental be a percentage of the appraised value of such Forest Service lands, and

Whereas, in counties of large federal ownership, private property is limited and therefore appraisal of both private and federal lands results in such high annual rental fees that states, counties, and municipalities are thereby effective prohibited from leasing such lands for valid local governmental public purposes, and

Whereas, these current policies discriminate against state and local governments by forcing them to adhere to the same prices and terms as profit-making private operations, thereby effectively frustrating the achievement of the creative federalism relationship which is sought by all levels of government.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Association of Counties does hereby strongly recommend to the Public Land Law Review Commission that it study and recommend to the Congress the enactment of appropriate legislation which would allow the sale, lease or transfer of Forest Service lands to states, counties and municipalities for the development of said lands for health, education, and recreation purposes at nominal prices and terms which will stimulate, encourage and facilitate the accomplishment of the public purposes involved and that such disposal of these Forest Service lands be deferred until comprehensive local governmental plans and enforceable zoning regulations have been adopted by the appropriate county or municipal jurisdiction, and provided further that the use of such lands be restricted to the public purposes enumerated in the legislation, otherwise title to such lands shall revert to the United States.

A certified true copy of this resolution as adopted by the 2,900 assembled delegates on Wednesday morning, July 20, 1966, during the National Association of Counties' 31st Annual Conference in New Orleans, Louisiana.

PAUL N. CARLIN,
Assistant Director for Federal Ownership Problems.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. HICKS), for June 19 and June 20, on account of official business.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), 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. KORNEGAY, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CURTIS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODELL, for 60 minutes, on June 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HALL and to include a quotation from the Flag Code.

Mr. BINGHAM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and to include a table.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. COLLIER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. WALDIE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 20, 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:

843. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting the text of ILO Recommendation 127 concerning the role of cooperatives in the economic and social development of developing countries, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 50th session, at Geneva, on June 21, 1966 (H. Doc.

No. 135); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

844. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of six facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233(a)(1), and to the authority delegated to me by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

845. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of two additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233(a)(1) and to the authority delegated to me by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

846. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1966–April 1967, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

847. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system of the U.S. Information Agency through establishment of a Foreign Service Information Officer Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

848. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 10918. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 369). 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. ASHMORE:

H.R. 10949. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10950. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain densified wood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 10951. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 10952. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 10953. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10954. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 10955. A bill to guarantee freedom of speech, assembly, and petition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 10956. A bill to to prohibit electronic surveillance by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10957. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10958. A bill to create a council of social advisers, to require the President to submit an annual social report, to create a joint committee on the social report, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 10959. A bill to create a council of social advisers, to require the President to submit an annual social report, to create a joint committee on the social report, and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 10960. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that a retired annuitant may elect to be subject to a system of deductions from his annuity on account of outside earnings instead of being subject to the prohibition against returning to the service of his last employer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 10961. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 10962. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall operate at least 18,000 beds in its domiciliary facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 10963. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of flue-cured tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 10964. A bill to enable the District of Columbia to receive Federal financial assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act for a medical assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10965. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940, to vest the administration of that act in the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10966. A bill to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the U.S. Government in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 10967. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work, and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10968. 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.

H.R. 10969. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage, under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B thereof, of certain expenses incurred by an insured individual in obtaining certain drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10970. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10971. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist in assuring the availability of both nursing home and alternative noninstitutional services for recipients of assistance thereunder, to encourage the use whenever professionally determined to be appropriate of noninstitutional services for such recipients, to establish basic standards of quality for nursing home and home health services provided to such recipients, and to provide for fair and equitable reimbursement for those providing health care services to such recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10972. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 10973. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain densified wood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 10974. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty of whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 10975. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to facilitate the provision of reliable, abundant, and economical electric power supply, by strengthening existing mechanisms for coordination of electric utility systems and encouraging the installation and use of the products of advancing technology with due regard for the proper conservation of scenic and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 10976. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use

of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10977. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that Federal service otherwise excluded from coverage shall be taken into account in determining whether an individual is insured for disability insurance benefits or satisfies the disability "freeze" requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10978. 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. 10979. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to negotiate and enter onto rental agreement with postmasters at fourth-class offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 10980. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 640. 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 Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the last week in October of every year as National Student Council Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.J. Res. 642. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 643. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first full week of October as Spring Garden Planting Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.J. Res. 644. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee to Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 645. Joint resolution to consent to and enter into the mid-Atlantic States air pollution compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 646. 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. BERRY:

H. Res. 590. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 591. Resolution requesting the President to submit to the House of Representatives recommendations for budget reductions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HALL:

H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Res. 593. Resolution directing the U.S. Tariff Commission to make an investigation of competition between domestic and imported leather and leather goods; to the Committee on Way and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H. Res. 594. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 595. Resolution authorizing travel for certain members of the Committee on Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER (for himself, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. BARING, Mr. HALEY, Mr. TUCK, Mr. MORRIS, Mr. LENNON, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. DORN, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. HERLONG, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. FALLON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. BURLESON, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. SATTERFIELD):

H. Res. 596. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 421; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

240. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to a study of practices and policies of Federal agencies regulating the allowable harvest of timber on Federal lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

241. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to the widening and deepening of the ship channels in the Columbia and Willamette Rivers; 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. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10981. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Licatini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 10982. A bill for the relief of George Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 10983. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alexis Joseph Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10984. A bill for the relief of Eustace A. Walters, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 10985. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lorenzo Galatas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 10986. A bill for the relief of Bong Hee Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10987. A bill for the relief of Emilio Porco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 10988. A bill for the relief of Eileen Hannevig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 10989. A bill for the relief of Maria de Conceicao Botelho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 10990. A bill for the relief of Miss Bernardita Barrientos Bollozos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10991. A bill for the relief of Miss Filomena del Rosario Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10992. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Micco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 10993. A bill for the relief of Jock Min Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 10994. A bill for the relief of Oscar C. Pineda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 10995. A bill for the relief of Judy Conching Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

108. By the SPEAKER: Petition of People's Republican Committee of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., relative to voting representation by the citizens of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

109. Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to unconstitutional State laws; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, June 12, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Dear God and Father of us all, in the miracle of another dawning, our grateful hearts rejoice that, fairer than morning, lovelier than daybreak, steals upon us the sustaining consciousness that we are with Thee. Go with us into this strange new day.

We pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues to commune with Thee, unseen source of goodness, that the light which is the light of the world may shine upon us and illumine our path of action.

We thank Thee for the stirrings of discontent within us with things as they are, for visions of a glory still to transfigure the earth, for the hope of brotherhood and justice and abiding peace. Keep us true to our highest and to Thy unceasing challenge to our best.

Make us honest and honorable enough to bear the vision of the truth, wherever it may lead; to cast aside all pretense; and expediency which warps the soul.

Above all other acclaim or reward, we crave the assurance of Thy approving voice: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 16, 1967, the President had