Robert J. LaPointe, Westmont.
Pasquale C. Fiandaca, Winfield.

INDIANA

Wilma G. Rice, Helmsburg.
Edith E. Cain, Heltonville.
Mary J. Griepenstroh, Lamar.
Donald F. Reidy, Medaryville.
Edna M. Gatewood, Poseyville.
Sam D. Talbert, Russiaville.
Glenn Dougan, Spurgeon.
James R. Kirkwood, Summitville.
Walter P. Hoke, Tipton.
Joseph J. Sorota, Whiting.

IOWA

Wayne G. Smith, Adair.
Edward P. Farrell, Algona.
Walter C. Anawalt, Cedar Rapids.
Robert F. Miller, Clarence.
Roy B. Martin, Junior, Clear Lake.
Duane P. Conrad, Dallas.
Quincy I. Rice, Delta.
Vernon P. Tiefenthaler, Halbur.
Bernard J. Mullaley, Marion.
Edmund J. Langenberg, Tiffin.

KANSAS

James M. Cameron, Summerfield.

KENTUCKY

Ernestine Ward, Inez.
Harry H. Boaz, Mayfield.

LOUISIANA

Bessie R. Brumble, Bethany.
Eva M. Boudreaux, Centerville.
Edward O. Douglas, De Quincy.
Hubert J. Bayham, Senior, Grosse Tete.
Evelina F. Agoff, Lafitte.

MAINE

H. Lloyd Carey, Augusta.
Robert A. Winslow, East Boothbay.
Mary F. Worcester, Harrington.
Robert R. Kendall, Perry.

MARYLAND

Arthur G. Virts, Jr., Boyds.
L. Everett Marvel, Easton.
Dorothy C. Bowie, Faulkner.
William J. Thomas, IV, Sandy Spring.
Wilber B. Leizear, Silver Spring.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph P. Dahdah, Feeding Hills.
Norman W. Daunais, Graniteville.
Edward M. Bassett, Jr., Leominster.
Warren E. Ward, Lunenburg.
Walter D. Calnan, Merrimac.
Gerald C. Tucke, North Chelmsford.
Raymond L. Stauff, Scituate.
Kenneth H. Doulette, South Easton.
William T. Trant, Westfield.

MICHIGAN

Marion E. Cooper, Jeddo.
Shirley H. Fogarty, Smiths Creek.

MINNESOTA

Albin L. Zinda, Appleton.
John C. Webster, Beltrami.
David H. Jennings, Truman.

MISSISSIPPI

Joseph E. Martin, Bentonia.
Samantha M. Denton, Crowder.

MISSOURI

Kenneth P. Grace, Albany.
Harold M. Sliffe, Archie.
Lloyd J. McGeorge, Bismarck.
Buford A. Patten, Miller.
Warren D. Osborn, Patton.
Charles R. Sands, Sr., Rolla.

MONTANA

Rex P. Guthrie, Columbus.
Milton M. Sloan, Whitefish.

NEBRASKA

William J. Kleinow, Curtis.
Alvin G. Staben, Elkhorn.
Robert L. Johnson, St. Edward.
Freda T. Shubert, Shubert.
Carson C. Williams, Stamford.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rudolph E. Curry, Hampstead.
Arthur R. Beauchesne, Newmarket.
Milton B. Paradis, North Stratford.

NEW JERSEY

William R. Connelly, Jr., Cedar Knolls.
Betty W. Dunfee, Chatsworth.
Frank J. Sedita, Lodi.
Leonora T. Harrison, Tabor.

NEW YORK

John F. Schumaker, Albany.
George O. Barden, Barton.
Raymond L. Sabre, Calcium.
Donald A. Krantz, Callicoon.
James P. O'Connor, Sr., East Northport.
Edward B. Bierman, Jr., East Syracuse.
John J. Collins, Glens Falls.
John M. O'Malley, Le Roy.
Harold F. Pierson, Painted Post.
Francis A. Hanigan, Phoenicia.
Dorothy B. Hall, Richville.
Ruth B. Fraser, South Wales.
Raymond M. Yahnke, Sylvan Beach.

NORTH CAROLINA

George D. Elliott, Jr., Bath.
Merdice T. Simmons, Hampstead.
James R. Breedlove, Lake Toxaway.
Henry Franklin Wilson, Mount Ulla.
George H. Wall, Rolesville.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ralph A. Pederson, Park River.

OHIO

M. Virginia Miller, Fletcher.
George R. Cotter, Glouster.
David W. Barnes, Homerville.
Nello F. Bianchi, Put-in-Bay.

OKLAHOMA

LaWanda M. Smith, Milburn.
Bobby G. Pitts, Noble.
Clarence D. Robertson, Jr., Wapanucka.

OREGON

Alma M. Elliott, Chiloquin.
Marjorie A. Stumbaugh, Crescent.

PENNSYLVANIA

Martin E. Breit, Beaver Falls.
Florence M. Hannan, Bradfordwoods.
Lora E. Eschenbach, Clarendon.
John F. Schupp, Fryburg.
Katherine A. Hart, Genesee.
Dorothy J. Osterberg, McKean.
David J. Florentine, New Brighton.
Albert M. Fry, Orefield.
Myrtle A. Palm, Renfrew.
Robert B. Myers, State Line.
Frank A. Fargo, Warren.

PUERTO RICO

Mario Arroyo-Lopez, Toa Baja.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Tillman W. Derrick, Fort Mill.

SOUTH DAKOTA

LaVerne V. Binger, Tulare.
Milo L. Godfrey, Woonsocket.

TENNESSEE

Howard I. Harris, Dukedom.
Edward L. McDonald, Gallatin.
John G. Mitchell, Smyrna.
Dennis L. Lewis, White Bluff.

TEXAS

William T. Zimmerman, Burkburnett.
Jefferson D. Collier, Cisco.
Homer R. Anderson, Forestburg.
Harry D. Anderson, McCamey.
Ruby M. Mouser, Spade.
Nezie L. Duncan, Willis.
William H. Kennedy, Woodsboro.

UTAH

Majorie C. Christiansen, Mayfield.
Richard C. Stevenson, West Jordan.

VERMONT

Lawrence A. Williams, Newfane.
William B. Holton, Westminster.

VIRGINIA

John W. Wood, Jr., Pearisburg.
George E. Kidd, Williamsburg.
Joseph C. Haines, Winchester.

WASHINGTON

Lawrence T. Baker, Airway Heights.
Gunnar R. Johnson, Chelan.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles C. Tickle, Bluefield.
Patricia W. Noel, Pratt.

WISCONSIN

Norman E. Anderson, Hudson.
Wallace J. Regan, Kohler.
Chris E. Youssi, Muskego.
Eugene L. Hoeffling, Poplar.

WYOMING

Betty J. Leonard, Bairoil.
Bessie E. Lieuallen, Fort Laramie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

In God is my salvation and my glory; the rock of my strength and my refuge is in God.—Psalm 62: 7.

O God and Father of us all, we know of no better way to begin the week than by lifting our hearts unto Thee in prayer and by pledging unto Thee the desire of our hearts to serve Thee by devoting ourselves to the welfare of our country and to the well-being of our fellow man.

In these stirring days which search our souls, try our faith, and often dampen our spirits, we pray for guidance that we may know Thy will, for courage to walk in Thy way, and for uplifting strength to keep on without faltering and without fainting.

We pray for peace and as we seek it may we be determined to protect our freedom against any aggressor. Both militarily and morally may we stand strong, and filled with Thy spirit continue to labor for liberty and justice for all. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 29, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 602) entitled "An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965."

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 68–4.

WALTER CHANDLER, A FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House today the death of a former and great colleague, Walter Chandler. This grand old man passed away this morning in Memphis, the city which he served so long and so well as both its Representative in Congress and as its mayor. He would have been 80 years old on October 5 and it is ironic that those of us now serving in Congress from the Memphis area were planning to surprise him with a joint telephone call of good wishes.

Walter Chandler was a great American in the finest sense of the word. He lived and worked for his community and its people and in serving them he served America. He was a fighter for those causes in which he believed, a dedicated proponent of justice, a tough but considerate adversary in debating those with whom he disagreed. His sudden and unexpected death was in the Chandler tradition, still on his feet, still looking ahead, still ready to accept new challenges.

Memphis has lost a revered and beloved citizen. The Nation has lost a soul filled with greatness, but Memphis and the Nation are better because Walter Chandler lived. No man can earn a more sincere tribute from his fellow citizens.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, it was with very great sadness that I learned of the passing of one of the most distinguished men who ever served in the House of Representatives. Walter Chandler served as a member of the Judiciary Committee during his two and one-half terms in the House and became nationally known as the author of the Chandler Bankruptcy Act, which completely revised bankruptcy laws.

Perhaps I knew him better than any Member of our present Tennessee delegation. All during my adult life he was my close neighbor in Tennessee and a man for whom I had the greatest admiration and respect.

Just 2 weeks ago he was in Washington and our friend, Cliff Davis, who succeeded Mr. Chandler in this body, had him up for luncheon. I was privileged to join Mr. Davis and Captain Chandler, along with Zeake Johnson, who was born in the same town as was Mr. Chandler, Jackson, Tenn., at luncheon. He appeared in excellent health though he was reaching his 80th birthday.

We had a delightful time reminiscing about many things. He was able to speak to our great Speaker, with whom he had served, and they shared a mutual admiration, along with WRIGHT PATMAN and others who served in the House when he was here, and he had a good time exchanging experiences.

On the floor of the House he was literally besieged by well wishers and made many new friends.

Mr. Chandler served in the Tennessee State Legislature, was an assistant attorney general, was city attorney, and twice served by draft as mayor of Memphis, before coming to the Congress. While he served here, the New York Times rated him as one of the 10 most valuable Members of Congress.

Not only was he active in the political life of his city, county, State, and Nation, but he had time to take a very deep interest in the cultural things of life. He served on an art gallery board and knew more of the State's history than anyone I have ever known.

He was most popularly addressed as Captain, though some called him Congressman and some Mister, because in World War I he was a captain and served in five major battles. Somehow he seemed to appreciate this title as much or more than any other.

He was a devoted husband to his late wife, close to his children, and very active in the Episcopal Church, which he had served so long and so faithfully.

Truly, the country has lost a very great man just 5 days before the city of Memphis was to celebrate a special occasion on his 80th birthday.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee are saddened by the passing of one of our most esteemed elder statesmen, former Congressman Walter Chandler, of Memphis.

Mr. Chandler would have been 80 years old on October 5, and my colleagues Mr. EVERETT and Mr. KUYKENDALL and myself were going to participate in a special recognition party for him on that date. We learned of his passing on Sunday, and we share the sorrow of his son, Wythe, and the countless friends he made over many decades of unselfish public service.

Walter Clift Chandler was born in Madison County, Tenn., October 5, 1887. He graduated with a law degree from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville in 1909.

He began his life of dedicated public service in 1916 when he became assistant district attorney general in Memphis. He served in the Tennessee legislature in 1917 as a member of the House, and then served as State senator from 1921 to 1923. He became the city attorney for Memphis in 1928 to 1934.

During World War I, Walter Chandler served as a captain in the 114th Field Artillery, 13th Division, American Expeditionary Forces.

A lifelong Democrat, who attended his first national convention as a delegate in 1940, Mr. Chandler was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1934, and served in the 74th, 75th, and 76th Congresses, representing Shelby County, Tenn.

He resigned January 2, 1940, having been elected by an appreciative people of Memphis as their mayor. He was reelected to this office in 1943, served until September 1, 1946. He then entered the private practice of law for the first time in 35 years. He was greatly grieved at the passing of his beloved wife in 1949.

But his service to the people of Tennessee and Shelby County did not cease then. A leader in the move to update the State constitution, he was elected president of the Tennessee Constitutional Convention in 1953. He again entered public life in 1955 when he was elected mayor for the third time of his career.

Walter Chandler has been a symbol of progress for Memphis, Shelby County, and the State of Tennessee. If any elected official can truly be called a "people's man," Walter Chandler was that. He not only served, but took the initiative in leading his constituents.

He labored for the people of Memphis in the same selfless attitude that won him wide admiration far beyond the borders of any one county or State.

A chapter of Tennessee history passed with the death of Walter Chandler, but the sense of self-sacrifice which embodied his entire life will always guide those who knew him, were in a contest with him, and who were served by him.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks concerning the late Honorable Walter Chandler.

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

There was no objection.

THE BOSTON RED SOX CHAMPIONS OF THE AMERICAN LEAGUE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days, Boston has been the capital of the world of baseball and, today, the Boston Red Sox are the champions of the American League. All America, and many areas around the globe, have thrilled to the fantastic, incredible American League pennant race. When this season opened last April, the Boston Red

Sox were picked to finish at, or near, the bottom of the league. Through magnificent management by manager Dick Williams—by sheer determination, unbounded enthusiasm, and marked improvement of all of its players, the Red Sox stunned the baseball world by their constant, consistent uphill struggle to capture the American League crown. It is indeed the miracle team of 1967. No club deserved to win it more. No other baseball club in either league is as close to its fans as the Boston Red Sox, and no other club has done so much for the community—particularly by raising, through the Jimmy fund, thousands and thousands of dollars for the Children's Hospital—one of the finest institutions of its kind in the world. The owner of the Red Sox, Tom Yawkey, has always been one of baseball's best assets. His faith in his club and its players may have faltered through the years but it has never fallen. His faith and his spirit in his club has paid off.

The Massachusetts congressional delegation joins millions around the Nation in congratulating the Boston Red Sox, its players and its management.

Mr. Speaker, we challenge the Missouri delegation. We will put up the best in beans, cod, or lobster for the best in beer or whatever else they have in Missouri. The Boston Red Sox will win the World Series.

Under unanimous consent I place the final standings of the American League for the years 1967 and 1966 at this point in the RECORD. These standings indicate the spectacular performance of the Boston Red Sox:

Final standing of the American League, 1967

	Won	Lost
Boston	92	70
Detroit	91	71
Minnesota	91	71
Chicago	89	73
California	84	77
Washington	76	85
Baltimore	76	85
Cleveland	75	87
New York	72	90
Kansas City	62	99

Final standing of the American League, 1966

	Won	Lost
Baltimore	97	63
Minnesota	89	73
Detroit	88	74
Chicago	83	79
Cleveland	81	81
California	80	82
Kansas City	74	86
Washington	71	88
Boston	72	90
New York	70	89

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts congressional delegation salutes all of the Red Sox organization who contributed so much to bringing the American League championship to Boston and Massachusetts. We are proud to list them.

Manager Dick Williams, players Carl Yastrzemski, Tony Conigliaro, Jim Lonborg, George Scott, Gary Bell, Darrell Brandon, Bill Landis, Al Lyle, David Morehead, Dan Osinski, Bill Rohr, Jose Santiago, Lee Stange, Hank Fischer, Jerry Stephenson, Gary Waslewski, John Wyatt, Ken Brett, Elston Howard, Mike Ryan, Russ Gibson, Jerry Moses, Jerry Adair, Mike Andrews, Joe Foy, Dalton Jones, Rico Petrocelli, Norm Siebern, Ken Harrelson, Reggie Smith, Jose Tartabull and George Thomas; coaches Bobby Doerr, Al Lakeman, Sal Maglie, and Eddie Popowski; owner Tom Yawkey and his aids Dick O'Connell, Haywood Sullivan, Neil Mahoney, and Tom Dowd; trainer Buddy LeBoux; team physician Dr. Tom Tierney; equipment manager Don Fitzpatrick; groundskeeper Al Forrister and his crew; and bat-and-ball-boys Keith Rosenfield and Jimmy Jackson.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts in a position to invite his colleagues up to see the Boston Red Sox play in the World Series?

Mr. BOLAND. We would be delighted to have you gentlemen up there. However, there is a question of tickets. I understand that there has been an allocation of a couple of hundred tickets to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and I would suggest that you place your request in the hands of the distinguished Speaker.

THE QUESTION OF TICKETS TO THE WORLD SERIES TO WATCH THE BOSTON CLUB PARTICIPATE THEREIN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and to state that we extend congratulations to the Boston Red Sox upon winning the American League pennant race. Now all Boston has to do is to worry about the Cardinals.

We as Members of the House have always loved the distinguished gentleman from Boston, Mass. [Mr. MCCORMACK], the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but never have we loved the Speaker more than we love him now for the two tickets to the series that he is going to provide to each one of us—or is he?

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

IRRESPONSIBLE ACTION ON THE PART OF THE REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week the American people witnessed what must be classified as one of the most politically irresponsible acts of this century by the Republican Party. The U.S. Government, by what I am told was a unanimous Republican vote, was denied in the House the funds needed to permit it to continue to function as a government. And the curious thing about it is that this move to decree that the President make billion-dollar cuts without specifying whatsoever the areas in which the cuts should be made was led by the party which has contended for years to the American people that it believes in congressional and legislative responsibility, and has also contended that it did not believe in enlarging the powers of the executive.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come to face up to our responsibility. It seems to me that our friends on the other side of the aisle cannot have it both ways. If they believe in congressional responsibility, if they believe in this body's exercising its power judiciously and wisely and effectively, then certainly they should abandon this attempt to hand over a $5 billion item veto authority to the President of the United States and should join us on this side of the aisle in meeting our responsibilities as a legislative body.

I feel that when this matter comes to the House on Tuesday that the House will decide to continue exercising its responsibility to the country in the traditional way, and that the effort on the Republican side to undermine congressional responsibility will be defeated.

VIGOROUS RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM NEEDED TO REVERSE POPULATION TREND

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the finest opportunity in America to deal with the problems of sickness in the Nation's cities is receiving almost no attention. A vigorous rural development program to reverse the population trend from rural communities to city slums would provide a bigger step forward at less cost than any of the programs which are being offered to cure big-city problems.

Throughout our country there are wholesome, pleasant rural communities and small towns, many of which literally are dying on the vine. Their people are moving away to the city where they feel opportunities are better. To my mind, this is a poor thing to happen to any family, but economic pressures are bringing about a great shift from rural to urban living. One of the bad features which results is the buildup of slum areas and the attendant growth in welfare rolls, both

of which directly contribute to riots and to the crime problem.

This trend makes it harder and harder for small communities to support proper education, to build needed community facilities, to provide the jobs required to hold their young people, and just to stay alive. Steps to make rural living more attractive obviously would help to solve the urban problems which now plague the nation. In comparison with the enormous problems presented by the cities, a little help would go a very long way toward improving job opportunities, education, and community facilities in rural communities and small cities. Apparently few in the administration are giving really serious consideration to helping America by making rural living more attractive. It would appear that this may well be the best means by which to combat the aggravating and growing problems which confront the cities. Certainly it would be a more economical and a far more wholesome approach.

Regardless of its economic status, the average rural community or small town offers a pleasant and happy environment which is much more desirable than that of the crowded metropolitan area.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO GUINEA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the ninth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Guinea is being celebrated today, October 2, I am pleased to call this occasion to the attention of the House and to extend my best wishes to the Government and the people of Guinea.

I am fortunate in having had the opportunity personally of meeting many high ranking Guinean officials during their recent visits to Washington, and I can vouch for the dedication and vigor of the leaders of that country. I particularly recall the visit of Foreign Minister Beavogui on March 9, 1967, at which time I had the honor, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, to be his host at a luncheon.

I express the hope that the mutuality of interests already shared by our two countries and two peoples may not only continue to flourish but may grow stronger in the years to come.

American industry is assisting the Government in mining Guinea's rich bauxite deposits, which obviously will do much for the economy of that country. The good relations that continue to exist between the Government of Guinea and American industry is gratifying and stimulating to both Guineans and Americans.

I express my personal felicitations to the able President of Guinea, His Excellency Sekou Toure, and to my good friend the Guinean Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Karim Bangoura.

REPUBLICANS PLAYING POLITICS IN VOTING TO RECOMMIT CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. GIAIMO. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I think the RECORD should show that our Republican colleagues in the House are trying to play politics with vital functionings of the Federal Government. By voting to recommit the continuing resolution, these Republicans have sought to paralyze the entire Federal establishment under the guise of alleged fiscal integrity.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say they want the budget cut, and many programs drastically trimmed. They claim that is why they have voted to recommit the continuing resolution.

But I think we may ask: Do you achieve fiscal integrity by paralyzing, in a dangerous and irresponsible way, the Federal Establishment? Do you save money by bringing the Government to its knees?

This is a foolish and irresponsible game the Republicans are playing. It is not the way to fiscal responsibility. It is the high road to political recklessness, and it will not succeed.

It will not succeed, Mr. Speaker, because the majority of House Members know that cutting back expenditures is not the job of the President; it is the function of Congress.

And I would say to these Republicans: Where do you want to start cutting? In which congressional district? If you are sincere, perhaps you will not mind if a few projects in your own districts are trimmed back?

These are the hard facts, Mr. Speaker. And the Republicans know them.

REPUBLICAN RULE OR RUIN POLITICS PARALYZES GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I too would have preferred to line up this morning for World Series tickets. Unfortunately, however, the major action in the Nation this week will not all center in Boston and St. Louis. There will be considerable public attention on Washington, D.C. For the Republicans in this body, by a unanimous, partyline, rubberstamp vote have threatened to paralyze the Federal Government. They have refused it permission to pay its bills and fulfill its obligations.

In recommitting the continuing resolution last week, those who wish to embarrass the administration politically have worked their will in this House. Major departments of Government can now not function.

But this political sham will be uncovered.

Willful men cannot merely shout "cut the budget" to the administration without specifying where those cuts should be made.

Willful men cannot practice rule or ruin politics in this House, without inviting a negative reaction from the people.

It is the responsibility of the House of Representatives as a whole to approve or disapprove budgets submitted by the President. But it is also the duty of the House of Representatives to make certain that Government is not paralyzed, that essential services go on, and that the Government of the United States is not made a laughing stock before the world.

I urge that the continuing resolution be approved, and that the fiscal year 1968 budget be approved, and that we get on with the job of Government.

Political maneuvers cannot be allowed to play havoc with the U.S. Government.

ABSENTEES COMPLAIN OF ABSENTEEISM

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think some note should be made of a recent letter that was sent to the Speaker of the House by some 28 freshmen Congressmen.

The gist of it was to provide some tips to the Speaker about more efficient management of House business.

These young Members of our body told the Speaker that business is scheduled on a Tuesday to Thursday basis so that everybody can take off Mondays and Fridays.

I think we should take some note of the fact that 11 of these 28 watchdogs were absent on the day after they sent the letter, last Friday, when a quorum was called prior to the vote on the bill, H.R. 10673, which would have amended or which did amend the Packers and Stockyards Act.

It seems to me that some of these 28 know-it-alls are worrying too much about other people's business. Perhaps they should concentrate making these rollcalls themselves first—or maybe they were too busy drafting another letter about people taking off on Fridays for personal matters.

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

Mr. KIRWAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have an opportunity here today to pay my respects to a great American—and I mean a great American.

Senator CARL HAYDEN is 90 years old today. He has done for the protection and development of our great national resources what the late John Fogarty did for the health of mankind. The New York Times said recently that John Fogarty did more than any man for mankind, and he did. The same can be said for CARL HAYDEN for his great achievements for mankind in respect to our priceless national resources.

Without people like CARL HAYDEN and John Fogarty in this country, where would we be?

The late Senator Kerr often said:

> Prosperity does not really come from our automobile factories, steel plants, railroads, and other elements of our industrial processes. Prosperity comes instead from the land, the woods, and the waters of this land.

For the protection and development of these basic resources he has done more for mankind than any man who ever lived.

It is a privilege and an honor for me just to mention his name, and I hope that God who in His wisdom has let him be here for 90 years will let him stay around here for 100 years to come.

HOW SCRUPULOUS IS THE READER'S DIGEST?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Reader's Digest is up to its old tricks of slanted rightwing attacks on American institutions; this time it is the social security system. In the October issue of the magazine, a Charles Stevenson has done a clever hatchet job on social security, entitled "How Secure Is Your Social Security?"

In the RECORD of September 27, the distinguished and fairminded chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. WILBUR MILLS, stated:

> I have read the article very carefully and find that it contains a number of half-truths that lead to misleading conclusions.

He then had reprinted in the RECORD a factual and soundly reasoned refutation of the Reader's Digest article by Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen.

The Reader's Digest has consistently attacked progressive Federal programs for years, usually under the spurious rationale that they interfere with the free enterprise system. It is regrettable that the Digest does not provide a letters-to-the-editor section within its magazine in order that replies to its attacks can be offered to its readership.

Because replies are not allowed within the pages of the Digest, I believe it is doubly important that the Members of this body and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are informed of the fact that while the Reader's Digest is crusading against Federal social programs, it is constantly dipping into the public till to add to its own profits. Currently, publishers of magazines pay less than 30 percent of what it costs the Post Office Department to deliver them; in the case of the Digest this means the taxpayers are subsidizing it by $8.9 million a year. The Digest is also a heavy user of third-class mail and is receiving a subsidy within this class of mail to the tune of approximately $2.3 million a year. Therefore, the taxpayer is subsidizing the Reader's Digest to the tune of over $11 million a year in second and third class alone; another hefty subsidy is given the Digest when they mail the books they publish, which are delivered by the Post Office for a little over 40 percent of cost.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I believe it is important that the information that I have disclosed today be included in the RECORD and thereby be made known to the American public.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES SHOULD BE REDUCED IN AN ORDERLY AND LOGICAL MANNER

Mr. KEE. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it has been indeed unfortunate that our Republican colleagues have voted to recommit the continuing resolution that provides various agencies of the Federal Government with operating funds to meet financial obligations.

This action—presumably—is to embarrass the President and demonstrate a the voters that those opposed to providing the Federal Government with sufficient funds to meet current obligations are for budget cutting against an administration of wild spenders.

Mr. Speaker, this is political demagoguery. We all know that the authority to reduce expenditures belongs to the Congress, not to the White House. The President recommends—the Congress appropriates.

Apparently the Republicans want the President of the United States to be the one to take the political criticism by cutting back programs the people want. The President has said—time and again—that he will carefully review all appropriations which have been passed by the U.S. Congress.

I, for one, do not want to give up the congressional authority to control Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the responsibility for appropriating funds rests entirely with the U.S. Congress, and I firmly believe that the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives should have adequate time in order to reduce Federal expenditures in a logical manner which will not disrupt the essential services and the economy of the United States.

SUCCESS OF BOSTON RED SOX IN WINNING AMERICAN LEAGUE PENNANT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you and the people you represent in the great city of Boston for the remarkable success of the Boston Red Sox in winning the American League pennant on the final day of the season. Every one in St. Louis looks forward to the appearance in our magnificent new Busch Stadium of the gallant Boston team in the World Series this coming Saturday.

I am sure the St. Louis Cardinals will do everything they can to prevent it, but it is my feeling that the Boston team should win one of the first four games of the series so that we will have the opportunity to have three World Series games in St. Louis.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when your constituents go to St. Louis for the world's series, they will have the opportunity to visit many of the other attractions in my city, and particularly the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial and the spectacular Gateway Arch which, are part of the national park system and for which we, incidentally, still need a final Federal appropriation of $6 million for construction. Once your people see this breathtaking structure, I am sure they will want you to continue to do everything you can to assure completion of the work. In any event, all St. Louis joins me in welcoming Boston to the world's series.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been unable to get any tickets out of Boston so far. What about St. Louis?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, may I tell the gentleman he is very late. Three weeks ago I could have gotten the gentleman what he wanted.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11722 UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 11722, to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, have until 12 o'clock tonight in which to file a conference report on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MAX KAMPELMAN TO NEW WASHINGTON CITY COUNCIL

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, the appointment by President Johnson of one Max Kampelman, to be the chairman of the new Washington, D.C. City Council, is astonishing to the point of disbelief.

Kampelman was a conscientious objector in World War II, who, through some sort of manipulation, after the shooting stopped in the Korean war, obtained a Reserve commission as a captain in the Marine Corps. When the war in Vietnam began to expand, he resigned his commission.

Kampelman was a pal of the notorious Bobby Baker. He was one of the organizers of the District of Columbia National Bank, a former chairman of the executive committee and a member of the board of directors.

It was the District of Columbia National Bank that handed out to the fast-traveling Baker an unsecured loan of $125,000.

Mr. Speaker, this appointment calls for the most careful scrutiny and I urge that the proper committee of the House undertake an immediate investigation of this appointee.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AND RESPONSIBILITY THEREFOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest today to the boilerplate speeches that have been made here on the question of the Bow amendment. I shall read them carefully, and we will meet them and reply to them in detail tomorrow.

I notice in the press reports that the President again has said, "Send all the appropriation bills down to me and I will then make the cuts in them."

Everyone seems to be complaining about the President and the vicious things he is going to do. I hope in 1969 I have more confidence in my President then than the majority seem to have in their President this year. Everyone complains of what he might do to him.

I say to you, I am more interested in what we are doing to the country. If we go forward with the spending on the basis we are now, the July and August expenditures of $24,232,000,000, this means they are going to spend this year $145 billion.

Now let us go back to last year. The limitation that I am suggesting is $131 billion. Last year total expenditures were $125 billion, and we did not do bad last year. It seems to me we might go back to last year and add for them a little $6 billion, and they would get along quite well, without all the trouble mentioned.

So far as shutting down the business of the Government is concerned, we were here, ready and willing to pass a continuing resolution, 2 days last week, but it was denied because of the majority. So if there is any shutting down of the Government, the majority must take responsibility for it.

Let me say, when there are complaints about the adoption of the motion to recommit, it was only done with the help of courageous and loyal Democrats. So when you say to us that we are upsetting the functions of Government by the adoption of the motion to recommit, the responsibility lies in the majority party, if there is anything to be said.

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

Mr. BOW. Of course I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman will admit that——

Mr. BOW. Do not tell me what I am going to admit. The gentleman does not know what I am going to admit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This is in the form of a question.

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will put it a different way. Is it true that by the exclusion of the military, the interest on the national debt, and other fixed contract obligations that could not be canceled without great cost to the Government, the $5 billion cut would apply to a $21 billion pool, which includes $9 billion for salaries of Government employees?

Mr. BOW. No. I do not admit that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You do not admit it. Will you explain why not?

Mr. BOW. I will explain that tomorrow, when we have time in the House to do it, when the continuing resolution comes up.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to have you do it.

Mr. BOW. We will be glad to do it.

ATTENDANCE AND ABSENCE

Mr. RIEGLE. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment briefly on the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] a few moments ago, and his point that some 11 freshmen were not present for the quorum call last Friday. I was present last Friday, but as I go over the RECORD for last Friday, I find there were 186 Members absent, and 106 of those, or well over half, were from the Democrat side of the aisle.

This is not surprising, because I believe the reason so many Members were gone last week was touched on by my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], with his request of Thursday that the continuing resolution be put over until Tuesday of this week, because of the fact that many Members of the House had made commitments to be away from Washington last Friday, on official business presumably.

I would now like to comment briefly on the letter sent to the Speaker last week by 28 freshmen Republicans. I want to say that I think the remarks I am about to make express the spirit of the Members who signed that letter, as well as my own. I think it in no way reflects on our esteem and our very deep respect for the Speaker. I know of no man in Government today that I have any higher personal respect for than the Speaker. Certainly our letter was not intended to reflect on him in any way. Our point is this: We have a congressional reorganization bill that has gone through the legislative mill for some months and is awaiting action on the House floor. We would like to see it come down here so that we can have a chance to look at it and discuss it and determine what reforms are needed. If we can win some bipartisan support on that, we all will be ahead and the country will be ahead.

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

Mr. RIEGLE. I will if you are supporting my desire to get the Congressional Reorganization Act out of committee and down here on the floor.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I merely want to compliment the gentleman for the kind remarks that he made with respect to the Speaker, which I am sure all of us share.

DISCUSSION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] in calling to the attention of the House the importance of the vote we will be having tomorrow here on the floor of the House. The important vote will be the vote on the previous question. That particular vote will be important because if the previous question carries, then Mr. BOW will be precluded from offering his amendment to establish an expenditure limitation for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important that we all realize that the Congress can make substantial reductions in appropriations but that reductions in appropriations will not directly affect spending levels. Even if we make a $7 billion or $8 billion reduction in appropriations, this will only reduce the amount of new obligational authority in the hands of the executive branch from $192 billion to about $184 billion. The executive branch will still have in its hands $184 billion with an appropriation cut of $8 billion available for expenditure in fiscal year 1968. This is because of the large carryover in obligational authority, or appropriations, from prior years.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all realize that the Congress cannot control the expenditure rate, because the Congress deals with appropriations and only with appropriations. We feel, however, that the time has come, because of the serious crisis facing this country, for the Congress to

move into the expenditure field in fiscal year 1968. We are facing a tremendous crisis with a budget deficit of over $30 billion.

The Chief Executive seems to be trying to create confusion in this country by refusing to distinguish between appropriations and expenditures. In doing this, he is only widening the credibility gap. Yesterday in his press conference, the President talked about a $1.6 billion reduction in appropriations for the Defense Department. He tried to tie that $1.6 billion up with the war cost in Vietnam. The Committee on Appropriations in reducing new obligational authority did not reduce expenditure rates, but in reducing new obligational authority by $1.6 billion not a single bit of that authorization was involved with war costs in Southeast Asia. It is true that the war in Southeast Asia is going to cost more than the budget estimate of expenditures of $21.9 billion. The cost of the war will in fact be at least $29 billion in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say I am shocked that the President of the United States would imply that there is any connection between the Congress cut in defense funds and the war in Vietnam.

I cannot remain silent when the word of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is thrown into serious question by the President of the United States. Yet, that is precisely the effect of the Chief Executive's attempt to relate the $1.6 billion reduction in the Defense Appropriation bill to the cost of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman MAHON and I may not see eye to eye on all things but he certainly made it crystal clear both in the Defense Committee report and on the floor during debate on the Defense bill that not a single penny of the $1.6 billion in defense cuts was in any way related to Vietnam war costs. The report clearly stated that—

> The reductions . . . are made in programs not directly related to the prosecution of the war.

For the President of the United States to cast public doubt on the word and the assurances of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the unanimous committee report written under his direction cannot go unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that additional funds will be required for the war in Vietnam—we know that and said so when the original budget came up last year.

But the $1.6 billion has nothing to do with those additional requirements and it is time this administration stopped throwing up smokescreens in attempts to cloud the issue that faces us in tomorrow's action.

Tomorrow's issue has to do with expenditure controls, not with new obligational authority or appropriations. Let us deal with that issue with relevant facts.

This credibility gap in America is being widened, and I say it is being widened deliberately in view of the important debate which we will have upon tomorrow here on the floor of the House.

TO AUTHORIZE AND REQUEST THE PRESIDENT TO ISSUE A PROCLAMATION COMMEMORATING 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE NATION BY THE LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand that this has been completely cleared on our side of the aisle with the members of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Illinois is eminently correct.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may we have some assurance that this is not going to cost the taxpayers of the United States any money?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, the proclamation will not cost the taxpayers one dime.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, let us go beyond the proclamation. Will this celebration cost the taxpayers of the United States of America any money?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, it will not.

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

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

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

S.J. RES. 109

Whereas this calendar year marks the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment in 1917 of the Langley Research Center at Hampton, Virginia; and

Whereas the Langley Research Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of forty-one years a facility of the former National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, has provided a continuing technological basis for significant advances in military and commercial aviation; and

Whereas pioneering scientific investigations conducted by the Langley Research Center contributed to the development over the years of unique facilities, research techniques, and the technical competence required to establish and maintain this country's leadership in aeronautics; and

Whereas the Langley Research Center was the birthplace of Project Mercury—the first United States manned space flight project; and

Whereas the Langley Research Center is one of the major research facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration engaged in significant programs of advanced research and technology relating to aeronautics and the manned and unmanned exploration of space, including, among others, the development of the supersonic transport, vertical and short take off and landing aircraft, the Apollo lunar mission, and a variety of other projects designed to accelerate our flight progress and expand our knowledge of the universe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Langley Research Center at Hampton, Virginia, and calling upon the people of the United States, during the first full calendar week in October 1967, to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities honoring such Center's fifty years of service to the Nation.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I arise in enthusiastic support of this legislation.

This resolution gives national recognition to the 50 years of scientific progress in the fields of space and aeronautics at Langley Research Center in Hampton, Va.

Langley was the first of the scientific facilities under the old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics which was subsequently changed to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration when this Nation decided to unite and promote its efforts in this scientific field.

Today it is one of the foremost facilities in the huge NASA complex. Under the capable leadership of Dr. Floyd L. Thompson and a dedicated group of scientists, Langley can achieve the impossible if asked to do so.

This first week in October is Langley Research Center Week and it is open to the public to see and hear what has been accomplished in the last 50 years and what we can expect in the future.

I have just returned from Langley a few minutes ago where I had the privilege of seeing the morning's presentation. It was dramatic, impressive, and educational. I was extremely proud to see the magnificent scientific accomplishments which our own facility has produced. I invite all the Members to attend if they possibly can. If they will call me, I will be happy to make the necessary transportation arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include a NASA press release which sets forth some of the achievements of the Langley Research Center:

[A National Aeronautics and Space Administration, news release, Oct. 1, 1967]

LANGLEY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

On Oct. 7, 1903, Charles M. Manley, chief assistant to Samuel Pierpont Langley, was launched from a houseboat on the Potomac in a heavier-than-air machine that was designed to fly. It sank.

Sixty-eight days later a similar wood and canvas contraption, designed by a pair of bicycle mechanics, Wilbur and Orville Wright, shot down the sands at Kitty Hawk, N.C., stayed in the air for 3.5 seconds and covered a distance of 105 feet.

A few weeks from now a sleek rocket, the Saturn V, 365 feet tall and with a thrust comparable to 160 million horsepower, will

take off from Cape Kennedy, Fla., on a test flight in preparation for this country's first trip to the Moon and back.

As unlikely as it seems, the Saturn V had its genesis in the Langley and Wright machines.

The journey from the first biplanes to supersonic aircraft and space vehicles was exciting, arduous and rewarding. Credit for the success of man's conquest of the air and space must go in large part to the work done at the research center, later named after Dr. Langley, located in Hampton, Va.

In recognition of Langley Research Center's contribution to the advancement of the United States in aeronautics and astronautics, the first week of October has been set aside by Presidential proclamation to commemorate 50 years of service to the Nation.

From 1917 to 1938, Langley, as the single laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, provided the facilities and scientific brainpower necessary to keep the nation in the vanguard of aviation progress. As other research centers were established across the country after 1938, Langley staff members provided the leadership to make them work. When the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established in 1958, it was built largely around NACA and the experience gained at Langley.

Langley has assisted in increasing the speed of the airplane from less than 100 miles-per-hour to more than 4,000 miles-per-hour. It has helped man conquer the air and move toward mastery of the infinite space above the atmosphere.

Its milestones include:

The development in the 1920's of a cowling for aircooled engines, a streamlining effect credited with increasing the speeds of airplanes of that period from 12 to 15 per cent; an innovation that made possible the use of engines of much higher horsepower;

The accumulation of scientific data and technical competence that increased the performance and utility of aircraft used in World War II;

The conception in the 1940's of research planes leading to history-making advancements at supersonic and hypersonic speeds;

The design, development, and practical application in the '50's of the world's first transonic wind tunnels which bridged the technological gap in research facilities between subsonic and supersonic speeds;

The discovery and verification of the Area Rule, a revolutionary idea concerning the configuration of aircraft;

The development of much of the technology for a practical supersonic commercial air transport plane.

Langley continues in its aeronautical researches, working on current and future concepts of hypersonic flight, advanced supersonic aircraft, helicopters, vertical takeoff and landing and short takeoff and landing aircraft (VTOL/STOL), and support services for the exploration of space.

If Dr. Langley were alive today he would be gratified by the nation's space program. He would also have a part in it. He had from his earliest years been interested in astronomy. For many years he was interested in research as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. He and his brother John built from scratch a telescope with a five-foot focal length and a seven-inch mirror. They polished and discarded 20 mirrors before they fabricated one that met their standards.

Later, at the Allegheny Observatory, he made drawings that served for years as classic sunspot representations. Having realized early the limitations placed on astrophysics by the blanketing layer of Earth's atmosphere, he attempted to overcome them first by trying to find a constant that would represent the filtering atmosphere of the Earth, and later by moving instruments to the tops of mountains where this effect would be minimized.

In order to explore the physics of outer space further he invented the boloscope, a device that could measure temperature differences of 1/100,000 of one degree Centigrade. With this instrument he extended the spectrum to a point until then undreamed of.

It was not until he was 50 years old that he launched a new career in aerodynamics.

The credit for flying the first heavier-than-air machine was hotly disputed by followers of the Wright brothers and Langley for many years, but time eventually dulled the dispute and all of the figures involved were given due credit.

Disputes were not unusual in the history of aviation progress.

Attempts to end NACA's existence as an independent agency were made with regularity. It was proposed at varying intervals that NACA's facilities and functions be transferred to the Navy, the Army, the Bureau of Standards, the War Department and the Department of Commerce.

The Langley laboratory also suffered its share of natural disasters. Wooden buildings, hangars and wind tunnels were beset by fires, and storms and floods took their toll. Langley, however, pushed aviation progress ahead in the face of adversity in politics, natural disasters, and a shortage of funds during the Great Depression of the 30's.

A five-foot wind tunnel was opened in 1920. In many ways, the development of the airplane has been the development of the wind tunnel, and Langley consistently has pioneered in these devices, extending with each new one the range of aerodynamic testing that can be done on the ground.

Langley's first wind tunnel was not unusual. It was modeled after one in use at the British National Physical Laboratory. Similar models were in use by the Army, Navy and various engineering schools. Its operation was quite simple: it directed a stream of air across a model airplane, where gages measured the stresses.

By the following year it was decided that a new kind of wind tunnel was needed, one using compressed air. It was known for some time that a model's behavior differed from that of a full-scale airplane. By raising the air pressure in the wind tunnel this difference in the effects of scale was overcome. As a result of tests in this so-called "variable density" wind tunnel, NACA studied the feasibility of jet propulsion some 25 years before the first jet airplane flew.

In 1927, a tunnel known as the propeller research tunnel, large enough to test full-scale parts, was put into operation. It had a 20-foot test section through which air flowed at 110 miles-per-hour. This tunnel, the world's largest at that time, allowed aerodynamic tests on full-scale propellers, fuselages, landing gear and other aircraft parts.

The most dramatic breakthrough achieved by this equipment was what came to be known as the NACA cowling. A streamlined covering for radial air-cooled engines, the cowling reduced the drag created by exposed engine parts. Because it greatly improved cooling, it permitted much larger engines of greater power.

In its 1928 report, NACA stated, "by the application of the results of this study to this study to a Curtiss AT-5A Army pursuit training plane, the maximum speed was increased from 118 to 137 mph. This is equivalent to providing approximately 83 additional horsepower without additional weight or cost of engine, fuel consumption, or weight of structure." For this achievement, NACA was awarded the Collier Trophy for 1928.

Another benefit from the Propeller Research Tunnel was the location of engine nacelles on the leading edges of wings, rather than slung beneath them as had been the previous practice. This resulted in important speed gains. The amount of drag on fixed landing gear was also accurately determined.

Throughout the 1930's, aviation continued its advance. The shape of wings and airplane bodies all over the world were determined by the knowledge gained at Langley. And when World War II came, the information acquired over the years at this NACA facility contributed mightily to America's superior wartime air power.

Elaborately instrumented research rocket planes were carried above the atmosphere, where the density of the air was low, to explore transonic and supersonic speeds. Starting with the spectacular flight of the X-1 and progressing through the more and more advanced models, speed and altitude records were broken again and again. Langley shared the Collier Trophy with Bell Aircraft and the U.S. Air Force for this pioneering research in 1947. Today the X-15, latest in the series, has achieved speeds over 4,000 miles-per-hour and altitudes of more than 354,000 feet.

Langley was honored with the Collier Trophy again in 1951 for the development and practical application of the transonic wind tunnel, a facility that bridged the gap which once existed in wind tunnel research in the range from high subsonic speeds to those just above the speed of sound.

Langley's fourth Collier Trophy was won in 1954 for the discovery and experimental verification of the Area Rule.

Essentially, the Area Rule is a method to balance in a rational way the lengthwise distribution of volume of fuselage and wings in order to produce an airplane with minimum drag at transonic speeds.

Slight modifications of the shape of the airplane fuselage can result in highly-improved performance. For example, a fighter plane prototype was unable in tests to achieve supersonic speed. With slight modifications indicated by the Area Rule, a gain in speed as much as 25 per cent was attained.

Today, Langley continues to improve the speed and versatility of aircraft. Some of its objectives are improved helicopters for urban travel up to 100 miles, short takeoff and landing aircraft for interurban travel up to about 500 miles, and improvements in subsonic jet transports to allow short runway operation.

Work is going forward on the supersonic airplane, and in the more distant future for an airplane designed to go more than five times the speed of sound—the hypersonic airplane.

Langley was the birthplace of Project Mercury, the first United States manned space flight project. It was instrumental in some of the key research in support of the successful Gemini project and the Apollo program, now just getting under way.

Langley research contributed to the Echo passive communication satellites. Once launched into orbit, a large aluminum-covered mylar plastic balloon automatically inflated and was used to bounce electronic signals from one point on Earth down to another. Line-of-sight electronic transmission is generally restricted to about 150 miles; by means of Echo satellites, this range was extended to span oceans and continents. In addition, regularly published reports of the transit of the Echo balloon allowed people all over the world to see their first man-made satellite move across the night sky.

Langley also took part in the development of the versatile Scout rocket, first all-solid-fueled launch vehicle to put a satellite in orbit, and the management of Lunar Orbiter, a spacecraft which circled and helped map the Moon. Lunar Orbiter was successful in five launches on five attempts.

Mercury models were tested in Langley's wind tunnels. Tests varied from static stability studies on full-scale models to drag

and heat transfer investigations on models weighing less than a ping-pong ball.

The research center is supporting project Apollo through the use of unique simulators and specialized laboratories, designed to enable the country to gain on the ground experience of the rigors of outer space.

The experience and accomplishments gained at Langley, combined with the availability at one location of an array of specialized laboratory facilities and equipment at Hampton, is unique. Langley today constitutes a vital national resource for the future conduct of advanced research and technology programs in aeronautics and the manned and unmanned exploration of space.

The Senate joint resolution 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of making an announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that we expect to call up the conference report on the military construction authorization bill tomorrow.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in order to find out how many of the 28 advisory committee members to the Speaker are here, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 288]

Ashley	Celler	Fino
Aspinall	Cleveland	Flynt
Ayres	Conyers	Ford, Gerald R.
Barrett	Corbett	Ford, William D.
Blatnik	Corman	Fountain
Brademas	Culver	Gallagher
Brock	de la Garza	Gettys
Broomfield	Dent	Hagan
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Halleck
Bush	Diggs	Hanna
Cabell	Eckhardt	Helstoski
Carey	Edwards, La.	Kluczynski
Carter	Evans, Colo.	Kupferman
Casey	Feighan	Kyl
Landrum	Monagan	Stuckey
Leggett	Nichols	Teague, Calif.
Lukens	Nix	Tiernan
McCulloch	O'Konski	Tuck
McDonald, Mich.	O'Neill, Mass.	Udall
McEwen	Pettis	Utt
Macdonald, Mass.	Pool	Vander Jagt
May	Pucinski	Waggonner
Michel	Rarick	Watkins
Miller, Calif.	Reifel	Watts
Mink	Resnick	Whitener
Minshall	Ronan	Williams, Miss.
	Sandman	Willis
	St Germain	Wilson, Bob
	Smith, Iowa	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

SAUGUS IRON WORKS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1308) to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 1308

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve in public ownership the first sustained integrated ironworks in the Thirteen Colonies, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within boundaries of the area generally depicted on drawing numbered NHS SI 7100, entitled "Proposed Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site", dated May 28, 1964, which is on file in the Department of the Interior. If the Secretary determines that features historically associated with the Saugus Iron Works, including the charcoal pit and the collection basin, are outside the boundaries shown on the drawing he may revise the boundaries of the area by publication of a notice to that effect in the Federal Register. The property acquired pursuant to this section shall be known as the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall administer the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, through page 2, line 7, strike out all of section 1 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That in order to preserve in public ownership the first sustained integrated ironworks in the Thirteen Colonies, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the area generally depicted on drawing numbered NHS-SI-7100B, entitled 'Proposed Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site', dated May, 1967, which is on file in the Department of the Interior. The property acquired pursuant to this section shall be known as the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site."

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert "$400,000".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1308, a bill to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 1308 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the site of one of America's earliest industrial landmarks—the old Saugus Iron Works. The nucleus of this proposed national historic site consists of property now owned by the First Iron Works Association, Inc. This association has offered to donate all of its property, comprising some eight acres, to the United States for the proposed national historic site.

This colonial iron works dates back to 1648 and the site was first owned and established under an English partnership called the "Company of Undertakers for the Iron Works in New England," and was operational from 1648 to 1670. The site is on the Saugus River about ten miles north of historic Boston.

The old Saugus Iron Works, though not successful financially because of competitive imports and mismanagement, was a prototype of a modern iron and steel plant. It was an integrated mill producing directly malleable wrought iron in contrast to pig or cast iron. This colonial iron works supplied the tools and hardware very much needed in our colonial development. The old Saugus Iron Works was a symbolic forerunner of America's present-day industrial giants.

The historic values of this property were recognized and in 1943 the First Iron Works Association, Inc., a private, nonprofit organization interested in historic preservation, was formed to protect the site from being moved and publicize its historic importance. In 1949, the American Iron & Steel Institute became interested in the restoration of the Saugus Iron Works and for the next 13 years spent $2.4 million in support of the archeological investigation as the first step toward reconstruction of this site. By 1954, extensive archeological investigation and research had been completed, the works were created and opened to the public.

The restoration and reconstruction of this colonial iron works has been accomplished in a meticulous manner using the foundations of the original building. The work has been done and supervised by the same group that advised and assisted in the reconstruction of historic Williamsburg.

At the site of the first iron works in America one can see how iron was made in the early days of this Nation. It is truly an enlightening experience to see and particularly for those people who live in the cities and towns where modern steel methods are being used.

It is most interesting to note that this colonial iron works was probably the first

example of a large scale capitalistic enterprise in the American colonies. The company of undertakers starting this venture was organized in England and included not only people who lived in England but people from all walks of life who lived in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, including members of the clergy who invested their money in this original undertaking. The first iron works was started with a capital investment of a thousand pounds sterling and later investments brought the total investment to approximately 15,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, establishment of the proposed Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site would, in my opinion, become a valuable addition to our national park system. The Saugus Iron Works exemplifies an important era in the industrial and economic development of this Nation. I wish to commend the American Iron & Steel Institute for its spirit and generosity in financing the excavation and restoration of this colonial ironworks. And further, I wish to commend the First Iron Works Association, Inc., for its preservation of this historic site and offer to donate the Saugus Iron Works to the United States for administration as a national historic site.

The estimated capital cost for acquisition of additional lands and development of the site is $400,000. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments has endorsed the proposal to establish the Saugus Iron Works as a national historic site.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be a tremendous benefit to the American people to be authorized to accept the gift of the First Iron Works Association, Inc., and the American Iron & Steel Institute, who have done an excellent job in preserving our American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 1308.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1308 by our colleague, Congressman SAYLOR, is to set up the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site.

Congressman SAYLOR, Congressman SKUBITZ, and I visited these ironworks about 2 months ago. These works were one of the most interesting attractions and historic spots we found in Boston.

The Saugus Iron Works as they exist today are a reconstruction on the original foundations of the first integrated ironworks in America. The works were in actual operation from 1648 to 1670. They consisted of a blast furnace, a forge, a rolling and slitting mill, and other works. In addition, there was an iron master's house which is still standing and is an interesting example of early 17th century American architecture. There are two large fireplaces you can almost walk in. Most of the reconstructed works are in operating condition today and are put through their paces twice a day when the big water wheels are set in motion, the fires of the forge flare up, and the machinery goes into operation.

Restoration of the Saugus Iron Works was accomplished through the interest and generosity of the American Iron & Steel Institute. The buildings and the 8 acres of land on which they stand are now owned by the First Iron Works Association, Inc. The association's income, however, is insufficient for it to maintain the works as they should be maintained and the American Iron & Steel Institute is unwilling to invest more money in the project. The association intends to donate these assets to the United States if H.R. 1308 becomes law.

There can be no question that the Saugus Iron Works represent an important chapter in our early industrial history and that, as such, they deserve a place in the national park system. I visualize on this spot a museum of great national value telling the story of development of iron processing in this country from the very beginning when it was in its primitive stage down to the present. There is a small museum there now that could well be enlarged to tell this whole story.

The Interior Department's report on the bill advised us that its cost estimates were $47,700 for acquisition of two parcels of land in addition to the 8 acres that are to be donated and $831,000 for rehabilitation and development expenses. The committee thought the estimated cost was too high and cut this figure to $400,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation and urge its enactment.

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 SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

The Clerk called the bill (S. 862) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GRAZING RESERVES FOR INDIANS OF FORT McDERMITT, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11576) to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2162, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

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

S. 2162

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), is amended by inserting a comma after "southwest quarter section 26; west half".

The 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. 11576) was laid on the table.

REALLOCATING PART OF THE BANKRUPTCY FILING FEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8632) to amend sections 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone who has had this bill under consideration how we are doing in this country with respect to bankruptcies. Are they increasing or decreasing?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer to the gentleman's question should not affect this proposal, but the information I have is that there are more bankruptcies being filed.

Mr. GROSS. There are more bankruptcies being filed in the Great Society than heretofore?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The answer is yes.

Mr. GROSS. I regret to hear that, but I guess it goes along with the welfare state that is being established.

Mr. Speaker, I 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. 8632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph c(1) of section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68c(1)) is amended by deleting "$32" and inserting in lieu thereof "$37".

SEC. 2. Paragraph a of section 52 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 80a) is amended by deleting "$8" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3".

SEC. 3. This amendatory Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of its approval.

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.

ALLOTMENTS TO UNIFORMED SAVINGS DEPOSIT PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4772) to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code.

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

H.R. 4772

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when

the Secretary concerned considers it to be in the interest of a member of an Armed Force or his dependents, he may direct the initiation of an allotment of the unallotted pay and allowances of the members for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, if the member entered a "missing status" (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37, United States Code) before having an opportunity to execute an allotment for that purpose. The Secretary may direct the initiation of an allotment under this act without the knowledge of the member, but the allotment shall be terminated upon the written request of the member.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following language:

"That section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection.

"'(e) The Secretary concerned, or his designee, may in the interest of a member who is in a missing status (as defined in section 551(2) of title 37) or his dependents, initiate, stop, modify, and change allotments, and authorize a withdrawal of deposits, made under this section, even though the member had an opportunity to deposit amounts under this section and elected not to do so. Interest may be computed from the day the member entered a missing status, or September 1, 1966, whichever is later.'

"SEC. 2. This act becomes effective as of September 1, 1966."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4772 is a bill that would give members of the military services who have been captured in Vietnam, or who are missing, certain rights which their more fortunate companions have today.

Last year the Congress enacted Public Law 538 which inaugurated a new savings deposit program for members of the armed forces. This new program replaced the soldiers', sailors', and airmen's savings deposit program which had virtually fallen into disuse.

The new savings deposit law became effective on September 1, 1966. Unfortunately, and through a mistaken interpretation of the law, the Department of Defense thought that 350 men who were captured or missing on that date could have deposits made in the savings fund on their behalf. However, the Comptroller General held that the law was not broad enough to cover these 350 persons in a missing status in Vietnam. This, of course, created a wholly unreasonable situation which this bill is designed to correct.

There is no one on the floor of this House but will agree that those unfortunate enough to be captured or missing should have the same rights as other military people in overseas areas.

H.R. 4772 as introduced would have taken care of these 350 missing persons. It did not, however, go quite far enough and the committee, therefore, broadened it to remove any doubt whatsoever that any person achieving the status of missing or captured after September 1, 1966, would have these same rights to have deposits made in the savings deposit program.

That is all this bill will do. It will give captured and missing people the same rights that our other military people in overseas areas have today.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of legislation I have sponsored. I believe that H.R. 4772 is a necessary addition to Public Law 89–538.

On August 14, 1966, the President signed into law a bill that both Houses of Congress thought necessary. Public Law 89–538 established a new savings deposit program for members of our armed services. This program provides competitive rates of interest and reasonable deposit and withdrawal terms; features which the old program lacked.

The purpose of H.R. 4772 is to extend the privilege of that program to members of the Armed Forces who are in a missing status, to prisoners of war, those people who do not have the option to act for themselves. There were 350 men in missing status on the enacting date of Public Law 89–583.

Existing legislation does not provide for those 350 missing men and their families. H.R. 4772 will correct that omission. This bill authorizes the Secretaries concerned to act in behalf of men missing or captured so that they might have the benefit of this program. It merely extends the privileges now enjoyed by all other men in the service.

These men cannot act for themselves. It is only right that we protect their interests and assist their families. I hope the Members of this body will follow the suggestion of the Armed Services Committee and give this legislation their full support.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative THOMAS P. O'NEILL, for authoring H.R. 4772, and the members of the Armed Services Committee for bringing it before the House.

I joined in cosponsoring this legislation when the inequity in the present law was brought to my attention by the parents of my first appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy, who is listed as missing in action in Vietnam. My bill, H.R. 4851, is a companion to that authored by my colleague.

The need for the authority contained in this bill—to permit the Secretary of the service branch to act in initiating or modifying allotments in the interest of missing or captured servicemen or their families—is obvious. These men cannot act for themselves, and certainly every effort should be made to assist them.

It is indeed gratifying to me that this legislation, which affects about 350 men and their families, has the full approval of the Department of Defense and Bureau of the Budget, and unanimous support of our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. It certainly merits similar support by the House.

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.

JURISDICTION AT U.S. NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11767) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislation jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

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

H.R. 11767

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy may, at such times as he may deem desirable, retrocede to the State of California all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for retrocession, of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any lands comprising the United States Naval Station, Long Beach, California. Retrocession of jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be made by filing a written notice of such retrocession with the Governor of the State of California, and shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the State of California in such manner as its laws may prescribe.

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11707 would permit the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede to the State of California all or such portion as he may deem desirable for retrocession of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

This authority is similar to many other bills that we have passed and specifically is sought to permit the State of California, acting through local civil authorities, to furnish regular police protection to the 391 families residing in two Navy housing projects constructed on separate parcels of land which now comprise parts of the Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

Retrocession would be accomplished by filing written notice thereof with the Governor of California to be effective upon its acceptance by the State in such a manner as its laws may prescribe.

The U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif., comprises a total of 1,503.63 acres

of land and submerged land. The main site of the naval station comprises 1,102.46 acres acquired by separate condemnation actions in 1940, 1942, and 1963. The remaining 401.17 acres of land acquired by condemnation and transfer are the sites of seven off-station Navy housing projects.

Over most of the naval station and the first five off-station housing projects, the Government jurisdiction is proprietorial only. However, over a 243.46-acre portion of the main site—including 219.58 acres in which the Government interest is only a leasehold until August 9, 1970—the Government presently has partial legislative jurisdiction, subject only to State reserved powers of taxation and service of civil and criminal process. Such jurisdiction is vested by article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution; section 255 of title 40, United States Code; an act of the California Legislature of March 12, 1872, as amended by chapter 710 of the statutes of 1939—California Political Code, section 34—and Secretary of the Navy letter of April 5, 1943, accepting jurisdiction, acknowledged by California State Lands Commission letter of April 10, 1943.

The same Federal constitutional provision and statute, the same substantive California law, recodified as California Government Code, section 111 by chapter 134, California Statutes of 1943, Secretary of the Navy letter of November 12, 1943, accepting jurisdiction and California State Lands Commission acknowledgment letter of November 12, 1943, operated to vest the Government with similar jurisdiction over 485 acres acquired in 1942 for use in connection with the U.S. Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, Calif. Two portions of this 485-acre tract, measuring 58.86 and 88.77 acres, were subsequently transferred from the Naval Fuel Depot, San Pedro, to the Naval Station, Long Beach. Their development and use as Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, respectively, has given rise to a significant problem in the furnishing of adequate police protection to the 391 families residing in the housing projects. The Government's existing legislative jurisdiction over the entire 485 acres leaves local police authorities with no jurisdiction over these projects for performance of their ordinary functions of law enforcement and protection of persons and property on behalf of the residents. The Navy shore patrol, the only Government police agency readily available, cannot effectively police these residential areas since it has no general authority over persons other than members of the Armed Forces. Under section 13 of title 18, United States Code, the criminal laws of the State would be enforceable in the project areas notwithstanding the lack of State jurisdiction, but only as Federal law and only by such other Government police officers as may be provided. The forum for enforcement of such laws would be the U.S. district court.

The law enforcement agencies of the city of Los Angeles and of the county of Los Angeles, presently rendering police services in the general localities of Palos Verdes public quarters and the San Pedro fund housing project, have both indicated willingness to furnish these housing projects with their regular services if the impediment of lack of jurisdiction is removed. Government retrocession of legislative jurisdiction over these projects as soon as possible is considered highly desirable to relieve the existing unhappy situation. This will make regular police services of the city of Los Angeles and the county of Los Angeles available to occupants of portions of the housing project under their respective jurisdictions. Advising that State acceptance of retrocession of Government jurisdiction will require an act of the California Legislature, the California State Lands Commission has prepared proposed general legislation to effect State consent to Government retrocession of jurisdiction under certain conditions of procedure.

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.

ESTABLISHING A JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS IN THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12910) to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I simply want to commend the committee for bringing forth this bill.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated the creation in the Department of the Navy of a Judge Advocate General's Corps. I have never been able to understand why the other branches of the Service have had a Judge Advocate General's Corps and not the Department of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to compliment the committee for proposing this legislation.

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

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his comments and to also thank the gentleman for his support of this legislation throughout the years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I 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. 12910

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 801(11) is amended to read as follows:

"(11) 'Law specialist' means a commissioned officer of the Coast Guard designated for special duty (law)."

(2) The following new clause is added at the end of section 801:

"(13) 'Judge advocate' means an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Army or the Navy or an officer of the Air Force or the Marine Corps who is designated as a judge advocate."

(3) Section 806(a) is amended by deleting the first sentence and inserting the following sentences in place thereof:

"The assignment for duty of judge advocates of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and law specialists of the Coast Guard shall be made upon the recommendation of the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which they are members. The assignment for duty of judge advocates of the Marine Corps shall be made by direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps."

(4) Section 815(e) is amended by striking out the words "Army or Air Force, a law specialist of the Navy" in the last sentence and substituting in place thereof the words "Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps".

(5) Section 827(b)(1) is amended by striking out the words "or the Air Force or a law specialist of the Navy or" and inserting in place thereof the words ", Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps or a law specialist of the".

(6) Section 865(c) is amended by striking out the words "or the Air Force, a law specialist of the Navy" and inserting in place thereof the words ", Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps".

(7) Section 936(a)(1) is amended by deleting the words "and the Air Force" and inserting in place thereof the words ", Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps".

SEC. 2. Chapter 513 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5148 is amended—

(A) by amending the catchline to read:

"§ 5148. Judge Advocate General's Corps: Office of the Judge Advocate General; Judge Advocate General; appointment, term, emoluments, duties";

(B) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), and (c) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively, and inserting the following new subsection:

"(a) The Judge Advocate General's Corps is a Staff Corps of the Navy, and shall be organized in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy."; and

(C) by striking out, in subsection (b) as redesignated, in the third sentence, the word "officers" and inserting in place thereof the words "judge advocates".

(2) Section 5149 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5149. Office of the Judge Advocate General: Deputy Judge Advocate General; Assistant Judge Advocate General

"(a) A judge advocate of the Navy or Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade of rear admiral (upper half) or major general, as appropriate, unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. The Deputy Judge Advocate General is entitled to the same privileges of retirement as provided for chiefs of bureaus in section 5133 of this title.

"(b) A judge advocate of the Navy or Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

"(c) When there is a vacancy in the Office of the Judge Advocate General, or during the absence or disability of the Judge Advocate General, the Deputy Judge Advocate General shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General until a successor is appointed or the absence or disability ceases.

"(d) When subsection (c) cannot be complied with because of the absence or disability of the Deputy Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General

shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General."

(3) The analysis is amended by amending the items relating to sections 5148 and 5149 to read as follows:

"5148. Judge Advocate General's Corps: Office of the Judge Advocate General; Judge Advocate General; appointment, term, emoluments, duties.

"5149. Office of the Judge Advocate General: Deputy Judge Advocate General; Assistant Judge Advocate General."

SEC. 3. Section 5404 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) The Secretary of the Navy, as of January 1 of each year, shall establish the authorized strength of the active list of the Navy in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps."

SEC. 4. Section 5508(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting the following new clause after clause (5): "(6) Officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps,"; and

(2) by renumbering clauses (6), (7), and (8) as clauses "(7)", "(8)", and "(9)", respectively.

SEC. 5. Chapter 539 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The following new section is added after section 5578:

"§ 5578a. Regular Navy; Judge Advocate General's Corps

"(a) Original appointments to the active list of the Navy in the Judge Advocate General's Corps may be made from persons who—

"(1) are at least twenty-one and under thirty-five years of age;

"(2) are graduates of an accredited law school or are members of the bar of a Federal court or the highest court of a State; and

"(3) have physical, mental, and moral qualifications satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

For the purposes of determining lineal position, permanent grade, seniority in permanent grade, and eligibility for promotion, an officer appointed in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with the amount of service prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, but not less than three years.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, appointments to the active list of the Navy in the Judge Advocate General's Corps may be made from officers of the Navy, including the Naval Reserve, in the line or in another staff corps. Notwithstanding any other law, an officer appointed under this subsection shall have a running mate assigned to him under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy."

(2) Section 5587(c) is amended by striking out "law,".

(3) The following new section is added after section 5587:

"§ 5587a. Regular Marine Corps: judge advocates.

"(a) With the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, any officer on the active list of the Marine Corps who is qualified under section 827(b) of this title may, upon his application, be designated as a judge advocate.

"(b) For the purposes of determining lineal position, permanent grade, seniority in permanent grade, and eligibility for promotion, a person appointed to the active list of the Marine Corps with a view to designation as a judge advocate may be credited with the amount of service prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, but not more than three years."

(4) Section 5600(b) is amended—

(A) by adding at the end of clause (1) the words

"(D) Judge Advocate General's Corps—3 years;";

(B) by striking out clause (2); and

(C) by renumbering clause (3) as clause (2).

(5) The following new items are inserted in the analysis:

"5578a. Regular Navy: Judge Advocate General's Corps."

"5587a. Regular Marine Corps: judge advocates."

SEC. 6. Section 5762 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5762(d) is amended by inserting the words "Judge Advocate General's Corps," after the words "Medical Corps,".

(2) The following new subsection is added at the end:

"(f) The Secretary shall furnish the appropriate selection board convened under chapter 543 of this title with the number of officers that may be recommended for promotion to the grade of captain or commander in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. This number, determined by the Secretary as of the date the selection board is convened—

"(1) may not exceed the total number of officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the promotion zone for the grade concerned; and

"(2) may not be less than the product of the number of officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the promotion zone and a fraction, of which the numerator is the number of male line officers, not restricted in the performance of duty, placed upon the promotion list pursuant to the report of the comparable board for the selection of line officers convened in the same fiscal year, and the denominator is the number of male line officers, not restricted in the performance of duty, in the promotion zone considered by that board."

SEC. 7. Section 202 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting the words "or as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy," after the word "Navy".

(2) Subsection (h) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (6);

(B) by redesignating clause (7) as clause (8); and

(C) by adding immediately after clause (6) a new clause as follows:

"(7) Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy; or".

(3) Subsection (i) is amended by striking out clause (3) thereof and by renumbering clauses (4) and (5) as clauses (3) and (4), respectively.

SEC. 8. (a) In this section "law specialist" means a line officer on the active or retired list of the Regular Navy or of the Naval Reserve designated for special duty (law) or a line officer of the Naval Reserve assigned a numerical designator indicating a special duty officer (law).

(b) All law specialists in the Navy are redesignated as judge advocates in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy. Each law specialist of the Navy who is on a promotion list on the day before the effective date of this Act shall be placed on the appropriate promotion list for the Judge Advocate General's Corps and shall be eligible for promotion when the officer who is to be his running mate in the next higher grade becomes eligible for promotion in that grade. All provisions of title 10, United States Code, not inconsistent with this Act, relating to officers of the Medical Corps of the Navy shall apply to officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall operate to terminate or reduce the term of an officer who was serving as Deputy and Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy on the day before the effective date of this Act or to deprive him of the rank, pay, allowances, or retirement privileges to which he was then entitled. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an officer who was so serving on the day before the effective date of this Act shall be deemed to be detailed as Deputy Judge Advocate General, pursuant to section 5149 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this Act, and, in addition to rights and benefits then accrued, to be entitled to the rank and retirement benefits authorized by that section. For the purposes of determining his eligibility for the retirement benefits authorized by section 5149 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this Act, an officer who is serving as Deputy Judge Advocate General on the effective date of this Act shall be credited with all service performed under appointment or detail as Deputy and Assistant Judge Advocate General before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 10. This Act does not affect rights accrued, duties matured, or proceedings commenced before its effective date.

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all provisions of law applicable to a male officer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the Navy, including the Naval Reserve, are applicable to a woman officer in that corps.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, lines 20 through 25, and page 4, lines 1 through 21, strike entire section and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"§ 5149. Office of the Judge Advocate General: Deputy Judge Advocate General; Assistant Judge Advocates General

"(a) A judge advocate of the Navy or Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade of rear admiral (upper half) or major general, as appropriate, unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. The Deputy Judge Advocate General is entitled to the same privileges of retirement as provided for chiefs of bureaus in section 5133 of this title.

"(b) An officer of the Judge Advocate General's Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 5148(b) of this title shall be detailed as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade to rear admiral (lower half), unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. An officer who is retired while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy under this subsection or who, after serving at least twelve months as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy, is retired after completion of that service while serving in a lower rank or grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the rank and grade of rear admiral (lower half). If he is retired as a rear admiral, he is entitled to retired pay in the lower half of that grade, unless entitled to higher pay under another provision of law.

"(c) A judge advocate of the Marine Corps who has the qualifications prescribed for the Judge Advocate General in section 4158(b) of this title shall be detailed as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy. While so serving he is entitled to the rank and grade of brigadier general, unless entitled to a higher rank or grade under another provision of law. An officer who is retired while serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy under this subsection or who, after serving at least twelve months as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy, is retired after completion of that service while serving in a lower rank or grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the rank and grade of brigadier general. If he is retired as a brigadier general, he is entitled to the retired pay of that grade, unless entitled to higher pay under another provision of law.

"(d) When there is a vacancy in the Office of the Judge Advocate General, or during the absence or disability of the Judge Advocate General, the Deputy Judge Advocate General shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General until a successor is appointed or the absence or disability ceases.

"(e) When subsection (d) cannot be complied with because of the absence or disability of the Deputy Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocates General in the order directed by the Secretary of the Navy, shall perform the duties of the Judge Advocate General."

On page 7, on the last line before line 6, add an "s" to the word "Advocate".

On page 9, after line 4, add the following:

"(4) The following new subsection is added at the end:

"'(k) Unless appointed to a higher grade under another provision of law, an officer of the Navy or Marine Corps serving as Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Navy is entitled to the basic pay of a rear admiral (lower half) or brigadier general, as appropriate.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12910 would provide for a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy. At the outset, I should say that this bill stems from legislation which had been carefully studied and drafted by our able and conscientious colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

The responsibilities of the uniformed lawyer in the Navy—now law specialists—have been increasing over the years. It was not until after World War II that the Navy began to use full-time lawyers in place of line officers with legal training who spent part time on legal matters. Now the problems have become even more complex—with the Uniform Code of Military Justice, with the increased necessity of providing legal guidance to service personnel and with the Navy's increased responsibilities around the world.

The Navy has had to rely recently more and more on young students right out of law school to provide the major portion of its officers. There has been a real dearth of officers continuing in the Navy making it a lifetime career. Young men who have been interviewed when leaving the service have said that one of the two main reasons for their departure was the lack of a professional organization within the Navy. This bill is designed to supply that lack. It is hoped that with a full organization within the Navy more young men will decide that there is a place in the Navy for a legal career and will stay with it for their professional lives. Then the lawyers will have the same kind of an organization within which they can have professional recognition as the doctors, the dentists, and the civil engineers. The bill has many sections because it was necessary to amend many parts of title 10 in order to provide for the Judge Advocate General's Corps.

The bill was unanimously approved in subcommittee and in the full committee. I move its passage.

Mr. BENNETT. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12910.

I support this for the following reasons: First, each other branch of the armed services already has such a corps and has found this to be efficient and helpful; second, if the Navy secures the establishment of such a corps it will be consistent with and carry out the internal Navy organization in other staff corps such as supply, civil engineering, medical, dental, nurse, and medical services; third, the present Navy strength of persons doing this legal work is now at the level of 555 and the demand for the type of work which they do is increasing. Recently enacted legislation to require the Navy to recover certain funds under the Medical Care Recovery Act of 1962 and the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1966 have increased the responsibilities of Navy lawyers. Further, decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States with regard to furnishing free legal counsel to the accused must eventually be consistently carried out in the armed services, and this would require a substantial number of lawyers. So it is clear from these and other things that the responsibilities of the Navy lawyers have increased substantially through recent years, and it seems clear for this reason alone that the Navy should be allowed the same organizational structure in this field as is enjoyed by other branches of the services. Fourth, and finally, the legislation will assist in obtaining and retaining adequate Navy lawyers. The experience level of the Navy lawyer has been steadily declining since 1957. Although the numbers available for the Navy have been adequate, if their lack of experience is not considered, the numbers reflect very largely the present draft situation. This means that we are obtaining inexperienced lawyers and that when the draft situation eases even they will not be available. Even at the present time the question of retention of an adequate number of lawyers with experience is very much a problem. This legislation would help to correct this situation.

It is my belief that the creation of a Navy Judge Advocate General's Corps would be a great help in the retention problems of the Navy in the field of maintaining adequate lawyers for the responsibilities that are placed upon them by statute. I sincerely hope that the House will pass the bill.

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.

FACILITATING COMPUTATION OF TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1564) to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

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

S. 1564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 313(g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary may convert the national marketing quota into a national acreage allotment by dividing the national marketing quota by the national average yield for the five years immediately preceding the year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, and may apportion the national acreage allotment, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 per centum thereof for new farms, for making corrections in old farm acreage allotments, and for adjusting inequities in old farm acreage allotments, through the local committees among farms on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (b), using past farm acreage and past farm acreage allotments for tobacco in lieu of past marketing of tobacco; and the Secretary on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (c) and the past tobacco experience of the farm operator, shall through the local committees allot that portion of the national acreage allotment reserved for new farms among farms on which no tobacco was produced or considered produced during the last five years."

The 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.

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

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4903) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4903

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act of July 12, 1960, Public Law 86-629, as amended (76 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the figure "$12,000,000" and inserting the figure "$25,000,000" in place thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4903 would raise our assistance to the Ryukyu Islands from the sum of $12 million to $25 million.

The bill, however, is very much more important than the amount of money would indicate, and I shall attempt to make this statement abundantly clear during my discussion of what the bill, if adopted, would do.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this is the third time that legislation of this kind has been considered by the House of Representatives. Only last year, in March, we considered a bill, identical in its language to the one which is pending

before us today. That bill was reported out of the Committee on Armed Services unanimously and passed the House. However, it failed of passage in the other body.

Further, by reason of your approval of this same legislation—and I do not intend to go into great detail, since great detail as has been gone into on previous occasions, we do have a real high priority and practical obligation to the people of Okinawa. Legislation of this kind is in the last analysis serving our own best interests. There can be no doubt that Okinawa is our most important military installation in the Far East.

Mr. Speaker, our investment to date in structures alone on Okinawa is in excess of one-half billion dollars. Of course, what this bill will do, if enacted, is very simply stated as follows: It will permit the raising of teachers' salaries, for example in the area of public health, it will provide for disease control and for health and medical facilities and equipment.

It will permit the building of roads, bridges, and a sewer system, and many other things of this same general nature.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go into further detail on this unless of course there are some questions on the part of the Members. But, Mr. Speaker, this is an essential bill in support of our military installations in Okinawa.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This bill, as I believe the gentleman has stated, would increase the authorization for the support of the Ryukyu Islands from $12 million to $25 million a year?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Why, having taken the islands at a terrific price in blood and lives, must we now, in addition to the economic support that our huge base there gives to these people, more than double the direct authorization each year?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that emphasis has been placed in the past that since we took Okinawa by conquest our use of the islands is merely the result of the defeat of the Japanese.

The gentleman will grant this is the emphasis that sometimes has been placed in these matters, that is true. But it fails to recognize that Okinawa is far separated from Japan, and has in many ways its own, ancient culture. The Okinawans were never really our enemies; they were rather the unhappy victims of the war that had little or no presence there. They do, however, consider themselves a part of Japan. They compare their situation as against the situation in the other prefectures of Japan. They compare their progress with the progress being made in the other prefectures of Japan. Unfortunately, they find themselves a little bit below that progress.

I believe we have some responsibility to assist them in at least maintaining the same rate of progress as the people in the other areas of Japan enjoy.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I know of no one who wants to surrender this bastion we have in the Pacific. That is not the issue at all. What I am concerned about is this continual increasing of the spending of our taxpayers' money on the Ryukyus, with the Japanese continuing to insist that they again take over the rule of the Ryukyus and Matsuoko, chief of the local government, insisting on a return to Japanese jurisdiction.

What are we proposing to do; spend more hundreds of millions of dollars putting capital improvements on Okinawa and then one day turning the huge investment over to the Japanese?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman that we went into this quite thoroughly during our hearings, and we have held extensive hearings on this matter. The Okinawa situation is a continuing situation. The increase in the cost of operation is like in any other part of the world. The economics have improved, naturally, and we want them to continue to improve.

But I do want to comment on the gentleman's concern about the reversion of the islands to Japan. There has been a great deal said in the past about the possibility of returning Okinawa to Japan. That is the reason we were careful in our hearings to give much attention to this matter. We went into it in detail, and I might say we went into it in depth, both with the Army representative and Ambassador Berger of the State Department, and I want to state frankly—and I believe the other members of the subcommittee will agree with me—that there is not any thought on this side, at least, in our Government being given to the return of Okinawa to Japan. There was no division of opinion on this in any of the testimony received by the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand there are about a million natives on the Ryukyu Islands?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. There are something less than a million. It is in the neighborhood of 940,000.

Mr. GROSS. And about 700,000 of them are on Okinawa?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is true—yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any figures as to the Japanese contribution to the economy of the islands?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes, we do. The Japanese have contributed about $26 million in 1967 to the same type of program. Over $67 million since 1951.

Mr. GROSS. What is their annual share of the contribution? I know what it is for 1966, but what was it for 1967? or what is it estimated to be?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. They are increasing it to about $25 million in 1967 and it has been a steady increase each year since 1951.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the Japanese in fiscal year 1966 put in about $16 million into Okinawa; is that not correct?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is right. They are increasing it this year.

I might say to the gentleman that this is one reason for the necessity of increasing our authorization because we have a partnership program with the Japanese for sharing the costs of certain specific items that are of great importance to the economy of Okinawa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that the bulk of Ryukyus exports are to Japan, and the bulk of their imports are from Japan?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That may be true. But the Okinawans for a long time have attempted to increase their trade with other parts of the world and they have attempted to increase their business with us.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, we are about to vote here to double the take from the United States—from $12 to $25 million—and yet we do not have the slightest assurance that this is going to provide us with any larger share of the trade with the Ryukyus, and principally Okinawa? The Japanese are living high on the hog so far as trade with the Ryukyus is concerned, and we are putting in more money than the Japanese.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No, no—we are not.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes, we are when it is all totaled.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In the whole picture—in the operation of our base—yes. But in the particular program for which these funds are being provided, we are not. We have to face the practical situation we are in in Okinawa. We have our main military installation in Asia in Okinawa. We are going to have to stay there a long time and the gentleman, I think, wants us to stay there. If we are going to stay there, we have to meet our responsibilities to the area and we have to assist the people of Okinawa to promote and build up their economy and to do the essential things that are necessary and this money will help them.

This is for educational programs. It is for public health and medical programs, and public safety and cultural facilities. It is for public works and economic development. It is for the construction of a sewer system and of a water system and for transportation. It is for all the essential things that go to make up the economy of a country. These are just as essential for our troops over there because without an adequate water supply and without an adequate sewer system, we are adversely affected.

Mr. GROSS. I again say to the gentleman that we obtained the island of Okinawa at a staggering price in lives and blood of Americans. I know of no reason why we should today expend the kind of money that we are, over and above the contribution that the stationing of our troops at this base contributes to their economy. I know of no reason why we should continue to pay right through the nose to the Ryukyus who are demonstrating at times and insisting that they be returned to Japanese rule.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I do not follow the logic of the gentleman because if he thinks that we should stay there, and if he thinks we are there by conquest, and if he thinks we have a right to be there, then we have the obligation to maintain

the island and support its economy. We have $1.5 billion in a military operation there to maintain and protect. I think it is in our own self-interest that we do this.

Mr. GROSS. There are any number of the natives employed by the U.S. Government at good pay by Asian standards and that is where their economy gets its biggest boost.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Of course, they are. There is no argument about that.

Mr. GROSS. Then why double the amount of the authorization in this bill?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Because the sewer systems are essential. The water system is essential. Because the educational system is essential. Because these funds are required to bolster the economy of the country and at least to try to bring them up to a level equal to that of the people in other prefectures of Japan.

I think it would be a sad reflection on America if we are not able to do that.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the recent visit of the Prime Minister of Japan to this country have anything to do with a commitment to pass this bill? Is the effort to pass this bill a result of his visit here?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That has nothing to do with it. This bill was passed by the House in the 89th Congress before his visit here. This will be the third time it has been passed. It has been passed twice by the House.

I would like the gentleman to bear in mind the preamble to the basic law related to those islands. Here is what it says:

> In the exercise by the President of the authority over the Ryukyu Islands granted to the United States, Article III of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, every effort shall be made to improve the welfare and well being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and to promote their economic and cultural development.

That is what we seek to do with this bill, but without these funds we will not be in a very good position to fulfill this commitment in the preamble to the treaty entered into with Japan.

Mr. GROSS. With the Japanese putting in $16 million and with an increase in our contribution to $25 million, that would be $41 million going into that country, in addition to the other money to which I have referred.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. We must contribute $25 million even to match what the Japanese may be expected to put in. The Japanese put up $16 million in 1966. We were not able to do that in this particular program. The Japanese were able to put $25 million in for fiscal 1967, which we are not able to match because we do not have sufficient authorization to do it.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman appreciate that the U.S. Treasury is "busted," and that we are borrowing money every hour of every day to run this Government? And this is an increase of more than 100 percent in our authorization for the Ryukyu Islands. I just do not go along with it, and I want the record to show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. To protect an investment of $1,500,000,000 that we have in military operations in the Ryukyus and which we hope to maintain.

Mr. GROSS. If the channeling of more and more millions of dollars into the Ryukyu Islands is necessary for our retention of the Ryukyus, then we had better prepare to get out of there now, because we cannot continue this endlessly and forever. We cannot always buy our way around the world. In this case there is no justification for buying our right to stay on Okinawa or any other island of that chain.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The report indicates that the Government of the United States recognizes a residual sovereignty of Japan with respect to the Ryukyu Islands. We all know that Japan has been increasing their economic aid and technical assistance throughout Southeast Asia in recent years. In view of the fact that the United States Government, and the taxpayers of the United States, are providing a nuclear as well as conventional umbrella over Japan, and in view of the fact that the security treaty and their Constitution require that Japan not have a Military Establishment and therefore she does not bear the costs of defense, would it not seem reasonable for the U.S. Government to encourage Japan to undertake a greater role with respect to economic assistance in the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because at this point I would like to read into the RECORD how the Japanese contribution has been increasing year by year.

In 1960 the Japanese Government contributed about $172,000. Then in 1961, $570,000; in 1965, to $8 million; in 1966, $16 million; in 1967, $25 million.

So those figures indicate that the contributions of Japan have grown year by year.

So Japan has been increasing its contribution.

I might say to the gentleman—I think he will agree with me—that it is in our interest to maintain our bases on Okinawa. I do not know where we would go in the Asian area, and I do not know what the cost of replacement of the facilities would be in some other place.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further. I certainly am not debating the question as to whether or not the United States should retain bases on Okinawa—at least until such time as the world situation is such that those bases are no longer required.

My point is this. On the economic side, and it assumes continuation of U.S. involvement there and the base there, and a continued attitude on the part of Japan that they recognize, as we do, a residual sovereignty. In view of the fact that Japan is spending less than 5 percent of her national budget per year on defense and on their foreign aid programs—and my guess is that it would be something closer to 2 or 3 percent—and in view of the fact that the U.S. Government is spending approximately 60 percent on defense, military assistance, and foreign aid, it seems to me it would not be unreasonable for the United States to attempt to make an arrangement with Japan whereby Japan would undertake a proportionally greater portion of the assistance in the Ryukyu Islands.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my time is almost up, so I will reply to the gentleman very rapidly. First of all, the Japanese Government is precluded in the Treaty of Peace from operation of military defense there.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The gentleman is not answering my question. I know that.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Secondly, I do not think there would be any difficulty in the world in having the Japanese put more funds into the existing joint program, but it would then strengthen their case for early reversion and would cause considerable problems.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I am interested to hear the gentleman say that that is what is behind his position.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I think we should bear that in mind.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 4903, being full well aware of the argument that has gone before. In noting that, I will advise our colleagues to review the committee report, pages 5, 6, 7, and 8 in particular. These pertain to the authority of the United States in the Ryukyus. It pertains to something that has been very close to the heart of those of us who have been in the military (and perhaps are still in the Reserves), those of us who have served in Okinawa and in the Ryukyu Islands in World War II, or who have visited there officially as architects for the Congress since that time, or indeed even on active duty as Reserves. I refer to the fact that control of the Ryukyus is in their assembly, elected in a representative fashion, in their elected head of State, in the High Commissioner of the Ryukyus, and the civilian adviser to the High Commissioner.

The High Commissioner of the Ryukyus has three different hats to wear: First of all, he is the commander in chief of the 9th Corps of the Army; secondly, he is the High Commissioner and is appointed by the State Department and has State Department functions; and also, indeed his civilian adviser is for the most part from and nominated by the Department of State. I for one am adamant in my belief that the High Commissioner should remain an armed service representative and designee.

This is a very complex situation. Suffice it to say that under the de facto sovereignty which we exercise there, although Executive Order No. 10713, and indeed the peace treaty with Japan, sections 2 and 3, do not clearly establish this as a total sovereign right or a ceding of territory to the United States of America, it is beyond any peradventure of doubt important that we maintain this

as a crossroads of the military in the Western Pacific, as far as our ability to maintain freedom around the world is concerned.

I, for one, do feel that it is important that we maintain this bastion in the far western Pacific forever. If we do so, I think we do have some obligation to see that, on a private enterprise basis and on a government basis, if necessary, "we fly our flag," in this area.

Toward this end I have indeed gone so far as to solicit private enterprise from time to time, and some medical care in particular, and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation specifically, for the establishment of clinics needed there, and also to see that some American-trained physicians practice there. We were partially successful in this effort for the area.

There has been a need for and an opportunity to fly the flag there with fertilizer plants, increased farming techniques with land restoration objectives, paints, certainly private power, and many other areas.

So long as we are going to maintain this as a base, and maintain control, including the health factors and the required sanitation in this faraway place, much of it for military purposes, our obligation is worthwhile; and albeit, as stated, we can never retract or take from them the installations of private enterprise, there planted in an effort to fly our flag, or any public installation, we need do this for the weal of all concerned.

Personally, after careful consideration of this bill, after having visited both with past and present high commissioners and representatives from the Ryukyus, after having been assured by our Department of State—which I am not always so positive can and will maintain our sovereignty there, other than residual sovereignty, as indeed they are now attempting to do in the Panama Canal—I have come to the considered opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is better for us to so manipulate and to so contribute and to so constitute our control, and the high commissioner's veto power, along with the ascendancy of the GRI (the governing body of the Ryukus), that they will, in the open market place on a fair enterprise basis, put out bids for the electric power company, which certainly we have subsidized in the past, even by putting barges alongside, and ships to generate power in times of need from low power peaks so that they themselves will be able to build the powerplant on a competitive basis, rather than let the Corps of Engineers do it, which would be wholly subsidized. I believe there is some evidence that perhaps the Corps wanted to do this construction and perhaps along with the Department of the Army has been instrumental, in an indirect way, in not allowing the bids for the consortium for the development of power on the Ryukyus base, for too long a time.

Therefore, I would rise—with some reservation—in support of this bill, especially in view of the fact that on two past occasions it passed this House. We should work the will of the House vis-a-vis the other body, where the bill has languished in idleness and failed to come before the body, as needed law.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] 3 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to quite a discourse from both sides of the aisle on the fact that we are there and apparently we are going to stay. I hope we do stay in the Ryukyus.

If we fail to increase this expenditure by more than 100 percent, from $12 million to $25 million, does it mean the United States is going to be forced off the Ryukyus, that we are going to be forced out of Okinawa? Is this what the gentlemen on the committee are saying, that unless we more than double this authorization we are going to be forced off the Ryukyus, including Okinawa? If this is the situation we are in today then we are militarily bankrupt.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman looked over this way, so I assume he wants me to answer.

No. I would say this is a reflection of our responsibility. If we are going to remain there and maintain our installation, we have this responsibility and it should be met.

I would say that the fact the authorization is for $25 million does not indicate there is $25 million in the budget this year. As a matter of fact, it would be considerably less than that for this year.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman should admit is that with the passage of this bill it can go to $25 million at any time in the future.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No. It puts us in a position, on a program we have there in conjunction with the Japanese, where we can match offers of contributions with the Japanese.

Mr. GROSS. Why should we match anything with the Japanese?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Because——

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute now. Why should we match anything with the Japanese? The Japanese, if I remember the figures correctly, for 1966, at least, are getting more than 70 percent of the import business into the Ryukyus and particularly into Okinawa and more than 70 percent of the exports from the Ryukyus are going into Japan. We are way down the list. We are in second or third place as far as trade with the Ryukyus is concerned despite the fact that we have been putting up the lion's share of the money for them. The reason why I do not know. When we consider the millions of dollars that we have spent for the support of this base, for the military forces there and for hiring of native employees and so on, I just do not understand why we should spend $12 million, much less increase it to $25 million as is proposed. Some place along the line you on the Committee on Armed Services ought to put a stop to this business. We are there by right of conquest at a staggering price in terms of Americans killed and wounded. We should stay there by right of conquest until the Ryukyus are no longer valuable to use as a base in the Pacific. There is no reason why we should ask the taxpayers of this country to pay through the nose for this right.

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I believe every member of the Committee on Armed Services full well realizes how Okinawa was obtained. I am sure we all realize the success and vagaries of the peace treaty with Japan. I want to emphasize to this House that this is the most important military base currently in existence in all of our armed defenses of the United States of America, and freedom around the world.

Second. I want to make the didactic statement that insofar as this member of the Committee on Armed Services is concerned, so long as he or any influence he might wield is concerned, these islands will never be returned or receded, with residuary rights or otherwise, to any foreign sovereign power because of their inherent value, considering our military defense needs.

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

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not saying that if we should refuse to add $13 million a year to the take by the Ryukyuan Government, that we are going to lose this base in the Pacific, is he?

Mr. HALL. No, I am certainly not, nor have I ever countenanced such a thought. Personally I do not believe this is on a matching-fund race basis with any other government, but I am sincerely anxious that we keep this as a going concern for the military. I just do not consider it on that basis or that we are matching pennies or playing games with any other sovereign power.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4903, a bill to provide for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, and to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] for the great leadership and foresight he has demonstrated in the matter under consideration. Much of the good relationship which we now enjoy with the Ryukyuans is the result of the work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. From personal knowledge, I know that he is one of the most highly regarded Americans in the Ryukyu Islands, as well as in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under debate will authorize the increase from $13 million to $25 million in appropriations to maintain our position in the Ryukyu Islands. As it is well known, the islands are under the complete control of the United States, and will continue to be so, so long as it is our wish. It is an undeniable fact too that the Ryukyu Islands play a highly important role in our efforts in Vietnam. Were it not for the free use of the military bases there our operations in Vietnam would be sorely handicapped.

Both the Japanese and the Okinawans recognize this, and being in support of our policy in Vietnam, they are not exerting undue pressure for the return of

the islands to Japan, under its recognized rights of residual sovereignty.

Despite the fact that the United States exercises complete jurisdiction and control over the Ryukyu Islands, the Japanese Government has, upon the urging of our Government, agreed to increase its economic assistance to the Ryukyuans and will be boosting its annual contribution from its present $16 million to $25 million.

Because there are thousands of Americans, civilian and military, now resident in the Ryukyu Islands, and because it is not known how long they will be there, whatever improvements we make there will be to the benefit of Americans, as well as to the Ryukyuans. If we fail to provide the necessary improvements, agitation for reversion will no doubt increase, and our operations in connection with Vietnam can become truly complicated. Passage of this bill will assure continued good relations and cooperation from the people of the Ryukyus, and will be in our own best interest. I therefore urge my colleagues to support and vote for the measure under consideration.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on the legislation before this body today, H.R. 4903, which provides for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have long been concerned about American policies and position in the Ryukyu Islands.

Less than 2 years ago as chairman of a study mission to Asia I visited both Japan and Okinawa in an attempt to gain firsthand information and opinions on the "reversion" issue.

The mission, which included our colleagues, Representatives MURPHY of Illinois, BROOMFIELD, WHALLEY, THOMSON of Wisconsin, and JAMES FULTON and Representative MATSUNAGA, representative of the House Agriculture Committee, discussed relevant matters with Japanese, Ryukyuan, and American officials.

Our observations confirmed that the requirement of free world security are intimately connected with the effective and unified control of the military facilities which dominate the life of the islands. At the same time, the study mission expressed support for any measures which would aid in improving American-Ryukyuan relations and in eliminating sources of friction.

The legislation before the House today fulfills those criteria. It seeks to help eliminate an economic source of unrest by providing additional funds for further development of the islands' wealth and resources.

Certainly progress has been made during the past few years. At the same time, however, the standard of living for the people of the islands lags behind that of the Japanese. The Ryukyuans, who are ethnically Japanese, need only look to the East to see a reason for pressing for the reversion of their island to Japan.

Through this legislation we hope to demonstrate to the people of the island that the United States is not only interested in their island as a military bastion, but as a real interest in the progress and welfare of the inhabitants.

Such a concern unfortunately, has not been too evident at times in the past.

It we are to keep this important base in the Pacific for as long as the security of our country and the countries of this area demand without constant friction and troubles, the future must be different.

That is the purpose of this legislation: to insure a better and more harmonious future for the Ryukyuan people and for American military presence on the islands.

At the same time, we continue to hope that the international and regional tensions which require a U.S. presence in the eastern Pacific will soon subside, allowing the reversion of the Ryukyus to Japan.

When that day comes, let us be sure that the Ryukyuan people do not look back on their "American period" as one of stagnation and unrest, but rather as a time of growth and development for themselves while their island home served as an indispensable arsenal of strength in the defense of the free world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4903.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONTE. 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 284, nays 80, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—284

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kuykendall
Kyros
Laird
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Mills
Minish
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Whalen
White
Whitener
Widnall
Wiggins
Winn
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—80

Abbitt
Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Ashmore
Bevill
Blanton
Bow
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Conable
Conte
Cowger
Cunningham
Dorn
Duncan
Edwards, Calif.
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Gardner
Gathings
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Gude
Gurney
Hammer-schmidt
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kleppe
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Mahon
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Montgomery
Natcher
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Poage
Pryor
Quillen
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Riegle
Robison
Roth
Roybal
Ruppe
Sandman
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebeli
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Snyder
Stubblefield
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Tuck
Wampler
Watson
Whalley
Whitten
Williams, Pa.
Wolff
Wyman

NOT VOTING—68

Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Brademas
Brock
Broomfield
Bush
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cleveland
Conyers
Corbett

Corman
de la Garza
Derwinski
Diggs
Eckhardt
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Gallagher
Gettys
Hagan
Halleck
Hanna
Helstoski
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lukens
McCulloch
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Minshall
Nichols
O'Konski
Pettis
Pool
Pucinski
Rarick
Reifel
Resnick
Ronan
Stuckey
Teague, Calif.
Tiernan
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Watkins
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright

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

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Willis with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Corman with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Eckhardt.

Mr. FUQUA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. HAMMERSCHMIDT, DUNCAN, CUNNINGHAM, BROWN of Michigan, GARDNER, LATTA, and BURKE of Florida 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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF THE ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 223) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 223

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 "Alaska Communications Disposal Act".

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. In this Act—

(1) "Transfer" means the conveyance by the United States of any element of ownership, including but not restricted to any estate or interest in property, and franchise rights, by sale, exchange, lease, easement, or permit, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty.

(2) "Long-lines communication facilities" means the transmission systems connecting points inside the State with each other and with points outside the State by radio or wire, and includes all kinds of property and rights-of-way necessary to accomplish this interconnection.

(3) "Agency concerned" means any department, agency, wholly owned corporation, or instrumentality of the United States.

TITLE II—TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT - OWNED LONG - LINES COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN AND TO ALASKA

SEC. 201. (1) Subject to the provisions of section 202, and notwithstanding provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense or his designee, with the advice, assistance, and, in the case of any agency not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, the consent of the agency concerned, and after approval of the President, is authorized to and shall transfer for adequate consideration any or all long-lines communication facilities in or to Alaska under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to any person qualifying under the provisions of section 202, and may take such action and exercise such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

(2) Transfers under this title shall be made in accordance with the procedures and methods required by sections 203(e), (1), (2), and (3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(e)), except that "the Secretary of Defense or his designee" shall be substituted for all references therein to "the Administrator".

(3) The requirements of section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 488), shall apply to transfers under this title.

(4) The head of the agency concerned or his designee shall execute such documents for the transfer of title or other interest in property, except any mineral rights therein, and take such other action as the Secretary of Defense deems necessary or proper to transfer such property under the provisions of this title. A copy of any deed, lease, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the head of the agency concerned purporting to transfer title or any other interest in public land shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) No interest in public lands, withdrawn or otherwise appropriated, may be transferred under this title, without the prior consent of the Secretary of the Interior, or, with respect to lands within a national forest, of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) In connection with soliciting offers to purchase such long-lines facilities of the Alaska Communication System the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall:

(a) Provide any prospective purchaser who requests it data on (i) the facilities available for purchase, (ii) the amounts deemed to be the current fair and reasonable value of those facilities, and (iii) the initial rates which will be charged to the purchaser for capacity in facilities retained by the Government and available for commercial use;

(b) Provide, in the request for offers to purchase, that offerors must specify the rates they propose to charge for service and the improvements in service which they propose to initiate;

(c) Provide an opportunity for prospective purchasers to meet as a group with Department of Defense representatives to assure that the data and the public interest requirements described in (a) and (b), above, are fully understood; and

(d) Seek the advice and assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, and the Governor of Alaska or his designees, to assure consideration of all public interest factors associated with the transfer.

SEC. 202. No transfer under this title may be made unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that—

(1) the United States does not need to retain the property involved in the transfer for national defense purposes;

(2) the transfer is in the public interest;

(3) the person to whom the transfer is made is prepared and qualified to provide, without interruption, the communication service involved in the transfer; and

(4) the long-lines communication facilities will not directly or indirectly be owned, operated, or controlled by a person who would legally be disqualified by subsection 310(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, from holding a radio station license.

SEC. 203. The agreements by which a transfer is made under this title shall include a provision that—

(1) the person to whom the transfer is made shall, subject to the rules and regulations of any body or commission established by the State of Alaska to govern and regulate communication services to the public and of the Federal Communications Commission and all applicable statutes, treaties, and conventions, provide without interruption, the communication services involved in the transfer, except those services reserved by the United States in the transfer;

(2) the rates and charges for such services applicable at the time of transfer shall not be changed for a period of one year from the date of such transfer unless approved by a governmental body or commission having jurisdiction; and

(3) the transfer will not be final unless and until the transferee shall receive any requisite licenses and certificates of convenience and necessity to operate interstate and intrastate commercial communications in Alaska from the appropriate governmental regulatory bodies.

SEC. 204. Transfers under this title do not require the approval of the Federal Communications Commission except to the extent that the approval of the Federal Communications Commission is necessary under section 203(3) above.

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the gross proceeds of each transfer shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 206. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall report to the Congress and the President—

(1) in January of each year, the actions taken under this title during the preceding twelve months; and

(2) not later than ninety days after completion of each transfer under this title, a full account of that transfer.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. This Act does not modify in any manner the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 302. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

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

Mr. HALL. 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, S. 223 is a bill to authorize the Department of Defense to dispose of the Alaska Communications System. It has been unanimously approved in both subcommittee and full committee.

In 1900 Congress authorized the Army to provide commercial communications to the then territory of Alaska. The Army has continued to do this until 1962 when the Air Force took over the responsibility since most of the defense communications in Alaska involved that Department. The Alaska Communications System has been a special organization formed to be the link between the local communications companies and the long-lines facilities of the Air Force. On the major links between Fairbanks and the lower 48 and between Anchorage and the lower 48, the Alaska Communications System utilizes one-fourth of the channels available. While the overall communications system in Alaska had an initial cost of about $200 million, the present fair market value of that portion relating to commercial messages is in the neighborhood of $20 million.

There are believed to be several advantages in turning the commercial communications business over to a private firm. First of all, since the Department of Defense decided that it should no longer be in the business of providing commercial communications in Alaska, it has not put in the new equipment which is needed to keep the system up to date. There is no commercial long-distance direct dialing. Second, the rates for long-distance calls are much higher than the rates for comparable distances in the lower 48.

Because the rates are so high, the subcommittee followed the Department of Defense and the Senate in providing essentially that the facilities to be sold should go for their fair market value, and that the competition among the bidders should be for enforceable improvement in service and rates. The successful bidder is not only going to have to spend about $20 million for the facilities at the outset, but it is also going to have to spend a roughly equal sum to modernize the facilities that are sold.

The disposal is not going to be able to be accomplished quickly. It is going to take between 1 and 2 years before the details can be straightened out. During this period, the Department of Defense is going to consult with both the Federal Communications Commission and the government of the State of Alaska to be sure that the disposal planned is in the best interests of that State.

There are committee amendments which merely clarify the role of the Federal Communications Commission—there might have been some conflict between its advisory capacity in connection with the sale of its later responsibility of licensing the successful bidder. By the technical amendments offered, it is believed that these two roles can be successfully handled without having them conflict.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois used a figure of $200 million. In what relation?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is the overall cost of the original installation of the long-line facilities and all other facilities that the Government owned and operated in Alaska.

Mr. GROSS. Over what period of time, if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I would like to say that this is a communications system and its initial construction commenced in 1900. Of course, there have been other stages of added construction which, of course, have added to the original cost of the construction of these lines.

I might say further to the gentleman from Iowa that this $200 million is not to be compared with the $20 million, because the Government is only selling the commercial long-line facilities. It is not selling any of its other facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, over what period of time was it depreciated?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Well, I do not know the period of depreciation, but this is the investment of the Government in its communications system up to this time. However, the commercial aspects of the operation——

Mr. GROSS. Now, let us see if we have this straight: $200 million invested in this communications system. Is that over the total period of time?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In the overall system, yes.

Mr. GROSS. And it has now depreciated down to the sum of $20 million?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. No, no. The $20 million represents that part of the facilities which are used for commercial purposes that the Government seeks to dispose of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order to further respond to the gentleman from Iowa.

The Government does not dispose of its own communication lines, only those that are used for commercial communications in the State of Alaska.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] could give us a little further explanation of the $500,000 which has been estimated as the cost, administrative cost, in order to dispose of the communications system?

It seems to me that this is a rather large sum of money to be used for the disposal of this system.

Could the gentleman from Illinois comment on that?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. It is for preparing the accounts, and preparing the specifications and the normal work that goes into setting up sales specifications for any commercial disposal, that is the amount which has been arrived at.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as I look at this, it seems to me that we might be better off to retain the system rather than paying the sum of $500,000 in order to get rid of it. I am just wondering if the gentleman would care to comment upon that situation? In other words, it might cost us more to get rid of it than to retain it.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Of course, we would not be paying $500,000 to get rid of it, because $20 million would come into the Treasury of the United States and that sum would certainly offset the $500,000 for setting up the investigation of its disposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me at this time.

I would like to reiterate the point that was just made by the gentleman from Illinois to the effect that this is a unique situation wherein the U.S. Government is going to profit because this communications system will be sold, and the income will come into the Treasury of the United States. That is point No. 1.

Point No. 2, to more specifically answer the question which has been propounded by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] as to sales costs involved in the disposition of this property. Higher than normal costs are involved due to the fact that over the years of the operation of this system by the military there was never any industrial fund accounting system implemented so that we would know what the actual cost of the operations have been. Therefore, in order to determine the realistic and accurate current sales price, and in order to determine the current maintenance and modernization condition of the operating system, a lot of research and detailed FCC accounting work is entailed which has not been previously done.

Mr. KLEPPE. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for this information and I thank the gentleman from Alaska for responding.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 223 and concur generally in the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, and advise the House that it came out of the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously.

In addition to that which has been said I might amplify on the fact that it was necessary within this $500,000 allowance to convert to the FCC type of bookkeeping from that which had been used since 1900 by the Army, and since it was turned over to the Air Force in later years.

I would also like to emphasize that this is the sale of only the commercial long lines aspects of the overall Alaskan communication system to private enterprise at a fair market value yet to be determined in detail.

The subcommittee had before it from the new and prideful State of Alaska the Public Service Commission, representatives and statements from the Governor, and all others who were interested in this and, indeed, the aims of the government of Alaska and it is the committee's feelings that they should not have the right of veto perhaps on any arrangement that can be made under this authority to sell, but should at least be up to date and appraised concerning this matter.

I want to emphasize that our BMEWS defense line and others, using all of the means of communications including forward troposphere scatter, and all other lines of communications from this vital defense area, are involved in such an Alaskan communication system as, indeed, are the communications of the Alaskan railway system, and many different departments, all coordinating in this effort to divest the Defense Department as controlling agency of another enterprise which certainly should be in the open marketplace, and on the basis of competitive price handling.

In addition to all of this, Mr. Speaker, there are two main reasons that I support this bill. First, we are relinquishing from the Department of Defense to private industry one of its burdens that now properly belongs in the open marketplace, and industrial side of our country. One of the reasons for the value and the depreciation is the fact that there has been no upkeep, no modernization or extension of the long-lines communications on the commercial side of this because the military side has been using other means of communications for some time.

To me it is most encouraging that even this portion of some 720-odd operations of the DOD, which should be, in my opinion, in the open marketplace, can now be turned over for what has generally been the goal that we on the Committee on Armed Services have sought for that Department for a long time.

Second, Mr. Speaker, by turning this group of facilities over to private industry there is started in the State of Alaska a new commercial enterprise which will help that State in many different ways. Not only will it help it to improve the present system of long-lines communications and give more equity and justice to toll rates, but it will allow bidding by many fine, capable, telephonic communications industries. And that is the basic reason for the legislation.

In addition it will also help to attract new business into Alaska. In my opinion, both the purchaser and the other new industries, the satellites of the long-lines communications, so to speak; will be brought into the State and will provide additional tax bases for the further development of Alaska, and hasten the time when it is not so largely dependent upon the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, S. 223 has my endorsement.

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

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman why, if an appraisal has been made of the fair market price for this property, it is necessary to expend half a million dollars for the disposal of it?

Mr. HALL. As was explained, the appraisal is in process of being made, and a lot of this is in the conversion to the FCC type of bookkeeping, so that a universal applicable appraisal can be made in the next 2-year period.

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

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I notice on page 7 of the report:

> It does not obligate or authorize the FCC or the State authorities to evaluate or choose between competing offerors, but only to act on applications from the successful offerors, as selected by the Secretary of Defense or his designee.

I have two questions. One—was there competitive bidding, and if so by whom?

Mr. HALL. Let me hasten to tell my colleague, the gentleman from California, the appraisal, as I just told the gentleman from Iowa, has not yet been completed and, secondly, this bill does make in order such competitive bidding for the future, and that the call or prospectus for bids has not yet been offered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman from Missouri and also to associate myself with his remarks.

Just recently the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works went to Alaska, and specifically to the Fairbanks area, to view some of the flood damage. During that time we had an opportunity to discuss this particular piece of legislation with a number of people there and they wholeheartedly endorsed this. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support to what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I could not accept any credit for this legislation because it belongs, indeed, to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK], to the Department of Defense, and to the committee that has worked wholeheartedly on this and has held extensive hearings.

In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to yield 2 minutes or such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska, our colleague [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 223 a bill which will lead to improved long-distance communications between the State of Alaska and the continental United States.

The purpose of this bill is to dispose of certain of the long-line communications facilities in Alaska now owned by the Air Force and operated for commercial, not military purposes.

A separate military organization was organized to run the system, first by the Army, then from 1962 by the Air Force. Now the Air Force wishes to sell the system, and to my knowledge there is no opposition to this authorization.

The Government will benefit as a result of reduced expenditures, plus the income from sale.

The State will benefit from an improved system and increased tax revenues.

The American people will benefit by private enterprise taking over this commercial business from the U.S. Government.

It is a vital bill from the standpoint of Alaskans who now pay exorbitant rates for service that is not up to present-day standards anywhere else under the American flag.

The act of May 26, 1900—48 U.W.C. 310—authorized the Army to transmit commercial business over military lines in the then territory of Alaska. Under this authority, the Army and from 1962 the Air Force has had a separate military organization, the Alaska Communications System, responsible for commercial communications within Alaska and between Alaska and the other 48 States in continental United States. The Government-owned facilities tie in directly with commercial operations at several points—at Ketchikan with an American Telephone & Telegraph cable and with a General Telephone tropospheric scatter route to Seattle; and at the Canadian border point on the Alcan Highway with the Canadian National Telecommunications and British Columbia Telephone Co. In Alaska the Alaska Communications System ties in with local and municipal telephone companies.

As presently established, the Alaska Communications System utilizes available channels on the Air Force communications routes to carry commercial messages long distance within Alaska and between Alaska and the lower 48. There are four main toll centers in Alaska—Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and Ketchikan. It is presently contemplated that these four centers, together with some additional equipment which would also cover the bush and marine operations, would be sold to a private company. The original cost of this equipment

was around $36 million, but it is estimated that the present fair market value would be about $20 million.

As Alaska begins to grow as a new State, good communications across her vast areas will be essential. Since about 1959, when it was first determined that the U.S. Government should withdraw from the commercial communications operation in Alaska, there has been little money gone into new equipment for the ACS. Consequently, the service is not up to present-day standards, including direct distance dialing. The rates are high. There is no effort made to get new business in the spirit that a regular telephone company would seek it. Hence the Air Force desires to sell the Alaska Communications System, a commercial enterprise for which it is not fitted, and the State of Alaska hopes to have a commercial communications operator vitalize this central element in its development.

This legislation has been sought by the Air Force ever since the operation of the Alaska communication system was transferred to it from the Army, 5 years ago. The system, popularly known as ACS, is the civilian long-distance communications network in Alaska. With the growth of the nonmilitary economy in Alaska, civilian users have accounted for about 90 percent of the traffic using the system. It has been a longstanding Government policy not to operate such a business where private enterprise can do the job. The Air Force has been particularly uneasy in its role as an operator of a civilian communications company. Feeling such an operation to be outside of its assigned mission, the Air Force has been eager to divest itself of ACS.

Because of this attitude, the long-distance communications facilities in Alaska have suffered greatly. As noted in the committee report, little improvement has been made in ACS since 1959. Air Force policy has been to "operate and maintain." "Improvement" definitely has not been part of this policy. As a result, the entire system is woefully obsolete and rates are astronomical.

From the standpoint of the Federal Government, it would be a distinct advantage to be rid of this unwanted business. The Senate Committee on Armed Services has estimated that a sale will probably result in a dollar benefit to the Government. From every angle, it is quite clear that the Government will benefit.

The parties most concerned, however, are the people of Alaska who are served by ACS, and their elected representatives. For several years the State and the Alaska Congressional delegation were unenthusiastic about such a sale. Last year, however, the delegation backed the measure and this year the State administration strongly endorsed S. 223. No opposition was expressed at the hearings. The reason for the change from this wariness to wholehearted support was the realization that Alaska would never have a modern communication's system unless ACS were sold. Only private industry is willing to make the multimillion dollar investment necessary to bring the facilities up to date. Several large companies have expressed interest in a purchase. It is thus expected that sufficient competition will exist to insure a fair price and a qualified buyer.

The Air Force has pledged to work closely with the Governor of Alaska and the Alaska Public Service Commission to insure that all public interest factors are considered.

It should be noted that S. 223 contains several safeguards for the Government and the public. No property can be transferred if its retention is needed for national defense. The Secretary of Defense must make a determination that the transfer is in the public interest and that the transfer is in the public interest and that the transferee is qualified to provide the service.

Mr. Speaker, S. 223 is a good bill from every angle. From Alaska's standpoint, however, it is a vital bill. Indeed, it is the only way open for the 49th State to obtain the type of communications system that is absolutely necessary in this modern age. I urge the passage of S. 223.

Mr. POLLOCK. 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his yielding to me at this time.

I have a question. Is there a possibility of this communications system being sold to a co-op and then the co-op coming back to ask for a part of the 2-percent money that the House has already appropriated?

We have many co-op telephone companies in this country, that are competing for 2-percent dollars to build up their own systems.

The question is, Could this system be sold to a co-op and then it in turn, ask for additional dollars to build up the system, thus causing an existing co-op with a pending loan application to have its application deferred?

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the subcommittee took this under advisement and detailed consideration, and that specific question was posed to both the author of the bill in the other body and certainly to our distinguished colleague.

I will say then that it could be possible under section 202 wherein the Secretary of Defense is required to work out plans for disposal to the best interests of the Government. But this is not a point of issue in this particular sale or in the disposition of the long lines communications.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 223, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. 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 358, nays 1, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—358

Abbitt	Dingell	Johnson, Calif.
Abernethy	Dole	Johnson, Pa.
Adair	Donohue	Jonas
Adams	Dorn	Jones, Ala.
Addabbo	Dow	Jones, Mo.
Albert	Dowdy	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Ill.	Downing	Karsten
Anderson, Tenn.	Dulski	Karth
Andrews, Ala.	Duncan	Kastenmeier
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dwyer	Kazen
Annunzio	Edmondson	Kee
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	Kelly
Ashbrook	Edwards, Calif.	King, Calif.
Ashmore	Eilberg	King, N.Y.
Baring	Erlenborn	Kleppe
Bates	Esch	Kornegay
Battin	Eshleman	Kuykendall
Belcher	Everett	Kyros
Bell	Evins, Tenn.	Laird
Bennett	Fallon	Langen
Berry	Farbstein	Latta
Betts	Fascell	Lennon
Bevill	Findley	Lipscomb
Biester	Fisher	Lloyd
Bingham	Flood	Long, Md.
Blackburn	Fraser	McCarthy
Blanton	Friedel	McClory
Blatnik	Fulton, Pa.	McClure
Boggs	Fulton, Tenn.	McDade
Boland	Fuqua	McDonald, Mich.
Bolling	Galifianakis	McFall
Bolton	Gardner	McMillan
Bow	Garmatz	MacGregor
Brasco	Gathings	Machen
Bray	Giaimo	Madden
Brinkley	Gibbons	Mahon
Brooks	Gilbert	Mailliard
Brotzman	Gonzalez	Marsh
Brown, Calif.	Goodell	Martin
Brown, Mich.	Goodling	Mathias, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Gray	Mathias, Md.
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Oreg.	Matsunaga
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Pa.	May
Buchanan	Griffiths	Mayne
Burke, Fla.	Gross	Meeds
Burke, Mass.	Grover	Meskill
Burleson	Gubser	Michel
Burton, Utah	Gude	Miller, Ohio
Button	Gurney	Mills
Byrne, Pa.	Haley	Minish
Byrnes, Wis.	Hall	Mize
Cahill	Halpern	Monagan
Carey	Hamilton	Montgomery
Cederberg	Hammer-schmidt	Moore
Celler	Hanley	Moorhead
Chamberlain	Hansen, Idaho	Morgan
Clancy	Hardy	Morris, N. Mex.
Clark	Harrison	Morse, Mass.
Clausen, Don H.	Harsha	Morton
Clawson, Del	Harvey	Mosher
Cohelan	Hathaway	Moss
Collier	Hawkins	Multer
Colmer	Hays	Murphy, Ill.
Conable	Hébert	Murphy, N.Y.
Conte	Hechler, W. Va.	Myers
Corbett	Heckler, Mass.	Natcher
Cowger	Henderson	Nedzi
Cramer	Herlong	Nelsen
Cunningham	Hicks	Nix
Curtis	Holifield	O'Hara, Ill.
Daddario	Holland	O'Hara, Mich.
Daniels	Horton	Olsen
Davis, Ga.	Hosmer	O'Neal, Ga.
Davis, Wis.	Howard	O'Neill, Mass.
Dawson	Hull	Ottinger
Delaney	Hungate	Passman
Dellenback	Hunt	Patman
Denney	Hutchinson	Patten
Dent	Ichord	Pelly
Devine	Irwin	Pepper
Dickinson	Jacobs	Perkins
	Jarman	Philbin
	Joelson	Pickle

Pike	Ryan	Tenzer
Pirnie	Sandman	Thompson, Ga.
Poage	Satterfield	Thompson, N.J.
Poff	St Germain	Thomson, Wis.
Pollock	St. Onge	Tuck
Price, Ill.	Saylor	Tunney
Price, Tex.	Schadeberg	Udall
Pryor	Scherle	Ullman
Purcell	Schneebeli	Van Deerlin
Quie	Schweiker	Vanik
Quillen	Schwengel	Vigorito
Railsback	Scott	Waldie
Randall	Selden	Walker
Rees	Shipley	Wampler
Reid, Ill.	Shriver	Watson
Reid, N.Y.	Sikes	Watts
Reinecke	Sisk	Whalen
Reuss	Slack	Whalley
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Calif.	White
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Iowa	Whitener
Riegle	Smith, N.Y.	Whitten
Rivers	Smith, Okla.	Widnall
Roberts	Snyder	Wiggins
Robison	Springer	Williams, Pa.
Rodino	Stafford	Wilson, Charles H.
Rogers, Colo.	Staggers	
Rogers, Fla.	Stanton	Winn
Rooney, N.Y.	Steed	Wolff
Rooney, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyatt
Rosenthal	Stephens	Wydler
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Wylie
Roth	Stubblefield	Wyman
Roudebush	Sullivan	Yates
Roush	Taft	Young
Roybal	Talcott	Zablocki
Rumsfeld	Taylor	Zion
Ruppe	Teague, Tex.	Zwach

NAYS—1

Burton, Calif.

NOT VOTING—63

Ashley	Ford, William D.	Minshall
Aspinall	Fountain	Nichols
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	O'Konski
Barrett	Gallagher	Pettis
Brademas	Gettys	Pool
Brock	Hagan	Pucinski
Broomfield	Halleck	Rarick
Bush	Hanna	Reifel
Cabell	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Carter	Helstoski	Ronan
Casey	Keith	Scheuer
Cleveland	Kirwan	Skubitz
Conyers	Kluczynski	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	Kupferman	Stuckey
Culver	Kyl	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Landrum	Tiernan
Derwinski	Leggett	Utt
Diggs	Long, La.	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Lukens	Waggonner
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Watkins
Evans, Colo.	McEwen	Williams, Miss.
Feighan	Macdonald, Mass.	Willis
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Mink	Wright
Foley		
Ford, Gerald R.		

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. Barrett with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Kyl.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Pettis.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Corman.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pool.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Stuckey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO CHANGE THE METHOD OF COMPUTING RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, OR MARINE CORPS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5943) to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5943

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3925(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of determining whether a regular enlisted member of the Army may be retired under section 3914 or 3917 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding all active service in the armed forces and service computed under section 3683 of this title. For the purpose of computing his retired pay under section 3991 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces;

"(2) his years of service computed under section 3683 of this title; and

"(3) the years of service, not included in clause (1) or (2), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 6330 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "the number of years of active service in the armed forces" in the first sentence of subsection (c) and inserting the following in place thereof:

"the total of—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces; and

"(2) the years of service, not included in clause (1), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title";

(2) by striking out the words "purposes of subsections (b) and (c)" in subsection (d) and inserting the words "purpose of subsection (b)" in place thereof; and

(3) by inserting the following new sentence after the first sentence of subsection (d):

"For the purpose of computing total years of service under subsection (c), after years creditable under clauses (1) and (2) have been added together, a part of a year that is six months or more is counted as a whole year and a part of a year that is less than six months is disregarded."

SEC. 3. Section 8925(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of determining whether a regular enlisted member of the Air Force may be retired under section 8914 or 8917 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding all active service in the armed forces and service computed under section 8683 of this title. For the purpose of computing his retired pay under section 8991 of this title, his years of service are computed by adding—

"(1) his years of active service in the armed forces;

"(2) his years of service computed under section 8683 of this title; and

"(3) the years of service, not included in clause (1) or (2), with which he would be entitled to be credited under section 1333 of this title, if he were entitled to retired pay under section 1331 of this title."

SEC. 4. This Act is applicable to enlisted members heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retainer pay. However, no person retired or granted retainer pay before the effective date of this Act is entitled to a retroactive increase in retired pay or retainer pay because of this Act.

SEC. 5. To accrue rights under this Act, a person who is entitled to retired or retainer pay on the effective date of this Act must file an application with the Secretary of the military department concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, I believe, is noncontroversial. An identical bill passed the House on two prior occasions but no action was taken on those bills in the other body.

H.R. 5943 would allow career enlisted men who have completed 20 years' active duty to receive credit in computing their retired pay for time they might have spent in nonactive Reserve duty status. That is all it does. It affects only career enlisted men.

The bill was unanimously approved by our committee. I know of no opposition to it.

Enlisted men now receive no credit in their retirement multiplier for inactive Reserve service. Officers do receive credit for such service and this has created a morale problem with enlisted personnel.

Officers who have completed 20 years receive full credit in their retirement multiplier for pre-1958 Reserve service. That is, they receive 2½ percent per year for each year active or reserve. In 1958, Congress changed this to say such officers could only receive credit according to the point system normally used for those citizen-soldiers who achieve Reserve retirement at age 60.

H.R. 5943 would give to enlisted men credit according to this point system for any nonactive Reserve duty time, regardless of when accrued.

The Department of Defense supports the bill.

The Department of Defense has estimated that the maximum additional annual budgetary requirements as a result

of the bill would be $2,630,532. This is the maximum. The estimate was arrived at by taking a sampling to determine the percentage of men who had prior Reserve service and the average number of years of such Reserve time and then assuming the maximum number of Reserve points were earned for each year. The committee believes that many enlisted men would have years in which they earned fewer points or, perhaps, none at all, thus reducing their creditable service and reducing the cost of the bill. However, there is no precise way to determine what the average number of points earned would be without screening the records of all enlisted personnel. The Committee on Armed Services is satisfied that $2,630,532 is the upper limit of possible cost for the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER].

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported out by the subcommittee unanimously as well as the full committee.

The present situation is such that the law discriminates against our enlisted men in terms of retirement credit.

This bill, H.R. 5943, will remove this inequity and will handle retirement credit for inactive service and compute it in the same way as is now done for commissioned officers.

This bill has already passed the House on two occasions and is legislation that is very much needed to take care of the great disadvantage to our enlisted men at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the immediate adoption of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5943.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZE LOAN OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9796) to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9796

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may extend on such terms and under such conditions as he deems appropriate the loan of ships, previously authorized as indicated, as follows: (1) Brazil, two submarines (Act of July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 376)); (2) Chile, one submarine (Act of July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 376)), two destroyers (Act of July 18, 1958 (72 Stat. 376)); (3) Federal Republic of Germany, one destroyer (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)); (4) Greece, one submarine (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)), two destroyers (Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 815)); (5) Korea, one destroyer (Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 815)), one destroyer escort (Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 815)); (6) Portugal, two destroyer escorts (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)); (7) Spain, two destroyers (Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), as amended by Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 967)).

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may lend to friendly foreign nations, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, ships as follows: (1) Republic of Korea, one destroyer, and (2) the Republic of China, one destroyer. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of ships transferred under this section shall be charged to funds programed for the recipient government as grant military assistance, or as reimbursable, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

SEC. 3. All new loans and loan extensions executed under this Act shall be for periods not exceeding five years, but the President may in his discretion extend such loans for an additional period of not more than five years. They shall be made on the condition that they may be terminated at an earlier date if necessitated by the defense requirements of the United States.

SEC. 4. No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

SEC. 5. The President may promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. The authority of the President to lend naval vessels under this Act terminates on December 31, 1969.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 9796, would authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and also authorize two new loans.

This kind of legislation has been passed on by the Congress on numerous occasions in the past. This bill is exactly the same as all of the previous ones.

Let me describe what this bill will do. It will authorize the extension of the loan of 15 vessels now in the possession of certain foreign countries. The countries are Brazil, Chile, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Korea, Portugal, and Spain. It should be understood that all of these ships are now in the possession of and are being used by the countries I have named.

The committee amended the bill to add two new loans. The countries involved are Korea and the Republic of China. The ship to be the subject of the new loan in each instance is a destroyer. I would like to point out that the Armed Services Committee was unanimous in its belief that these new loans should be granted.

Korea has a very special problem with respect to protecting its shoreline. Frequent forays are made along its shores by the Communist North Koreans. The North Koreans have in their possession very fast patrol boats which are extremely difficult to intercept. It is very clearly in not only their interests but in our own interests that our friends in South Korea have a capability of maintaining constant vigilance in order to repulse these intrusions along their coasts.

Let us remember, not so incidentally, that there are over 50,000 Korean troops fighting side by side with Americans in Vietnam today.

Little need be said about the loan of a destroyer to the Republic of China. This country has no firmer friend or greater ally in the Far East than the Government of the Republic of China. The trained and ready force which Chiang Kai-shek maintains on Formosa is a powerful, stabilizing force in that part of the world. The Chinese Navy needs improvement and enlargement. The loan of one destroyer to this great ally will constitute an important step toward this end and cannot help but redound to our own benefit.

The bill refers to "friendly foreign nations." We have no better friends than the Koreans and the Chinese. They are indeed "friendly foreign nations."

The basic theory of lending ships to friendly foreign nations is simple. The program of lending ships from our Naval Reserve Fleet to selected friendly countries—as approved by Congress—has, over the past 15 years, proven to be one of the most effective and economical ways to assist our friends and allies. With our assistance, these allies can accomplish tasks such as antisubmarine escort, patrol, mine warfare, and coastal and harbor protection in their local waters. Also, the potential help of these navies is valuable in our wartime role of controlling the deep seas. Our loaned ships provide the major assets for accomplishing these tasks. To deny our friends and allies the use of these vessels would create vacuums in many areas of the world which could be filled only by us and only with difficulty and at the expense of other commitments. By combining our idle ships and their competent manpower and strategic locations, we contribute substantially to mutual defense—and at a minimum cost.

Many of the ships involved in this proposed legislation are loaned to navies which have responsibilities under bilateral or multilateral defense agreements. Greece requests that the loan of two destroyers and one submarine be extended. Portugal desires the same for two destroyer escorts. Germany seeks to extend the agreement for a destroyer now on loan. These countries are, of course, NATO allies, and the ships involved are important units which help fulfill mutual security commitments as well as perform national tasks. These ships participate in combined naval exercises which have attested to the effectiveness of these navies in carrying out their responsibilities.

Spain requests that the loan of two

destroyers be extended. The efforts of the free world in the European area have been assisted significantly by the privileges granted U.S. forces by this friendly nation. Spain's strategic position makes her extremely important to free world defense. In recent years, Spanish Navy ships have a fine record of performance in combined exercises with U.S. 6th Fleet units. And this is something concerning which I have extensive personal knowledge.

The two South American countries included in this bill—that is, Brazil and Chile—have played an active role in the annual combined fleet exercises—called Unitas—conducted in Latin American waters. Brazil requests that the loan of two submarines be extended. Chile desires the same for two destroyers and a submarine. These ships compose very significant parts of the active fleets of these two friendly maritime nations. The submarines in both countries provide essential target services for antisubmarine warfare training.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that these 17 ships—15 loan extensions and two new loans—are not now required for the defense of the United States.

I would also like to make specific note of the fact that the bill includes the language:

> No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

You should understand that these ships are not ships that we would be using ourselves were they not on loan to our friends since they are old and were in the mothball fleet.

In addition to the prime purpose of antisubmarine patrol there are collateral benefits that accrue to the United States. The officers and men who run these ships come to the United States for training at our naval installations and become oriented to the manner in which our Navy does its work. In effect, these foreign crews become an arm of our own naval forces and it is easy to see that this, on a longrun basis, cannot help but benefit us.

As I have said, someone has to do the job and this is an inexpensive and efficient way to do it.

There is no cost involved in this bill for the 15 ships already on loan. The only cost is about $15 million to place the two destroyers for Korea and China in operational shape. This money will be spent in our own shipyards here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is the bill—it is no different from many previous ones that the House has passed on favorably over the years and I strongly recommend the favorable consideration of the House.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe the gentleman needs to convince the House of the propriety of loaning certain warships to Korea and Nationalist China. The pertinent question here is why are we lending ships to Chile and what assurance do we have that they and others are not going to continue stopping our fishing boats on the high seas or chasing them onto the beaches?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington. Does the gentleman want to answer the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. PELLY. Yes. As the gentleman from South Carolina will remember—and I am sure also the gentleman from Iowa—in the past I have strongly objected to legislation to authorize the President to lend naval vessels to certain Latin American countries who are illegally seizing American fishing boats on the high seas. However, I have scrutinized this bill and report, and I am delighted to assure the gentleman from Iowa that the two South American countries included in this bill, Brazil and Chile, are not guilty of seizing our fishing boats. Others in South America are.

I only want to say I will join with the gentleman from Iowa in opposing legislation where there is a case of a nation seizing our fishing boats, but these two nations are not guilty as far as I know.

Mr. RIVERS. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. No, not quite, because the disease seems to be contagious.

Mr. RIVERS. To what is the gentleman referring?

Mr. GROSS. I am referring to the various Latin American countries and the disease they have of seizing our fishing boats or chasing them onto the beaches.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer the gentleman. Not one ship which we authorized for loan is engaged in the activity to which the gentleman refers. Not one single ship.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman how the gentleman knows some of these naval vessels we have given them have not been used to intercept our vessels?

Mr. RIVERS. I guess we can rely on the Navy, can we not? The Navy says they have not been so used. They are our authority on the high seas. Not a single ship which has been the subject of a loan has engaged in these activities.

Mr. GROSS. The Mexican Government did not use any of our naval vessels to chase our shrimp boats onto the beach?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman now refers to Mexico. I can investigate that also. Mexico is not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I just say this disease seems to be catching. I think we ought to have assurance in every case that we loan any kind of an American combat vessel.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Iowa suggested that to the State Department and the military several years ago in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I want to be assured that when we lend vessels, that is warships, combat ships to these countries, under no circumstances will they be used to go after our fishing fleets.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course. I agree with the gentleman. I insist on that also.

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

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in regard to what the gentleman has said, I think actually—according at least to a letter I received from the State Department—our naval vessels have been used by certain Latin American countries to seize our fishing boats.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. And I certainly know that one nation, Ecuador, has used our cutters.

Mr. RIVERS. But not naval combatant ships loaned under this type of legislation.

Mr. PELLY. That is correct. But I will say this, that I have introduced legislation which will ask our Coast Guard to lend protection to our fishing ships when they are congregated there. The State Department says it is against our policy to protect our American vessels flying American flags.

Mr. RIVERS. To what committee will those bills go? Will they go to the gentleman's committee or to our committee?

Mr. PELLY. I believe they will go to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. If they should come to our committee, they will be reported out.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is also a question of their gratitude. When they go 200 miles offshore to intercept our fishing vessels and cargoes, confiscating them along with the crews. There is a question of gratitude, in addition to that.

Mr. RIVERS. I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman mentioned that I did not have to sell him on the idea of furnishing ships to Korea and Nationalist China.

I had to sell the State Department and the Defense Department, because they did not include additional destroyers for these two countries. The committee added them, because they are our great allies. We added these two destroyers in committee.

This is not a ship loan bill. This is a bill to authorize the President to loan them if he sees fit. We do not loan anything by this bill. We extend the authority to the President; that is all.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that raises another question. Are we here delegating more power to the President? We have been hearing a lot about that in the past few days. I wonder if we should do this.

Mr. RIVERS. Every other President has had this same authority.

I am glad to see the gentleman, as usual, is trying to help. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the rest of this legislation and the ships that are involved but I would like to question the advisability of extending the loan of one submarine and

two destroyers to the Government of Greece which is today charged with denying the democratic process to many of its citizens.

It seems to me that under the circumstances we should carefully consider what we do and defer action on the Greek loan until the facts can be ascertained.

Mr. RIVERS. This would only authorize the President to make the loans, not require that the loans be made.

I have here, handed to me by Mr. Kelleher, the Greek policy statement issued in April. It states:

The Government will endeavor to carry out the following: to abide firmly by the idea of peace and freedom according to the principles of the U.N. Charter. In this sense, Greece, as a free and proud nation, intends to abide firmly by its obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its Western Allies.

The bill would not extend existing loans, but only authorize the President to extend the loans. In other words, the bill if approved would merely authorize the State Department to negotiate an extension of these loans. Negotiations will not commence until the bill becomes law.

The State Department advises that loan extension agreements customarily stipulate that the extensions are pursuant to the provisions of the basic agreement, and subject to all terms and conditions stated therein. This provision will be included in any ship loan extension, as authorized by Congress, negotiated with the respective countries.

As I said to the gentleman from Iowa, and I repeat, this bill would not extend any loan. It merely authorizes the President to do so. He may extend all of these, or hold back on one or more.

Mr. VANIK. What is the date of that?

Mr. RIVERS. April 21.

Mr. VANIK. However, the conditions I talk about have developed since that date.

Mr. RIVERS. What Mr. Kelleher has pointed out is that the memorandum conveying this policy statement to the committee is dated September 29, 1967, and refers back to the April 21 statement of policy.

Mr. VANIK. The letter is dated September 29?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes. The memorandum to the committee is dated September 29, 1967; and I will put this in the RECORD:

The use of loan ships is restricted by—

a. *Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended*, Sec. 305, which states that "Military Assistance to any country shall be furnished solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security. . . ."

b. *Military Assistance bilateral agreements* which state that respective countries will not permit the use of articles provided thereunder for "any purpose other than that for which the article . . . is furnished."

c. *The Ship Loan Agreements*. For example, the Ship Loan Agreement with Greece states that Greece will "retain possession of and use the vessels . . . for the purpose of promoting an integrated defense of the North Atlantic area in accordance with defense plans formulated by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

Mr. Speaker, this only authorizes the President to take action. He can extend them all or none of them, as he sees fit.

Mr. VANIK. He has full discretion?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes. I would also like to point out the language of section 4 of the bill which reads:

SEC. 4. No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requirement for time.

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

I want to reaffirm what the chairman of the committee has said.

Of the 17 ships involved, 15 are merely a continuation of the use of the vessels which has already been accorded these particular countries. The other two involve destroyers to Korea and the Republic of China.

Our committee this time, as it has on all other occasions, unanimously reported the bill to the House.

It seems to me this is an economical way of getting defense. These ships, except for Korea and China, are already an active part of the navies of the requesting countries and the continued loan is at no cost to the United States.

I am in full agreement with the bill and ask that the House pass it.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I refer back to the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio. I am not quite satisfied with the answers given by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

What this bill provides is military aid to a totalitarian junta in Greece that has been locking up friends of democracy—that has just recently, within the past few days, put in jail and is going to try in a military court Mrs. Helen Vlachos, who has two Athens newspapers. Do Members know what the charges are? The charges were that she insulted the Government in an interview with an Italian newspaper.

Does the gentleman not believe it is about time that the House have a debate on our relationship with Greece?

I think it is possible that the whole world and certainly the Greek people are awaiting the expression of an attitude by us on this. Perhaps these items should be aired and perhaps it would be better to defeat this bill and then bring that portion on Greece out with a rule so that there could be full debate.

Mr. BATES. Is the gentleman asking me this question?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Yes.

Mr. BATES. Certainly at all times we should have full debate on these issues. I am glad that the gentleman brought this point up. I do not think every time someone is arrested in some country that we can stop the flow of legislation on this floor. I would suggest that the gentleman contact the Department of State and the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the matter.

When this bill came before us there was no inkling of such an episode. Certainly Greece has been our friend. In the realm of foreign aid I do not think there has been any example given that has been more indicative of success than there has been in the case of Greece and Turkey. I feel that when the foreign aid bill comes before this House every year the advocates of the bill always point with great pride to what happened in the late 1940's when we first gave aid to Greece and Turkey and thus saved them from communism. For that reason and for other reasons as well, Mr. Speaker, I advocate the passage of this bill today, including the ships to Greece.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Greece is still a member of NATO and these are NATO allies of ours. I do not know what the intricacies are of the situation in Greece, but we have a member of NATO in good standing. We are committed to the security of Greece in our NATO commitments. We are carrying out the things that we have been doing all this time. I do not know how we can change the course of things at this time.

Mr. BATES. Circumstances change in the development of a country, but it is not right to try to fashion every country in the world in our image here in the United States. Other countries have their laws which they respect, and we have ours. As the chairman said, in the postwar period Greece has indeed been our ally and has been a good one. I think she should be the beneficiary of this legislation.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNEY. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. RIVERS, one or two questions.

I have one boy who just came back from Vietnam and another boy aboard the U.S.S. *Dupont*. His ship was hit 2 weeks ago off the coast of North Vietnam. My question is do you have any knowledge as to whether or not any of these countries that we are authorizing ships to, have any trade directly or indirectly with North Vietnam?

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know of any having any trade with them. None of these ships.

Mr. DENNEY. None of the ships listed here?

Mr. RIVERS. I am not aware of any. I do not know of any.

Mr. DENNEY. In other words, what I am concerned about is we in America proceed to make ships and money and

material available to foreign countries. That encourages their economy, and then they are able to trade with other countries and carry munitions of war to North Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. I can almost positively say I do not think there is any such thing as this happening in Greece or any that I know of.

Mr. DENNEY. I appreciate that statement.

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services yielding to me at this time. I have only one brief question. Can you tell me who will pay for the activation and modernization and overhaul of these two new ships being loaned?

In other words, we are taking these two ships out of the fleet?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman refers to the ships going to the country of Korea and the Republic of China?

Mr. SCHERLE. Yes, I do.

Mr. BATES. The renovation of these two ships is estimated to cost $15 million and will be paid for by the United States.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, to pursue this a little further, why is it necessary, if we are to loan these ships to these countries, do we have to furnish and overhaul them, rather than to have the recipient countries do this job?

Mr. BATES. Because they are our allies and, presently, under the foreign aid bill we are spending a lot more money than this. This is just another effective way in which we believe the job can be done.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman means this is another means of extending foreign aid to these countries to which we are presently providing such aid?

Mr. BATES. I beg the pardon of the gentleman?

Mr. SCHERLE. This is another means of providing additional foreign aid to these countries?

Mr. BATES. As the gentleman is aware, the foreign aid bill does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SCHERLE. But I am saying, this is in addition to the foreign aid program?

Mr. BATES. We do provide foreign aid to both of these countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of pursuing this question about Greece. I am a little surprised to hear the remarks on the other side of the aisle, suggesting that Greece at the present time is the loyal and stanch ally of this country. Other members of NATO have taken a different view indicating very clearly the disapproval which they attach to the present military junta in Greece. I refer specifically to a report which appeared in the press recently to the effect that the European Common Market had voted, by a vote of 9 to 5, to deny a $10 million loan to Greece on the grounds that this was a Fascist government and on the ground that it was denying its people the fundamental liberties expected of a democratic form of government. This was buttressed by another article which appeared in the press—I think by the former Premier who headed a rightist cabinet, who in defiance of the laws of the military junta spoke out against the military junta and asked the military junta to get out and leave Greece. This was no leftist political leader of Greece. This was a leader who formerly had headed a rightist cabinet of Greece but who was deposed by the members of the military junta.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that our allies in NATO are very reluctant to give more economic assistance to Greece. This is particularly true with reference to the Scandinavian countries. These countries have spoken out very sharply against the present regime in Greece.

I have in my hand a copy of a telegram which was sent from Denmark to the other NATO countries, a telegram from one of the great members of the Atlantic community, which is a strong indictment of the present regime in Greece.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that for the United States to put any stamp of approval or to furnish or indicate any support of that regime would represent a flat denial or repudiation of our concern as has been expressed by our efforts in Vietnam and in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this bill ought to be sent back to the committee and brought out again without the Greek ship loans in order that we may have a separate discussion of this particular matter. We ought to make clear to the rest of the world that the United States believes in what it says it believes in. We ought to demonstrate that we believe certain things are wrong and that we believe in freedom.

I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if the chairman does not think that this question requires further discussion? I would also ask why should we stand alone among our NATO allies in defense of a Fascist regime, when our closest allies say, "Let us cut off aid to the present Greek regime."

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

Mr. FRASER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman from Minnesota is talking about the Common Market. NATO has done nothing about Greece. We have extended loans to the military—to our allies—in the Scandinavian countries. Some of the Scandinavian countries represent some of the best members of the alliance which we have and have proven that they are fighting the same type of situation which we are fighting.

I do not know what is going on in Greece. I hope they do get a representative government. However, that has nothing to do with these loans. If the President decides he does not want to make these loans, this is not mandatory. This is only permissive. One could debate it 10 times or for 10 days. We do not make anything mandatory under the provisions of this bill.

We only authorize the President to do this as we have been doing for 15 years. If he sees fit to do it he can, and he can attach any strings he wants to keep up with our commitments to our allies, and in keeping with whatever treaties we are signatory to. So I do not know what good any debate would do on this. The gentleman can make such representations to the President as he desires to.

Mr. FRASER. I will say to the gentleman that it is the Common Market that has spoken, and the Common Market members happen to be, for the most part, members of NATO.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know anything about the Common Market. The gentleman knows more about that than I do.

Mr. FRASER. We ought to learn something about it, maybe this should be done.

Mr. RIVERS. I have nothing to do with the Common Market, this is something else again.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to emphasize the statement that my colleague from Minnesota made in connection with the arrest of a reputable Greek publisher and point out that this one particular arrest is not an isolated incident. I had occasion to be in Greece for a week in July of this year, and had many conversations with our own Embassy people there; from the Ambassador on down, and spoke also with many Greek professionals—doctors, lawyers, economists, bankers, and the like. There is no question of the fact that the intelligentsia of Greece feel they are suffering under a reactionary and repressive regime. Somewhere between 3,000 and 5,000 Greek intellectuals and politicians are languishing in confinement on an isolated island off the coast of Greece, under the most primitive conditions, without charges being brought, without arraignments, without trials. So I believe this Congress should have very serious doubts and misgivings about giving further aid at this time to the present Greek regime.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer the gentleman on that point before he continues with his statement.

I would say to the gentleman that we are lending these ships in our own interest in connection with our NATO and other responsibilities. If someone else does not patrol the Aegean Sea and the other waters in that part of the world then we must do so ourselves. Already NATO has been cut in half by one De Gaulle.

If the gentleman wishes to take all these ships away from them and send our own ships and men to do it, then go ahead, I just do not want to do this. These loans are in our own interest, and I want the gentleman to keep that in mind always. That is why we are authorizing the President to do this, and the

President can do it if he sees fit. If the President does not want the Greeks to patrol for us, then the President can send our own ships down there. That is all this bill does—is to authorize the President to continue on with that policy of letting the Greeks patrol the Aegean Sea, the Adriatic Sea and the Ionian Sea.

Mr. SCHEUER. I am afraid of voting for a policy that is not in our interest.

Mr. RIVERS. That is very simply what this is: to continue our current policy.

Mr. SCHEUER. It is not that simple.

Mr. RIVERS. That policy to me is quite simple.

Mr. SCHEUER. I believe it is in our interests to have peace and stability in the Middle East and the Aegean; to have governments that have popular support. I believe that is in our long-range interest.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not believe we can impose pax Americana on every people and nation on earth. Somewhere down the line we are going to have to let somebody else run his own country instead of us dipping our nose into it.

Mr. SCHEUER. This present administration in Greece was by no means popularly elected.

Mr. RIVERS. That may well be so.

Mr. SCHEUER. In the next 30 to 60 days the present junta is supposed to put into effect a constitution under which they would give some power back to the people. Our own State Department people are involved and are having some quiet conversations. Does the gentleman know what that means? This will be a turning point in Greek history if it is done, and it seems to me that, until the Greek junta gives evidence of its bona fides in returning to a system of constitutional democracy, we ought to tread very warily in giving them additional military aid. The time is only 30 to 60 days off. We can defer action that long.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is not saying on the floor of the House that our Government is going over there telling them how to run Greece?

Mr. SCHEUER. I said I believe some quiet conversation is going on between our State Department people and the members of the ruling junta.

Mr. RIVERS. If they are doing anything about what happened in Greece I believe this is highly improper. I hope we let them run their own country.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would say that this junta took over by force, and imposed itself by force of arms, and that we have every right to encourage them to return to constitutional democracy—just as we have been doing for several years with some limited success in South Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know how our State Department could think of such a thing.

Mr. SCHEUER. I will say our State Department has been carrying on quiet discussions, and quite properly so.

Mr. RIVERS. I hope they are very quiet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it always has seemed to me that legislative emotion on an unrelated matter did not furnish the most promising background for the development of sound foreign policy.

Most respectfully would I disagree with my good friends who see in a negative vote on H.R. 9796 a means of strengthening and advancing their concept of foreign policy as regards the present Government of Greece. I agree with them that affairs in Greece at the moment are disquieting to many good Americans and certainly I am of that number. I doubt, however, that the present situation will be long continuing. It is even possible that the enactment of H.R. 9796, with the broad powers it gives the President of the United States, could hasten the return of democratic government to Greece.

It should be made perfectly clear that H.R. 9796 does not turn over to Greece or any other country a single naval vessel of any size, age, or condition—not one ship to Greece or any other country. If it did this I might admit some germaneness to the present contention. If, upon the enactment of H.R. 9796, its passage by the House and the other body, and its signature by the President, and without any further ado the United States was giving Greece the continued and unrestricted use of a destroyer I well could join with my colleagues in advocating a halt at least until we had come to a better understanding.

But what H.R. 9796 does—and all that it does—is to give the President authority to "extend on such terms and under such conditions as he deems appropriate" the continued loan of ships to Brazil, Chile, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Korea, Portugal, and Spain and the new loan of destroyers to Korea and free China.

Mr. Speaker, that is not all. Let me read section 4 in its complete verbiage:

> No loan may be made or extended under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such loan or extension is in the best interest of the United States. The Scretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all loans made under authority of this Act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under H.R. 9796 the old naval loan to Greece, as well as those to Brazil, Chile, the Federal Republic of Germany, Korea, Portugal, and Spain, and the new naval loans to Korea and Free China would not start until, first, the Secretary of Defense had consulted with the Joint Chiefs of Staff; second, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff had agreed that the loans or extensions were in the best interest of the United States; and third, the President of the United States had reached the determination that the loan or renewal in each instance was in the national interest, and on what terms and under what conditions.

Not to be overlooked is the power vested in the President of the United States to outline to Greece, as well as the other recipient nations, the terms and conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in the Congress under four Presidents, three of my party and one of the opposition. With all the faith in me I have believed in the loyalty of all four Presidents to the United States and the American people. If ever the unhappy day should come that the loyalty and patriotism of our President was in question, historians could write finis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9796, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. 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 321, nays 42, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—321

Abbitt	Clawson, Del	Goodling
Abernethy	Colmer	Gray
Adair	Conable	Green, Pa.
Adams	Conte	Gross
Addabbo	Corbett	Grover
Albert	Cowger	Gubser
Anderson, Ill.	Cramer	Gude
Anderson, Tenn.	Culver	Gurney
	Cunningham	Haley
Andrews, Ala.	Curtis	Hall
Andrews, N. Dak.	Daddario	Halpern
	Daniels	Hamilton
Annunzio	Davis, Ga.	Hammer-schmidt
Arends	Davis, Wis.	
Ashbrook	Dawson	Hanley
Ashmore	Delaney	Hansen, Idaho
Baring	Dellenback	Hardy
Bates	Denney	Harrison
Battin	Dent	Harsha
Belcher	Devine	Harvey
Bell	Dickinson	Hathaway
Bennett	Dingell	Hays
Berry	Dole	Hébert
Betts	Donohue	Heckler, Mass.
Bevill	Dorn	Henderson
Biester	Dowdy	Herlong
Blackburn	Downing	Hicks
Blanton	Dulski	Holifield
Boggs	Duncan	Horton
Boland	Dwyer	Hosmer
Bolton	Edmondson	Howard
Bow	Edwards, Ala.	Hull
Bray	Eilberg	Hungate
Brinkley	Erlenborn	Hunt
Brooks	Esch	Hutchinson
Brotzman	Eshleman	Ichord
Brown, Mich.	Everett	Irwin
Brown, Ohio	Evins, Tenn.	Jarman
Broyhill, N.C.	Fallon	Johnson, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Farbstein	Johnson, Pa.
Buchanan	Fascell	Jonas
Burke, Fla.	Findley	Jones, Ala.
Burke, Mass.	Fisher	Jones, Mo.
Burleson	Flood	Jones, N.C.
Burton, Utah	Ford, Gerald R.	Karsten
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Karth
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton, Pa.	Kazen
Cahill	Fulton, Tenn.	Kee
Carey	Fuqua	Keith
Carter	Galifianakis	Kelly
Cederberg	Gardner	King, Calif.
Celler	Garmatz	King, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Gathings	Kirwan
Clancy	Giaimo	Kleppe
Clark	Gibbons	Kornegay
Clausen, Don H.	Gonzalez	Kyros
	Goodell	Laird

Langen	Passman	Shriver
Latta	Patman	Sikes
Lennon	Patten	Skubitz
Lipscomb	Pelly	Slack
Lloyd	Pepper	Smith, Calif.
Long, La.	Perkins	Smith, Iowa
McClory	Philbin	Smith, N.Y.
McClure	Pickle	Smith, Okla.
McDade	Pike	Snyder
McDonald, Mich.	Pirnie	Springer
McEwen	Poage	Stafford
McFall	Poff	Staggers
McMillan	Pollock	Stanton
MacGregor	Price, Ill.	Steed
Machen	Price, Tex.	Steiger, Ariz.
Madden	Pryor	Stephens
Mahon	Purcell	Stratton
Mailliard	Quie	Stubblefield
Marsh	Quillen	Sullivan
Martin	Railsback	Taft
Mathias, Calif.	Randall	Talcott
Mathias, Md.	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
Matsunaga	Reid, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
May	Reinecke	Tenzer
Mayne	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, Ga.
Meeds	Rhodes, Pa.	Thomson, Wis.
Meskill	Rivers	Tuck
Miller, Ohio	Roberts	Vigorito
Mills	Robison	Waldie
Minish	Rodino	Walker
Mize	Rogers, Colo.	Wampler
Monagan	Rogers, Fla.	Watson
Montgomery	Rooney, N.Y.	Watts
Moore	Rooney, Pa.	Whalen
Moorhead	Rostenkowski	Whalley
Morgan	Roth	White
Morris, N. Mex.	Roudebush	Whitener
Morse, Mass.	Roush	Whitten
Morton	Ruppe	Widnall
Mosher	St Germain	Wiggins
Multer	St. Onge	Williams, Pa.
Murphy, Ill.	Sandman	Winn
Murphy, N.Y.	Satterfield	Wolff
Myers	Saylor	Wyatt
Natcher	Schadeberg	Wydler
Nedzi	Scherle	Wylie
Nelsen	Schneebeli	Wyman
O'Hara, Ill.	Schweiker	Young
O'Hara, Mich.	Schwengel	Zablocki
O'Neal, Ga.	Scott	Zion
O'Neill, Mass.	Selden	Zwach
	Shipley	

NAYS—42

Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Reuss
Blatnik	Griffiths	Rosenthal
Bolling	Hechler, W. Va.	Roybal
Brasco	Jacobs	Rumsfeld
Brown, Calif.	Joelson	Ryan
Burton, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Button	Long, Md.	Sisk
Cohelan	McCarthy	Thompson, N.J.
Collier	Michel	Tunney
Dow	Moss	Udall
Edwards, Calif.	Nix	Ullman
Foley	Olsen	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Ottinger	Vanik
Gilbert	Rees	Yates

NOT VOTING—69

Ashley	Fountain	Nichols
Aspinall	Frelinghuysen	O'Konski
Ayres	Gallagher	Pettis
Barrett	Gettys	Pool
Brademas	Hagan	Pucinski
Brock	Halleck	Rarick
Broomfield	Hanna	Reifel
Bush	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Cabell	Hawkins	Riegle
Casey	Helstoski	Ronan
Cleveland	Holland	Steiger, Wis.
Conyers	Kluczynski	Stuckey
Corman	Kupferman	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Tiernan
Derwinski	Kyl	Utt
Diggs	Landrum	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Leggett	Waggonner
Edwards, La.	Lukens	Watkins
Evans, Colo.	McCulloch	Williams, Miss.
Feighan	Macdonald, Mass.	Willis
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Flynt	Mink	Wilson, Charles H.
Ford, William D.	Minshall	Wright

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. Frelinghuysen and Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Riegle against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Casey with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pettis.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Holland.
Mr. Hagan with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. William D. Ford.

Messrs. LONG of Maryland and OLSEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WALDIE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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 authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HURRICANE BEULAH

Mr. KAZEN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently returned from a tour of the areas in my district which suffered from floods, the winds of Hurricane Beulah and tornadoes spawned by the hurricane.

It is impossible to watch the struggles of those made homeless, the destruction of citizens' most prized possessions, the crumbling of roads and buildings, without feeling heartsore.

The 23d Congressional District received a large amount of flood and wind damage. Two counties—Jim Wells and Duval—were struck by the hurricane itself. In addition to direct damage, many areas will continue to feel the effect of loss of topsoil and pasture for some time to come.

I was fortunate, however, in being able to watch cities and counties, as well as the State of Texas, and the U.S. Government, put emergency procedures into operation. In every instance, cooperation was magnificent.

This spirit of helping others was pointed out in a September 21 editorial in the San Antonio Light newspaper which states:

There can be no taming of a shrew such as Beulah turned out to be, but her vindictiveness can be blunted by the skill and courage and generosity of thousands of South Texans.

And even though the article refers to work done in only one county, it could very well speak for all of the other counties affected, since this wonderful spirit was very much in evidence in every single part of the disaster area.

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to name all of the organizations and the many hundreds of individuals who did such a tremendous job in helping victims of the hurricane, flooding, and the tornadoes. I am proud to report to you and the membership of this Congress that every single Federal agency, every State agency, and all local agencies worked as one in helping those affected. I am also happy to report to you that every single person who was in need of food, shelter, or medicine was taken care of.

On behalf of the people whom I am privileged to represent, I offer my sincere thanks for a job well done. Over and beyond this, I want to commend the people themselves, who in the midst of suffering and heartache, exhibited a tremendous spirit of cooperation and concern for the less fortunate. This attitude of concern for others in time of great duress prompts me to reaffirm how very proud I am to be an American.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to include with these remarks in the RECORD a copy of the San Antonio Light editorial of September 21 entitled "Hurricane Heroes."

HURRICANE HEROES

There can be no taming of a shrew such as Beulah turned out to be, but her vindictiveness can be blunted by the skill and courage and generosity of thousands of South Texans.

Hurricanes may not make heroes of us all, but they create an astonishing number. Some become widely known. Many more are known only to those in their immediate vicinity. The identity of others is known only to themselves.

Who can measure the contribution of all the law enforcement officers, the National Guardsmen, and the Red Cross, Civil Defense and Salvation Army workers?

We think also of the telephone and electricity linemen, working at all hours and in appalling conditions to restore the means of communication and the source of power that are needed all the more when disaster strikes.

It is good to know that San Antonio also has been in a position to help the victims of Nature's rampage.

Auditorium Circle became the site of an unusual kind of convention. The delegates were fugitives from the hurricane, housed in the basement of Municipal Auditorium and at the city's Civil Defense headquarters.

Other refugees were cared for at Lackland AFB, Agudas Achim auditorium, Trinity Baptist Church, Alamo Stadium gym, and elsewhere. The Mexican Chamber of Commerce supplied interpreters for the Spanish-speaking.

We salute all those, professional or amateur, who responded to the emergency, including (may we add?) this newspaper's reporters and photographers who have kept you informed.

THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF NIGERIA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Government of Nigeria marked its seventh anniversary. To that troubled nation and all its people I express the fervent wish that future anniversaries will find the country united and in peace.

Nigeria has the resources, ability, and strength to become one of the strongest nations in the world and certainly a leader on the continent of Africa.

I pray that a way will shortly be found for all Nigerians to work together once more making their country a great and united nation.

HINDSIGHT IS BETTER THAN FORESIGHT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, when the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 was before the House on September 21, I offered an amendment which would have provided the necessary funds for financing the program, through a schedule of license fees, to be set by the FCC, approved by the appropriate committees of Congress, and which would have saved the taxpayers of this Nation an initial $10 to $15 million a year, and which eventually are estimated to run possibly a half billion a year or more.

Since the defeat of my proposed amendment by approximately 4 to 1 on a division vote in the Committee of the Whole, a number of Members have told me that, while they did not vote for the amendment, because they did not understand how it would operate, that after having had an opportunity to read and study it, they were of the opinion that it was unfortunate the House did not adopt the amendment, especially in view of the fact that it will probably be a long time before such legislation will be approved by the committee, particularly when one realizes that the proposition which I have proposed is opposed by the FCC, the networks, and larger stations who also control the NAB, which exercises a great influence in the broadcasting industry, but in my opinion does not represent the views of the smaller broadcasters.

In the current issue of Broadcasting magazine, I read where the National Citizens Committee for Public Television had advocated that the television advertisers ought to contribute a "proper percentage" of their total advertising budget to noncommercial TV. I do not agree with that recommendation but feel that those who enjoy the exclusive and monopolistic use of the airwaves should contribute in proportion to the income they receive through the use of these channels, based on a very small percentage of their gross income—says, in proportion to the fees they pay ASCAP, Sesac, and BMI. Following is the editorial referred to above which appeared in the October 2, 1967, issue of Broadcasting:

WRONG PLACES TO LOOK

Now that the House has passed a bill to create a Corp. for Public Broadcasting (Broadcasting, Sept. 25) and that compromise seems probable between that bill and one that the Senate passed earlier, it may be assumed that the corporation will indeed come into being.

That brings us to the next question of how public broadcasting is to be financed in the long range.

Thomas P. F. Hoving, chairman of the National Citizens' Committee for Public Television, proposed, in the same week the House passed the CPB bill, that television advertisers ought to contribute "a proper percentage" of their total advertising budgets to noncommercial TV. During House debate 25 congressmen voted for an amendment that would have assessed commercial broadcasters to pay for noncommercial broadcasting.

More of the same will be heard—and, no doubt, louder.

BIG SPENDING CUT BACKERS DISREGARD PAINFUL LESSONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks an article from the Sunday, October 1, 1967, Washington Post by Joseph R. Slevin, entitled "Big Spending Cut Backers Disregard Painful Lessons."

Mr. Speaker, this article analyzes the true meaning of the Bow amendment to direct the President to cut $5 billion in expenditures from the fiscal 1968 budget. The figures given in the article have been checked by my staff and verified by the Bureau of the Budget with one correction of a technical nature. The 3.1 billion listed for the National Health Institute also embraced the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

The gist of the article is to show that the $5 billion cut must be made from a pool of $21 billion and not from the overall pool of the total budget of $141 billion.

The cut of $5 billion must be found in appropriated funds from the following programs:

First. Government payroll, $9 billion.

Second and third. Health, Education and Welfare programs and educational grants and aids totaling $3.1 billion.

Fourth. Surplus food to underdeveloped countries, $1.8 billion.

Fifth. School lunches, food stamps, housing, urban development, and veterans programs, $1.9 billion.

Sixth. Transportation, $500 million.

Seventh. Foreign aid, $500 million.

Mr. Speaker, the $5 billion cut, because of fixed charges such as interest on the national debt and excluded military appropriations and contract obligations, will, if carried out, destroy many of the Nation's most vital domestic programs.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1967]

BIG SPENDING CUT BACKERS DISREGARD PAINFUL LESSONS

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

Congressional backers of big Federal spending cuts are disregarding painful lessons in budget arithmetic.

The burden of the lessons is that President Johnson can satisfy Congressional demands for a spending slash of $5 billion or more only by ordering deep cuts in a large number of popular programs. The candidates for the presidential axe include everything from the school lunch program and the agricultural extension service to small business loans and new Bureau of Reclamation dams.

Congressional Republicans and a big clutch of Democrats have been pushing the spending cuts as their price for supporting the President's Vietnam War surtax. Mr. Johnson agrees that spending has to be reduced. He pledged a cut of more than $2 billion when he sent his tax request to Congress in early August. But the White House insists that there cannot be an additional $5 billion of reductions without drastic cutbacks in programs that command powerful support in Congress and in the country at large.

Slashing Federal outlays by over $5 billion looks manageable when the cut is measured against a Federal spending budget that currently totals more than $141 billion.

The trouble is that most of the $141 billion is beyond Mr. Johnson's control. The startling fact is that any savings will have to come out of a relatively small $21 billion slice of the total budget, including $9 billion that is earmarked to meet the Government's payroll.

A quick look at the rest of the $21 billion shows that it covers $3.2 billion for space, $3.1 billion for the sacrosanct National Institutes of Health and school aid, $1.8 billion to provide surplus food to needy, underdeveloped countries, $1.9 billion for school lunches, food stamps, housing, urban development, and a variety of veterans programs, $500 million for transportation, and $500 million for foreign aid.

The biggest, untouchable chunk of Government spending is more than $75 billion that is budgeted for Viet Nam and other defense programs this year. The question is not whether the $75 billion can be reduced but whether it can be kept from going even higher.

Another $45 billion of civilian spending is beyond Mr. Johnson's control because it either is fixed by law or is tied to contracts that the Government cannot breech without huge losses. Major items include $14 billion for interest on the public debt, $5 billion for veterans benefits, $4.4 billion for public assistance grants to the states, $1.9 billion for the jealously guarded farm price supports, and $1 billion to cover the post office deficit.

The President, as this is written, has been steadfastly refusing to give Congress a list of potential spending cuts but high officials privately have been showing lawmakers a teeth-rattling rundown of the kind of slashes that would have to be ordered to chop the $21 billion of relatively controllable civilian programs by $5 billion.

At the top of their list, the Administration officials have a one-third slash in grants to states and local communities for aid to education, school lunches, maternal and child welfare, antipoverty programs, urban transportation, waste disposal, agricultural extension activities, and a broad range of other programs.

New construction of dams and Federal buildings is prohibited. All recently started projects of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are to be halted immediately.

The confidential Administration list includes a 50 per cent slash in new loans including loans to farmers for electricity and telephones, in Federal emergency loans to disaster areas, and in housing, small business, and foreign aid loans.

The closing of some VA hospitals is proposed along with the discharge of a number of doctors and nurses.

The Administration officials even have included a cut in the FBI. They don't think the number of FBI agents is likely to be reduced under any circumstances but they stress that other programs would have to be chopped more severely if the FBI did not bear its share of the $5 billion spending reduction.

THE PRESIDENT COURAGEOUSLY FIRM: "WE SHALL PRESS FORWARD"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, 100 years from today historians will perhaps search fruitlessly for what mania possessed a nation when people in high places and even Members of the Congress of the United States, in effect, ask for the death of their own flesh and blood, now fighting in South Vietnam, by asking for a cessation of bombing even while our men are under fire in South Vietnam.

Perhaps the answer is, we all tend to specialize. In this body we are very busy people, and perhaps those people calling for a halt do not really know what would happen during a bombing cessation—and what happened during the last bombing cessation.

Without further comment, Mr. Speaker, I will include an editorial by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "The President Courageously Firm, 'We Shall Press Forward' ":

THE PRESIDENT COURAGEOUSLY FIRM: "WE SHALL PRESS FORWARD"

Replying to the most recent freshet of emotional, vituperative criticism, coming from Senate foes of the Vietnam policy, President Lyndon B. Johnson has restated with clarity and logic the United States policy in Southeast Asia.

He refused to be cowed by the new bombast of tongue-lashing doves. He rejected the diatribes of appeasement that would have the nation retreat from the Vietnam cauldron—no matter what the cost to American integrity, no matter what the fate of South Vietnam, no matter what the profit to Communist aggression throughout Asia, indeed over the whole world.

Mr. Johnson's talk was calm, reasoned, at times eloquent. He stood staunchly behind conduct of the Viet war. If only he had gone further and set a victory goal, he would have had the nation behind his policy as the people have never been before.

The country is deeply worried and confused by the ugly conflict 10,000 miles distant, when the President has no clear goal.

In war there is only one goal: Victory. Americans cannot understand a war of attrition, that saps our strength, treasure and the lives of our troops with no clear design to win.

* * *

The President declared we "shall press forward." We shall fulfill our commitment under the SEATO Treaty, hard and sacrificial as it has become—not only to protect South Vietnam freedom under assault by combined Red power, but because American safety and our national existence as a democratic free people are threatened.

This took political courage on the threshold of a campaign in which he will seek reelection. An intensely political man, he has a compulsive desire for consensus approval of all his acts. No other President has sought to be all things to all people so assiduously. Yet in the Vietnam policy, he repudiates a cut-and-run compromise, which might achieve censensus if sugared over with a thick veneer of Washington propaganda.

In his week-end talk at San Antonio, Mr. Johnson once again showed his willingness to meet with Ho Chi Minh for peace talks. Time after futile time he has made the same plea. But it takes two to talk. Ho coldly, flatly turns down every suggestion. So have other, more powerful Communist nations, backing the Red Viet aggression with increasing supplies of rockets, planes, artillery, munitions and all needed materiel to kill our troops.

Again was the proffer made in cease bombing, if it could lead to "productive discussion." This cannot be done—and Mr. Johnson made this amply clear—unless the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese give similar concession. Repeatedly, when we have halted bombing, Red forces have used the lull to fortify, regroup and rush in new supplies for stepped-up aggression.

It would be a proved stupidity to halt bombing unilaterally in the north, or anywhere in Vietnam, in the fuzzy hope this insane strategy would do anything but prolong the war and slay more of our youth.

The key to all we have done, as the President declared, is our own basic security. He said he could not forecast with certainty that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communists would bring a third world war. None can read the future. But we can know the past. He was grimly right in warning "all we have learned in this tragic century" strongly argues that a Communist sweep of Southeast Asia would follow in the wake of a Vietnam capitulation.

The domino theory is still the only viable conclusion that can be read into a South Viet defeat. North Vietnamese are already in Thailand and Burma. These states would drop into the Red China maw. So, most certainly, would Hong Kong. Then Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, even Japan would be under a rapacious Red threat which would soon be open and violent.

Mr. Johnson emphasized he would "not risk the security, indeed the survival of (the United States) on mere hope and wishful thinking." Nor has he any right to do so.

Vietnam Reds believe that, despite their steady, slow setbacks in Vietnam, they are going to win out in Southeast Asia. They are banking on America getting weary, discouraged, disgusted with an inconclusive war that has already killed 13,500 of our sons and wounded 85,000 more. That's why they obdurately refuse to consider any talk of peace.

Such bilious blasts as Senator Thruston Morton's charge that the President of the United States has been "brainwashed" to defend South Vietnam, and the politically scurrilous speech of Senator Clifford Case calling the Johnson policy "perversion" of the Tonkin Gulf resolution by Congress, are music in the ears of Ho Chi Minh and his Hanoi warmongers.

Rational dissent is always justified, usually healthy. Divisive contumacy and harangue, such as we have recently suffered, simply give aid and comfort to the enemy, hardening their design to continue the war and kill more Americans.

Until we declare a victory purpose in Vietnam, and pursue that end, Hanoi will cling to a conviction of Communist triumph. The most humane, intelligent way to end the grueling Vietnam issue is to use whatever power is necessary to win the bloody conflagration—fast and decisively.

AN EVER-PRESENT DANGER

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the superabundance of fictional spy stories on the market in the past few years one might perhaps be tempted to view the field of espionage with undue levity. One need only recall the many cases in country after country where citizens have betrayed the country of their birth for various reasons to realize that the danger of espionage is forever with us. Especially so, when the Soviet Union over the years has enticed persons from foreign lands to switch their allegiance and service to the U.S.S.R.

One such case is that of Harold A. R. Philby, a former British diplomat, whose service to a dangerous foreign power makes Benedict Arnold look like a piker.

I request that the article, "Philby Admits Spying for Reds," from the New York Daily News of October 2 be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

PHILBY ADMITS SPYING FOR REDS

(By Henry Maule)

LONDON, October 1.—Twelve years after British diplomat Harold A. R. (Kim) Philby was exposed in the News as the "third man" in a spy case, he has admitted being a Soviet agent for more than 30 years.

An exclusive dispatch from this correspondent to The News in 1955 named Philby for the first time as the man who had tipped off British turncoats Guy Burgess and Donald MacLean, enabling them to flee to Russia.

The question was raised in Parliament and Harold Macmillan, then foreign secretary, cleared Philby, former first secretary of the British Embassy in Washington, declaring there was "no reason to conclude that Mr. Philby has at any time betrayed the interests of this country or to identify him with a so-called third man."

"I HAVE COME HOME," HE TELLS SON

Philby, 55, has admitted to his oldest son, John, 24, who recently visited him in Moscow, that his allegiance has been to the Soviet Union most of his adult life.

"I have come home," he told the son, declaring himself completely happy in Moscow, where he ostensibly works for a Soviet publishing house.

Two London newspapers, the Observer and Sunday Times, carried today what the Observer called his "unmatched success story in espionage."

They reported that Philby was now known to be the most important spy the Russians ever had in the West, and that for more than a decade, while serving as a Soviet agent, he was a trusted senior officer at the heart of British intelligence.

Philby reportedly was assigned by the Russians in 1934 to infiltrate British intelligence. By 1944 he was appointed head of British anti-Soviet intelligence.

IN ON BRITISH AND U.S. SECRETS

He was named to diplomatic posts from which he was able to disclose to Moscow the inner secrets of M-16, Britain's counter-

intelligence service, and of American Central Intelligence Agency, the newspapers said. He was being groomed to head M-16 and be Britain's link with the CIA.

In 1951, Philby risked exposing his position by warning MacLean that he had just been unmasked as a major atomic spy, permitting MacLean to flee with his friend Burgess, who since has died.

Apparently Philby did so because he suspected MacLean and Burgess might break down under interrogation and betray him.

Philby was later exposed by a Soviet intelligence officer who defected to the West in 1961 and told London about him. Philby fled to Moscow in 1963 from Beirut, Lebanon, where he was working for the Observer and, that paper said, for British intelligence.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ELOQUENT ADDRESS PLACES VIETNAM IN ITS TRUE PERSPECTIVE

Mr. BROOKS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Friday night in San Antonio, the President of the United States reiterated our Nation's determination to stand fast against Communist aggression in Vietnam.

In this memorable speech, President Johnson explained to the American people the reason why Vietnam is so important to the vital interests of the United States. He emphasized that if aggression is allowed to go unchecked in Vietnam, its flaming violence would soon spread across the great land mass of Southeast Asia.

The President declared:

> I cannot tell you—with certainty—that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third world war much closer to terrible reality. One could hope that it would not be so. But all we have learned in this tragic century strongly suggests it would be so. As President of the United States I am not prepared to gamble on the chance it is not so.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for those so vocally opposed to the President's policy in Vietnam to ask themselves whether they are prepared to take such a gamble.

For as the President said:

> I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, reduce the danger for our children and our grandchildren.

I support this view, Mr. Speaker. I support it not only because I have confidence in the wisdom and judgment of the President, but because I believe we have learned our lesson about appeasement. We learned in the 1930's that appeasing an aggressor only whets his appetite for more violence and territorial expansion at the expense of freedom and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, our cause in Vietnam must—and will—prevail. Our goal, as the President noted, is peace. But, he reminded us:

> Peace cannot be secured by wishes; peace cannot be preserved by noble words and pure intentions.

And he added:

> Peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD President Johnson's address to the American people, as it was delivered at the National Legislative Conference in San Antonio:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, VILLITA ASSEMBLY HALL, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Speaker Barnes, Governor Hughes, Governor Smith, Congressman Kazen, Representative Graham, most distinguished legislators, ladies and gentlemen, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before an organization whose members contribute every day such important work to the public affairs of our State and of our country.

This evening I came here to speak to you about Vietnam.

I do not have to tell you that our people are profoundly concerned about that struggle.

There are passionate convictions about the wisest course for our nation to follow. There are many sincere and patriotic Americans who harbor doubts about sustaining the commitment that three Presidents and a half a million of our young men have made.

Doubt and debate are enlarged because the problems of Vietnam are quite complex. They are a mixture of political turmoil—of poverty—of religious and factional strife—of ancient servitude and modern longing for freedom. Vietnam is all of these things.

Vietnam is also the scene of a powerful aggression that is spurred by an appetite for conquest.

It is the arena where Communist expansionism is most aggressively at work in the world today—where it is crossing international frontiers in violation of international agreement; where it is killing and kidnapping; where it is ruthlessly attempting to bend free people to its will.

Into this mixture of subversion and war, of terror and hope, America has entered—with its material power and with its moral commitment.

Why?

Why should three Presidents and the elected representatives of our people have chosen to defend this Asian nation more than ten thousand miles from American shores?

We cherish freedom—yes. We cherish self-determination for all people—yes. We abhor the political murder of any state by another, and the bodily murder of any people by gangsters of whatever ideology. And for 27 years—since the days of Lend-Lease—we have sought to strengthen free people against domination by aggressive foreign powers.

But the key to all we have done is really our own security. At times of crisis—before asking Americans to fight and die to resist aggression in a foreign land—every American President has finally had to answer this question:

Is the aggression a threat—not only to the immediate victim—but to the United States of America and to the peace and security of the entire world of which we in America are a very vital part?

That is the question which Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson had to answer in facing the issue in Vietnam.

That is the question that the Senate of the United States answered by a vote of 82 to 1 when it ratified and approved the SEATO treaty in 1955, and to which the members of the United States Congress responded in a resolution that it passed in 1964 by a vote of 504 to 2, "The United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia collective defense treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Those who tell us now that we should abandon our commitment—that securing South Vietnam from armed domination is not worth the price we are paying—must also answer this question. And the test they must meet is this: What would be the consequence of letting armed aggression against South Vietnam succeed? What would follow in the time ahead? What kind of world are they prepared to live in five months or five years from tonight?

For those who have borne the responsibility for decision during these past 10 years, the stakes to us have seemed clear—and have seemed high.

President Dwight Eisenhower said in 1959: "Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in Southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. The freedom of 12 million people would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million in adjacent lands would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom . . ."

And President John F. Kennedy said in 1962: "Withdrawal in the case of Vietnam and the case of Thailand might mean a collapse of the entire area."

A year later, he reaffirmed that: "We are not going to withdraw from that effort. In my opinion, for us to withdraw from that effort would mean a collapse not only of South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia. So we are going to stay there."

This is not simply an American viewpoint, I would have you legislative leaders know. I am going to call the roll now of those who live in that part of the world—in the great arc of Asian and Pacific nations—and who bear the responsibility for leading their people, and the responsibility for the fate of their people.

The President of the Philippines has this to say: "Vietnam is the focus of attention now . . . It may happen to Thailand or the Philippines, or anywhere, wherever there is misery, disease, ignorance . . . For you to renounce your position of leadership in Asia is to allow the Red Chinese to gobble up all of Asia."

The Foreign Minister of Thailand said: "(The American) decision will go down in history as the move that prevented the world from having to face another major conflagration."

The Prime Minister of Australia said: "We are there because while Communist aggression persists the whole of Southeast Asia is threatened."

President Park of Korea said: "For the first time in our history, we decided to dispatch our combat troops overseas . . . because in our belief any aggression against the Republic of Vietnam represented a direct and grave menace against the security and peace of free Asia, and therefore directly jeopardized the very security and freedom of our own people."

The Prime Minister of Malaysia warned his people that if the United States pulled out of South Vietnam, it would go to the Communists, and after that, it would only be a matter of time until they moved against neighboring states.

The Prime Minister of New Zealand said: "We can thank God that America at least regards aggression in Asia with the same concern as it regards aggression in Europe—and is prepared to back up its concern with action."

The Prime Minister of Singapore said: "I feel the fate of Asia—South and Southeast Asia—will be decided in the next few years by what happens out in Vietnam."

I cannot tell you tonight as your Presi-

dent—with certainty—that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia. But I do know there are North Vietnamese troops in Laos. I do know that there are North Vietnamese trained guerrillas tonight in Northeast Thailand. I do know that there are Communist-supported guerrilla forces operating in Burma. And a Communist coup was barely averted in Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in the world.

So your American President cannot tell you—with certainty—that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third world war much closer to terrible reality. One could hope that this would not be so.

But all that we have learned in this tragic century strongly suggests to me that it would be so. As President of the United States, I am not prepared to gamble on the chance that it is not so. I am not prepared to risk the security—indeed, the survival—of this American Nation on mere hopes and wishful thinking. I am convinced that by seeing this struggle through now, we are greatly reducing the chances of a much large war—perhaps a nuclear war. I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, and facing up to it, thereby reduce the danger for our children and for our grandchildren.

I want to turn now to the struggle in Vietnam itself.

There are questions about this difficult war that must trouble every really thoughtful person. I am going to put some of these questions. I am going to give you the very best answers that I can give you.

First, are the Vietnamese—with our help, and that of their other allies—really making any progress? Is there a forward movement? The reports I see make it clear that there is. Certainly there is a positive movement toward constitutional government. Thus far the Vietnamese have met the political schedule that they laid down in January 1966.

The people wanted an elected, responsive government. They wanted it strongly enough to brave a vicious campaign of Communist terror and assassination to vote for it. It has been said that they killed more civilians in four weeks trying to keep them from voting before the election than our American bombers have killed in the big cities of North Vietnam in bombing military targets.

On November 1, subject to the action, of course, of the constituent assembly, an elected government will be inaugurated and an elected Senate and Legislature will be installed. Their responsibility is clear: To answer the desires of the South Vietnamese people for self-determination and for peace, for an attack on corruption, for economic development and for social justice.

There is progress in the war itself, steady progress considering the war that we are fighting; rather dramatic progress considering the situation that actually prevailed when we sent our troops there in 1965; when we intervened to prevent the dismemberment of the country by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

The campaigns of the last year drove the enemy from many of their major interior bases. The military victory almost within Hanoi's grasp in 1965 has now been denied them. The grip of the Viet Cong on the people is being broken.

Since our commitment of major forces in July 1965 the proportion of the population living under Communist control has been reduced to well under 20 percent. Tonight the secure proportion of the population has grown from about 45 percent to 65 percent—and in the contested areas, the tide continues to run with us.

But the struggle remains hard. The South Vietnamese have suffered severely, as have we—particularly in the First Corps areas in the North, where the enemy has mounted his heaviest attacks, and where his lines of communication to North Vietnam are shortest. Our casualties in the war have reached about 13,500 killed in action, and about 85,000 wounded. Of those 85,000 wounded, we thank God that 79,000 of the 85,000 have been returned, or will return to duty shortly. Thanks to our great American medical science and the helicopter.

I know there are other questions on your minds, and on the minds of many sincere, troubled Americans: "Why not negotiate now?" so many ask me. The answer is that we and our South Vietnamese allies are wholly prepared to negotiate tonight.

I am ready to talk with Ho Chi Minh, and other chiefs of state concerned, tomorrow.

I am ready to have Secretary Rusk meet with their Foreign Minister tomorrow.

I am ready to send a trusted representative of America to any spot on this earth to talk in public or private with a spokesman of Hanoi.

We have twice sought to have the issue of Vietnam dealt with by the United Nations—and twice Hanoi has refused.

Our desire to negotiate peace—through the United Nations or out—has been made very, very clear to Hanoi—directly and many times through third parties.

As we have told Hanoi time and time and time again, the heart of the matter really is this: The United States is willing to stop all aerial and naval bombardment of North Vietnam when this will lead promptly to productive discussions. We, of course, assume that while discussions proceed, North Vietnam would not take advantage of the bombing cessation or limitation.

But Hanoi has not accepted any of these proposals.

So it is by Hanoi's choice—and not ours, and not the rest of the world's—that the war continues.

Why, in the face of military and political progress in the South, and the burden of our bombing in the North, do they insist and persist with the war?

From many sources the answer is the same. They still hope that the people of the United States will not see this struggle through to the very end. As one Western diplomat reported to me only this week—he had just been in Hanoi—"They believe their staying power is greater than ours and that they can't lose." A visitor from a Communist capital had this to say: "They expect the war to be long, and that the Americans in the end will be defeated by a breakdown of morale, fatigue, and psychological factors." The Premier of North Vietnam said as far back as 1962: "Americans do not like long, inconclusive war . . . Thus we are sure to win in the end."

Are the North Vietnamese right about us?

I think not. No. I think they are wrong. I think it is the common failing of totalitarian regimes, that they cannot really understand the nature of our democracy: They mistake dissent for disloyalty; they mistake restlessness for a rejection of policy; they mistake a few committees for a country; they misjudge individual speeches for public policy.

They are no better suited to judge the strength and perseverance of America than the Nazis and the Stalinist propagandists were able to judge it. It is a tragedy that they must discover these qualities in the American people, and discover them through a bloody war.

And, soon or late, they will discover them.

In the meantime, it shall be our policy to continue to seek negotiations—confident that reason will some day prevail; that Hanoi will realize that it just can never win; that it will turn away from fighting and start building for its own people.

Since World War II, this nation has met and has mastered many challenges—challenges in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, in Cuba.

We met them because brave men were willing to risk their lives for their nation's security. And braver men have never lived than those who carry our colors in Vietnam at this very hour.

The price of these efforts, of course, has been heavy. But the price of not having made them at all, not having seen them through, in my judgment would have been vastly greater.

Our goal has been the same—in Europe, in Asia, in our own hemisphere. It has been—and it is now—peace.

And peace cannot be secured by wishes; peace cannot be preserved by noble words and pure intentions. Enduring peace—Franklin D. Roosevelt said—cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom.

The late President Kennedy put it precisely in November 1961, when he said: "We are neither war mongers nor appeasers, neither hard nor soft. We are Americans determined to defend the frontiers of freedom by an honorable peace if peace is possible but by arms if arms are used against us."

The true peace-keepers in the world tonight are not those who urge us to retire from the field in Vietnam—who tell us to try to find the quickest, cheapest exit from that tormented land, no matter what the consequences to us may be.

The true peace-keepers are those men who stand out there on the DMZ at this very hour, taking the worst that the enemy can give. The true peace-keepers are the soldiers who are breaking the terrorist's grip around the villages of Vietnam—the civilians who are bringing medical care and food and education to people who have already suffered a generation of war.

And so I report to you that we are going to continue to press forward. Two things we must do. Two things we shall do.

First, we must not mislead our enemy. Let him not think that debate and dissent will produce wavering and withdrawal. For I can assure you they won't. Let him not think that protests will produce surrender. Because they won't. Let him not think that he will wait us out. For he won't.

Second, we will provide all that our brave men require to do the job that must be done. And that job is going to be done.

These gallant men have our prayers—have our thanks—have our heart-felt praise—and our deepest gratitude.

Let the world know that the keepers of peace will endure through every trial—that with the full backing of their countrymen, they are going to prevail.

GI LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we read constantly of those who advocate withdrawal from South Vietnam. We hear from those who demand that the United States stop bombing the aggressor, North Vietnam. We receive letters and petitions from many who should know the tragedy of appeasement, demanding that we quit and come home.

Mr. Speaker, all of the communications and statements that I receive urging that we quit in South Vietnam come from the continental United States—areas far removed from the fighting in South Vietnam. I have yet to receive a letter demanding that we quit from a member of our Armed Forces now engaged in combat or who has recently

been engaged in fighting the ruthless aggressor in South Vietnam.

Having traveled throughout this Nation pleading for support of our men in Vietnam and pleading for unity here in the United States, the following letter from a combat soldier from my congressional district is a source of personal encouragement to me. I commend this letter, straight from a combat soldier's heart, to the attention of those who would create disunity, discord, and doubt here at home:

BEARCAT,
August 28, 1967.

DEAR MR. DORN: Received your most warm and appreciated letter today. I am very truly and honored to have such a fine man, such as yourself, representing that good old Dixie State of South Carolina, and the rest of the U.S.A.

The Reverend George Baker is truly a man of God and he believes in our policy over here as much as anyone. Just today, he sent me a small prayer book, that helps me in so many ways. I want to give him a word of thanks, because he is really a wonderful person just to give me a little of his time each week and write and send the books and etc.

I know your job in Congress has its problems like every other job, and that your job is a big burden sometimes. I know the decisions and questions that you have to decide some times.

Well Mr. Dorn, maybe I can help you see how we GIs feel about the conflict over here. We do not like to kill anyone, but the men know that they have a job to do, and believe me they do it, because we are proud. We are proud because we have something to be proud of. We have the greatest nation, the most opportunities, and last, we are free to go, and do what ever we want to do.

The G.I.'s over here have more spirit than the people back in the U.S.A.

I know this is the most downgraded conflict in our history, and many people cannot understand why we are here, and why we are fighting. If they could be in Viet Nam for a week or so and just see how the Vietnamese make their living, build their homes, and grow their food, and then see the Congs destroy their homes and everything they have in 5 minutes or see innocent children and civilians killed by bombs or mines, I believe they would change their minds about the conflict over here.

So, Mr. Dorn, you don't have to worry about us G.I.'s losing our morale, nor about Army standards because of some bearded demonstrator or someone burning their draft card. I was drafted into the Army, too, but I know when I get out shortly, I will look back over my 2 years in service and say "I did my best" and I can be proud of it the rest of my life.

I know this conflict will go on for years to come. It will just take time, that's all. I know we will win it in the end, because we have great men like yourself and President Johnson and the whole Congress who are giving us 100% backing and support. I remember you came to Whitmire High School a few years back and gave us a very good talk on Character and Respect.

Thanks again for the encouraging letter. The best of luck in all the work you do in the future.

Your friend,

Sp/4c. GARY COLLIER.

BALTIMORE EXPERTS HELP SAVE ITALY'S ART

Mr. FRIEDEL. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, during March of this year, I addressed the House regarding the storms and floods which hit the city of Florence, Italy, and caused the Arno River to overflow its banks.

The world expressed its deep concern that famous treasures of art—paintings, statues, books, and other priceless art objects—were either destroyed or severely damaged. I voiced my own sympathy for the brave and artistic Italian people and strongly urged and recommended that all Americans interested in preserving the heritage of the past aid in every way they can the efforts to salvage as much as possible.

It gives me great pleasure to report to my colleagues in the Congress that, in addition to the many people of the State of Maryland who have contributed money and other help, two experts of the city of Baltimore have been working to restore the flooded Florence art treasures. They are Miss Kay Silberfeld, a young restorer from the excellent Baltimore Museum of Art, and Miss Mary Lou White, a staff restorer at the justly renowned Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore.

The Sun magazine, a part of the Baltimore Sun, of Sunday, October 1, 1967, published an interesting account of the work done by these two very talented artists in salvaging and restoring some of the Italian art.

Believing it to be of such general interest, I include this article in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPING SAVE ITALY'S FLOODED ART: TWO BALTIMORE EXPERTS AT RESTORATION HAVE BEEN WORKING ON FLOODED FLORENCE TREASURES

(By Vera Martin)

FLORENCE, ITALY.—As an American fund raiser had predicted—after collecting a million dollars within one week of the catastrophic Italian floods last fall—Florence is now going through a new Renaissance, but this time the United States has a hand in it.

Since that first million was raised, a great deal more money has come from all over the world to help relieve the disaster.

But money alone was not enough.

Even before the floods, the restorers in this country were understaffed, underpaid and heavily overloaded with work. For years the Italian art experts, conservators and officials complained, appealed, warned—and despaired. But nobody paid attention and many invaluable and irreplaceable treasures were slowly going to ruin.

Then, on the rainy, bleak dawn of November 4 the river Arno took over the city. Its fetid, oily waters inundated practically all the major art centers and monuments—the museums, the churches, the galleries, architectural masterpieces, as well as everything else in the heart of Florence.

In a few hours, the number of damaged art treasures that had accumulated over centuries became only an infinitesimal fraction of all the urgent restoration jobs to be done.

This time the world listened.

Among the people everywhere who heard about the floods, there were many who immediately got on the move to help. Among them was Miss Kay Silberfeld, a young restorer from the Baltimore Museum of Art.

"I was horrified," she said, when I heard the news of the disaster over the radio in Baltimore. It struck me all the more because I had been to Italy and Florence. It was hard to believe that all those magnificent works of art which I had admired ever since I was 14 were drowned in mud and water."

Kay decided that she must go to Florence as soon as possible. She talked to Charles Parkhurst, director of the Museum of Art. "We were busy at the time," she said, "but he immediately agreed to let me go." It was arranged that the museum would continue to pay her salary while she was away; the Committee to Rescue Italian Art paid her travel fare.

A Baltimore party of volunteer helpers was just about to leave for Florence and Kay was able to join it.

"I had to get ready almost at once," she said. "It was a terrible rush to gather all the equipment I wanted to take. I started out with an enormous amount of luggage, and yet I would have willingly taken another thousand things which I knew would be invaluable. I left for Italy with a curious mixture of emotions."

In Florence, it was hard work from dawn to dusk. Such elementary comforts as are usually taken for granted—water, electricity and heating—were rare. Meals tended to be erratic.

"But nobody had time to think about these things," Miss Silberfeld said. "Everyone was determined to accomplish as much as possible in the time available."

On arrival in Florence, each restorer picked an object to work on. Kay had until then been restoring only paintings. Here, however, she was attracted by the curious antique objects from the Bargello, a major museum.

One of the objects was a Sixteenth Century Venetian shield, covered with paint-decorated leather and shaped like a saddle. From the mud-ridden Bargello, Kay carried this to the Palazzo Davanzati. This stupendous Fourteenth Century palazzo was also a museum before the flood, but since then it has been turned into a well-equipped, efficient and certainly the most romantic art restoration laboratory that ever existed.

"It was exhilarating to witness and participate in the enthusiasm of all the young people of different nationalities who set up this laboratory," Kay said.

The shield that Kay "adopted" was a complicated restoration job to tackle. It had a base of wood, then a layer of gesso, a leather cover and, finally, the paint and varnish of the decorations. Each of these four materials required its own treatment.

At first Kay was able to remain in Florence only three weeks, which barely gave time to perform the first stage of restoration, the so-called acid treatment, to stop the damage from spreading. One of the worst after-effects of water damage is mold.

Restoration, like creative art, requires talent, steady application and great patience, in addition to specialized technical knowledge. And unlike a successful artist, a restorer acquires no public glamour. "But it's a marvelous satisfaction when the work comes out well," Miss Silberfeld said.

Upon special request from Signora Cristina Piacenter, in charge of the restorations at the Palazzo Davanzati, Kay returned to Florence at the beginning of summer. In August she was finishing her part of the restoration of one shield; it had been kept waiting for her return. Before it can go back to the Bargello, however, leather experts from Holland will have to come for the final stage.

Kay had another few weeks left before going back to Baltimore. Until then, she was going to work on wood sculptures—yet another new experience.

Kay shared her apartment with Miss Mary

Lou White, a staff restorer at the Walters Art Gallery. Miss White, who speaks fluent Italian, had studied restoration in Rome, Florence and London.

An expert at restoring sculptures and paintings on wood panels, she had spent some six weeks at the Fortezza da Basso, an old army barrack also converted into a restoration center.

"The work going on in the Fortezza is exciting," Mary Lou said. "The paintings often arrive in such a state that you can't even see what they are. The Italians are doing a magnificent job. Even to us, professionals, it seems a miracle the way some practically nonexistent paintings come back to life."

The flooded panels blister and come out in holes like large wounds. "The work I do is like putting jigsaw puzzles together," Miss White said. She estimates that at least 200 panels of great value are still in danger.

"The problem now is to stop further damage—the so-called first-aid treatment—so that eventually they can be properly restored. But there are far too few of us here to do this task in time."

According to Professor Umberto Baldini, head of restoration work at the Fortezza da Basso, another 50 head restorers and about 500 assistants are still needed.

Mary Lou was also leaving Florence soon, but both girls hoped to come back to do more work.

TAX INCREASE AND INFLATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL] 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. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, in his weekend press conference the President said that unless his tax increase proposal is accepted there will be a tax increase anyway as the result of the inflation which would take place. Just to keep the record straight we should remind ourselves of a few facts.

Inflation is already here and the American taxpayers are hurting now because of it. Especially hard hit are those on fixed incomes and our older citizens on pensions and annuities.

We faced a national financial crisis in 1966 as the result of an $11 billion deficit. Even if the President's 10-percent surtax is enacted without a corresponding cut in Federal spending we will face a deficit of some $22 billion. The result will be that we will get a direct-tax increase, plus a hidden-tax increase caused by more inflation, because without a cut in spending, the inflationary pressures will still be with us.

The only sane course for us to follow before agreeing to a tax increase is to demand concrete proof that there will be a sizable cut in spending to bring the budget more nearly in balance.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, during the period September 23 to 30, I had the honor of serving, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, as one of the congressional advisers at the annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

I am sure that my colleagues have followed the reports on the meetings and know how constructive the discussions were in helping reach an understanding on international monetary matters.

Because it was necessary for me to be away when the House took action on several measures, I am not recorded as voting on this legislation. So that my constituents and the other Members will know exactly where I stand, I wish to offer this explanation about my position.

On rollcall 273, to provide for the election of a nonpartisan, locally elected school board for the District of Columbia, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 274, to permit the new District of Columbia government to issue rules and regulations regarding the sale of alcoholic beverages, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall 277, the Railsback amendment to the juvenile delinquency bill, requiring block grants to the States, based on population, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 278, the Waggonner amendment to the juvenile delinquency bill, to prohibit receipt of funds under the act by the Office of Economic Opportunity, I would have voted "yea."

Or rollcall 282, the recommittal motion on continuing appropriations, I was paired for recommittal. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 285, establishing procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall 287, the amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act, I would have voted "yea."

FCC CEREMONY HONORS MR. RAYMOND TOBIAS, LYONS, KANS.—A PIONEER IN BUSINESS SERVICE TWO-WAY RADIO

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] 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. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, this morning a ceremony was held in the offices of FCC Chairman Rosel Hyde in Washington commemorating the approval of the 100,000th license in the business radio service. The ceremony was arranged by the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, Inc., in coordination with the Federal Communications Commission, to mark the occurrence.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Raymond Tobias, head of the Tobias Dirt Construction Co., of Lyons, Kans., which is in my congressional district, who was the first licensee in the business radio service. Mr. Tobias and his wife are in Washington today for the observance. His license was granted on August 1, 1958, just a few weeks after the business radio service was created by the FCC.

It is a matter of significance and pride that this small businessman from Lyons, Kans., had the foresight and vision to recognize, even before businessmen in the big cities of our Nation, the benefits which the use of two-way radio in business could bring for him and the people he serves.

Today Mr. Tobias also utilizes two-way radio communications in his soil conservation work and in farming. In addition he is engaging in the development of channel catfish, a new and important industry in Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, the ability to contact trucks and all types of vehicles while they are in motion, and even to contact individuals, such as policemen and doctors while they are making their rounds, is one of the miracles of the century. It has opened for us a whole new vista of effective operations, not only in business but in fighting forest fires, conservation work, police work, disaster relief, and in every phase of our daily activity.

The growth in the use of this type of radio communication has been remarkable. According to the FCC's last annual report, there were over 2¼ million transmitters in the land mobile radio services and the FCC reports that applications for new ones are pouring in at the rate of almost 20,000 per month.

A report from the executive office of the President estimates that between the years 1965 and 1970 the number of transmitters in the safety and special services, about one-half of which are in the land mobile radio services, will increase from 5.3 million to 15.5 million, and by 1975 will reach the astounding number of 39 million.

These are impressive statistics and they help drive home the significance of Mr. Tobias' action in becoming the first licensee only 9 years ago. Today the 100,000th license authorization went to the Hooie Plumbing Co., of Rogersville, Ala.

In conclusion, I also want to congratulate the National Association of Business and Educational Radio on its leadership and guidance in behalf of two-way radio users in this country. Last year NABER effectively brought to the attention of the Select Committee on Small Business the plight of small businessmen and other users of two-way radio whose communications are hindered by too little frequency spectrum.

MESKILL REPORTS ON BURLINGTON POSTAL CONFERENCE

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL] 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. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 29, I attended a conference in Burlington, Conn., which I had arranged some weeks ago so that town officials could meet with a representative of the Post Office Department from the Boston regional office.

For almost 8 years the town of Burlington has been attempting to establish a post office. This town has been served for many years by two rural carriers out of the Unionville Post Office, two rural carriers out of the Bristol Post Office, and one rural carrier out of the Collinsville Post Office.

Burlington has been growing, as have most of the small towns in my district. The town is trying to obtain identification through its own post office. It is experiencing some difficulty with business locations and industrial acquisitions because it does not have a post office address which can be used for mailing purposes. Furthermore, the citizens of this community experience frequent mixups and delays resulting from mail being forwarded from one town to another.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Burlington, Conn., has three zip codes but no post office.

The Friday session was a most productive one and it appears that changes will be made in the postal service which will improve mail delivery to the citizens and also help to give postal identity to Burlington, Conn.

I am grateful to the Department for its cooperation and to the officials of Burlington for their understanding. Although details remain to be worked out, I am hopeful that the postal needs of this growing community will be met in a more satisfactory manner than they are at present.

A LONG-NEEDED AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining a number of my House colleagues in introducing a long-needed amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

In 1938, Congress made major changes in the act with respect to drugs, partly as a result of the proliferation of newly discovered drugs in the first four decades of this century. We are faced with the need to again make changes in the law because of the rapid development of food supplements since 1938. It is time for Congress to define for the Food and Drug Administration just exactly what the term "food supplement" means. The definition is taken from the FDA's own regulations, which were in effect until very recently.

In 1966 the Food and Drug Administration published regulations in the Federal Register altering the previous understanding of "food supplements" and drastically interfering with the freedom of individual citizens to purchase the "food supplements" of their choice. The new FDA regulations would require a warning label stating that the food supplement is, in effect, of no scientific or medical value and would establish specific guidelines with respect to the potency, number, combination, and amount or variety of any food supplement.

The Food and Drug Administration is to be lauded for its efforts on behalf of the American people with respect to impure foods, or injurious, improperly tested drugs. Such vigilance prevented the tragedy of thalidomide in this Nation. In the case of "food supplements," however, the question is not whether they are injurious to health, but whether the FDA should be permitted to imply through its regulations that "food supplements" are a waste or money. Although FDA has marshaled a mountain of statistics to show that such supplements are unnecessary for health purposes, we are also aware that statistics can be manipulated to support almost any argument.

The FDA, through its statistics and statements of facts, says that "food supplements" are not necessary if Americans eat properly. Yet, I should like to point out that the Agricultural Department, using its reservoir of statistics, reports that 48 percent of American families are deficient in at least one important nutrient in their daily diets.

My legislation would guarantee the right of Americans to purchase and use nonharmful "food supplements" of their choice. Anything less would be inconsistent with our treasured heritage of individual freedom of choice.

A RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE PRESIDENT TO PROMOTE NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADES

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during the summer months our Nation witnessed a spectacle of riot and destruction such as we have never experienced in our history. Anarchy reigned in large areas of our major cities until Federal troops, National Guardsmen, and police were able to quell the disturbances. We are all now searching for long-lasting solutions to prevent any more rioting in our cities.

The best way to attack a problem is to begin at the base and build from there. There is an urgent need for responsible community-level leadership to stem the tide of rabble-rousers and outside troublemakers who have invaded riot-torn cities. Such disturbances are caused by a minority in the area involved, yet all residents suffer severe consequences when their homes, schools, businesses, and churches are destroyed.

For this reason I am joining a number of my colleagues in introducing a joint resolution calling upon the President to promote neighborhood action crusades. These would be composed of local neighborhood leaders, working in their own neighborhoods on a primarily voluntary basis, in order to rally those stabilizing influences within each local community necessary to assure peace in America's cities. The text of the resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 862

Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary Neighborhood Action Crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban slum dwellers in preventing riots.

Whereas the overwhelming majority of Negro Americans are dedicated citizens, strongly opposed to disorder and violence; and

Whereas the involvement of these, our fellow citizens, in keeping peace within their own neighborhoods is essential to the realization of the current crises in our cities; and

Whereas such involvement must be through voluntary citizen participation, organized and directed by local citizens at the community level; and

Whereas the President and the Congress of the United States possess the power of leadership necessary to inspire such locally controlled and directed citizen-involvement: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

1. That the Congress urges the President to use the persuasive powers of his office to call upon the communities to initiate a Neighborhood Action Crusade to provide continuing communication and positive direction to defuse the tensions now threatening the lives and property of urban America; and

2. That the Neighborhood Action Crusade be composed of local neighborhood leaders, working within their own areas, on a largely voluntary basis in order to rally those stabilizing influences within each local community necessary to assure peace in America's cities; and

3. That the Congress urges the President to place at the disposal of such local governments as may request assistance, such fund and equipment permitted by existing statutes and as may be necessary to support this Neighborhood Action Crusade; and

4. That is is the sense of the Congress that the Neighborhood Action Crusade shall be composed of local programs, developed, organized, and directed by local citizens for such periods of time as may be deemed advisable.

LEGISLATION TO STOP IMPLEMENTATION OF RECENT ARBITRARY FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION RULINGS ON DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] 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. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to do

two things—first, to stop the implementation of recent arbitrary Food and Drug Administration rulings restricting the addition of dietary supplements to certain foods—House Concurrent Resolution 516; second, H.R. 13249, which will give the American people a choice on how they wish to supplement their diet.

On December 14, 1966, a FDA order redefined "food supplement." Although this definition had stood for 26 years, suddenly this agency, under certain conditions, would now classify food supplements as prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I have received considerable correspondence from my constituents demanding that I, as their Congressman, take action to remedy this arbitrary ruling. It is my belief that enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 516 and H.R. 13249 will provide a suitable solution for their request. For instance, one of the practices that would be affected is the addition of vitamin C to milk. Addition of this much-needed vitamin to milk has provided a low-cost method of supplementing people's diets.

This is especially true in low-income areas with people who do not have sufficient funds to purchase enough fresh fruits. As my colleagues know, recent testimony before a congressional committee demonstrated the excessive profits obtained by certain drug manufacturers which have been and are extracting exorbitant prices for their products. Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on medicare also emphasized the high cost of prescription drugs.

As too often the case, we have one agency of the Government attempting to accomplish a task and another agency engaged in activities diametrically opposed to that effort. In this case, OEO, the food stamp program, and other activities of the Federal Government are aimed at improving the diets of needy Americans. On the other hand, the effect of this ruling by FDA is to deny those very same people low-cost vitamins and nutrients.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER] 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, September 29, I was confined to my home because of illness and following the directions of our House physician, Dr. Rufus J. Pearson.

Had I been present for that day's session, I would have voted "yea" on roll No. 287, amendment of Packers and Stockyards Act.

ADMINISTRATION MUST ESTABLISH NEW PRIORITIES

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] 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. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now the Ways and Means Committee has had under consideration the President's proposal for a 10-percent tax surcharge. An overwhelming majority of the members of the committee—Democrats and Republicans alike—have taken the position that it would be futile to enact increased taxes without at the same time correspondingly reducing the level of Government expenditures.

I am not talking about cutting out any specific program. The threatened $29 billion budgetary deficit for fiscal 1968 can be reduced by rescheduling the priorities and level of spending. Control over the level of spending rests wholly within the discretion of the President. To this extent, almost every expenditure of Government is controllable.

Nevertheless, we seem to have reached an impasse.

Over the weekend, the President is reported to have stated that he would not submit any proposals for reducing spending at this time. If I correctly judge the temper of the members of the Ways and Means Committee—and the American people—they are equally adamant in opposing a tax increase unless spending is reduced.

If the administration persists in its refusal to reduce spending, we might as well be prepared to go through another round of inflation accompanied by higher interest rates, a squeeze on the home-construction industry, and the other dislocations in the economy which occurred last fall. If this should occur, responsibility rests squarely on the administration.

I would like to review the Republican record on this issue.

As early as February 1966—when the Ways and Means Committee reported the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 (H.R. 12752)—the Republicans urged a reappraisal of domestic spending. While generally supporting the Tax Adjustment Act, the Republicans stated:

> Notwithstanding the inclusion in the budget for fiscal 1967 of nonrecurring revenues of more than $12 billion, coupled with an unprecedented projected level of economic growth and tax revenues, the administration's budget shows a deficit of $1.8 billion. If the administration cannot present a balanced budget under these conditions, when does the administration propose to balance the budget?
>
> If there were any assurance that the war in Vietnam would not extend beyond the fiscal year 1967, there might be some justification for financing that war through a series of temporary expedients. On the contrary, however, we are told to prepare for a long struggle in Vietnam. If this is correct, and domestic spending continues even at the present level, how does the administration propose to raise the additional revenues which will be required for fiscal 1968?
>
> The administration knows that increased expenditures for social programs at home and abroad, in the face of the escalating costs of the war in Vietnam, have already created dangerous inflationary pressures. The administration may be forced to seek controls over wages, prices and credit as well as further increases in taxes, if it continues on its present course. Apparently, the administration is willing to take this risk if the "day of truth" can be postponed until after the November congressional elections.
>
> We are unalterably opposed to the fiscal policies which make it necessary to raise an additional $5 billion in revenues for fiscal 1967. Under present circumstances, however, it is our judgment that the failure to raise additional revenues at this time will increase the danger of inflation and aggravate the problems with respect to our balance of payments, gold flow, and debt management. We therefore reluctantly support this bill. We caution, however, that unless the administration and the Congress are willing to establish strict priorities for its nondefense programs, and put some of them "on the shelf" for a later day, this bill will be only the first in a series of bills increasing taxes and imposing controls on our economy.
>
> (Separate Views of Messrs. Byrnes, Curtis, Schneebeli, Collier, Broyhill (Va.), and Battin on H.R. 12752, H. Rept. No. 1285 (H.R. 12752) 89th Cong., 2d sess.)

On June 2, 1966, in reporting the bill (H.R. 15202) to provide for an increase in the public debt limit, the Republicans reiterated their concern over the fiscal policies of this administration. The Republicans said:

> From the outset, the fiscal policies adopted by this administration have been calculated to deceive the Congress and the American people. Initially, the Johnson administration adopted a cloak of frugality in Government expenditures. Expenditures for fiscal 1964 were held to $97.7 billion and expenditures for fiscal 1965 were held to $96.5 billion. Beginning in the fall of 1965, however, the administration abandoned any pretense of fiscal restraint. As a result, by fiscal 1967, the administration's reported spending will have increased to $112.8 billion. To this amount, there should be added an additional $5 or $6 billion realized from the sale of loan and other Government assets, the proceeds of which are reflected in the budget not as "receipts" but as a reduction in expenditures for fiscal 1967. We are thus faced with an expenditure budget of more than $118 billion for fiscal 1967—a $35 billion increase in the Federal spending since fiscal 1961. Less than one-third of this increase can be attributed to the war in Vietnam.
>
> It is becoming more and more apparent that the Government cannot continue to increase its spending, as the administration proposes, without disastrous consequences. The business and financial community, as well as the economists in our leading universities and industries, have expressed their concern over the inflationary pressures in the economy today. For the most part, they agree that Government spending has largely contributed to these pressures. The administration's spending policies have resulted in a rising deficit in our balance of payments, the threat to international monetary stability, a further drain on our gold reserves, and a serious problem in debt management. Now, as a final consequence the American people must stand by and watch the value of their savings being drained off by inflation.
>
> Instead of being willing to reduce expenditures, and thereby curtail these inflationary pressures, the administration suggests that a further tax increase may be needed. Such an increase cannot be justified on account of any "short fall" in Federal revenues. While differing in amount, both the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation point out that tax revenues are running well ahead of estimates made as late as January 1966. If

a tax increase is proposed by the administration, it will only be because the administration is unwilling to recognize that, notwithstanding the record yield of our tax system, there is a limit on the amount of money Government can and should spend. For this reason, we are unalterably opposed to any further tax increase.

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 15202, H. Rept. 1607 (H.R. 15202), 89th Cong. 2d sess.)

In the fall of 1966, faced with a so-called fiscal crunch, the administration requested the suspension of the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code providing for the investment credit and for accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property. While some of us supported the suspension as being necessary under the circumstances, a majority of the Republicans joined in opposing suspension of the investment credit. They pointed out again that the problem did not arise from business spending, but Government spending. In the report on this bill, those Republicans stated:

In opposing this bill (H.R. 17607), the undersigned Republican members of the committee join in sounding a note of caution. Let no one be misled. This bill is presented by the administration to relieve the inflationary pressures confronting our economy. The basic cause of inflation is clear—excessive Government spending. Without an attack on Government spending, further inflation is inevitable. The Government has been on a spending spree. Today, we are suffering from a "hangover." What is needed is a period of restraint—not just on the part of labor or on the part of business—but on the part of Government.

During the past 6 years a Democrat administration and a Democrat-controlled Congress have proceeded on the assumption that there was no deficiency in our society which the Federal purse and the heavy hand of Federal regulation could not cure. We have seen each piece of legislation beget more legislation—each new expenditure by the Federal Government beget other expenditures.

The level of domestic spending—wholly apart from our defense requirements and the war in Vietnam—has increased from about $46 billion in fiscal 1965 to more than $58 billion in fiscal 1967, and it is still going up.

Spending for national defense, including the war in Vietnam, as presented in the President's budget last January increased from about $50 billion in fiscal 1965 to about $61 billion in fiscal 1967. It is already clear that this is an underestimate of the true cost of the war in Vietnam. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee recently warned the Congress to be prepared for a further increase of as much as $15 billion if the war continues.

Overall the annual Government expenditures already show an increase of more than $35 billion during the past 6 years, and if we are to add another $15 billion for the Vietnam war, this will mean an increase of $50 billion. The Government will be spending $50 billion more in 1967 than it spent 6 years ago.

It should be surprising to no one that this policy would bring about uncontrollable inflationary pressures. Something had to give—and it turned out to be the consumer's pocketbook.

Prices for food, goods, and services have been increasing at an accelerated rate. Increases in the cost of living index exceed any period in the past 10 years.

Wages have also been increasing, but the purchasing power of the wage earner has not kept pace with increases in the cost of living.

Interest rates—a part of the cost which the American consumer must pay whether he is buying a house, automobile, or a household appliance—have reached the highest level in 40 years. While the dollar buys less and less, it costs more and more to borrow. The deterioration in the value of the dollar both at home and abroad has led to a steady drain on our gold reserves.

* * * * *

At this late date, the administration states that it proposes to reduce the amounts ordered, contracted for, or to be expended by the Federal Government in fiscal 1967 by a total of $3 billion, of which a total of $1.5 billion already has been approved by the President. In spite of repeated questioning on the part of the Republican members of the committee, the administration witnesses were unable or unwilling to substantiate these claims. They refused to identify a single reduction. The promised $3 billion reduction in expenditures—or commitments—is a reduction from an unknown and unidentified expenditure budget. It is wholly illusory. We have no assurance that the administration will, in fact, cut back on its domestic spending programs.

(Dissenting Views of Messrs. Curtis, Utt, Betts, Schneebeli, and Collier, H. Rept. 2087 (H.R. 17607), 89th Cong. 2d sess.)

As one of the first acts of this Congress, we were called upon to enact a further increase in the debt limit. In the report on that bill (H.R. 4573) on February 6, 1967, we said:

The exigencies of the war in Vietnam made it imperative that the administration exercise fiscal restraint. Instead, in order to get the Congress to provide the "butter," the administration deliberately understated the cost of the "guns." The administration came to the Congress with a proposed budget for fiscal 1967 which understated expenditures by at least $15 billion. The administration now admits this.

This bill (H.R. 4573) is the price tag which the American people are being called upon to pay for the failure of the administration to disclose to the Congress and to the American people a year ago the cost which would be incurred in fighting a major war in Vietnam. After refusing for the past 12 months to disclose to the Congress—and to the American people—the true state of the Government's finances, so that the Congress might take appropriate steps to alleviate the problem, the administration now comes pleading an emergency. With threats of dire consequences if the Congress should fail to act promptly, we are called upon to provide forthwith an additional $6 billion of borrowing authority.

* * * * *

Not only did the administration fail to exercise fiscal restraint, but it kept from the Congress the information on which the Congress might have exercised such restraint. The conclusion is inescapable that it has been the gross mismanagement of the fiscal affairs of the Nation by the administration, if not actual bad faith in its dealings with the public and the Congress, which necessitates a further increase in the public debt at this time.

* * * * *

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 4573, H. Rept. No. 4, 90th Cong., 1st sess.)

Last June—just a few months ago—another increase in the public debt limit was brought to this body. The first time, the bill (H.R. 10328) was voted down. At that time the Republicans again urged a review of the budget. In the report of June 2, 1967, accompanying that bill the Republicans said:

THREAT OF $29 BILLION DEFICIT REQUIRES BUDGET REVIEW

Facing a deficit of this magnitude, the administration and the Congress should "stop, review, and revise" our whole fiscal policy. The impact of such a deficit on our economy could be disastrous.

In a recent statement at Rochester, N.Y., the chairman of this committee emphasized the need for reappraisal. After pointing out that in the absence of a reappraisal, the budget deficit for fiscal 1968 could go as high as $29.2 billion, the chairman said:

"I again emphasize tonight that we must continually reevaluate existing expenditure programs in the light of a very objective measurement of the benefits which they convey and the costs which they will impose. Every new program should be viewed not in terms of its first year cost alone, but in terms of what its cost will be 5 years from now, 10 years from now, or perhaps 15 years from now. It is only by this process that the full impact of spending programs can be objectively evaluated in terms of their demands upon the entire economy."

The administration in January submitted a budget for fiscal 1968 showing a deficit of $8.1 billion. Presumably, the priority of expenditures in the budget were evaluated on that basis. If it now appears that without remedial action the deficit may run as high as $29.2 billion, as the chairman of this committee estimates, the reappraisal of all expenditures and the adoption of new priorities are absolutely essential.

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 10328, H. Rept. 331, (H.R. 10328) 90th Cong. 1st sess.)

When a second bill (H.R. 10867), was brought to the floor a couple of weeks later, we reiterated this view. Pointing out the danger of a threatened deficit running as high as $30 billion, we said:

REVIEW OF FISCAL POLICY ONLY RESPONSIBLE COURSE

In the face of a deficit running as high as $30 billion—and notwithstanding the action of the House in rejecting a similar bill on June 7—the administration steadfastly refuses to discuss means either for reducing expenditures or for improving the revenues. The administration seeks to ignore the dangers facing our economy. Without regard to the consequences, the administration persists in its refusal to change its spending plans. Under the circumstances, we have no alternative except to oppose this legislation. It is the only responsible course open to the Congress.

Certainly, something must be done to prevent the debt ceiling from reverting to $285 billion on June 30, as provided for in existing law. Before doing more, however, it is equally important—and responsible—to insist upon a review both of expenditures and revenues—a reconsideration of priorities. That is the only responsible course in the face of the magnitude of the threatened deficit.

(Separate Views of the Republicans on H.R. 10867, H. Rept. 368 (H.R. 10867), 90th Cong. 1st sess.)

I wanted to present these excerpts from prior statements by the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee—not merely to show where the blame rests for our present fiscal mess—but to make clear to the administration the Republican position in regard to the fiscal policy the Nation should pursue.

To increase taxes without reducing expenditures will not get at the root of our problem. Such action will merely

provide more money for the administration to spend, without requiring any reduction in the deficit.

My position is clear. The magnitude of the threatened deficit is such that neither expenditure reduction nor increased taxes standing alone will solve the problem. I am convinced that the best interests of our people would be served by a course of action which resulted in both reduced expenditures and increased Federal revenues. I am not willing, however, to impose additional taxes on the American people while the administration persists in its refusal to take constructive action in order to reduce the level of Federal spending.

AIR POLLUTION DAMAGE TO PLANTS

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE] 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. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] held hearings before his subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee on our legislation to provide for the control and elimination of air pollution in the District.

Last week, in connection with our legislation, I went to Beltsville, Md., where Dr. H. E. Heggestad, head of the air pollution laboratories at Agriculture Research Service, is doing commendable scientific work on the effects of air pollution on plants. To say the very least, Dr. Heggestad's findings are alarming.

I think my colleagues both from the suburbs and the cities will be interested in the contents of the following article from the April 1967 issue of Grounds Maintenance magazine concerning air pollution damage to plants. It gives a good description of what has been and is being done in this area of research so vital to our attack on air pollution.

The article follows:

AIR POLLUTION DAMAGE TO PLANTS

Air pollution is on the increase all across the United States. Major cities get most of the publicity, but you can find damage to vegetation in the open country near ore smelters, pulp and paper mills, coal and petroleum burning furnaces, fertilizer and other industrial plants and wherever vehicle traffic is heavy.

There are areas in the United States and foreign countries near ore processing plants where nothing can grow, not even a blade of grass.

The visible air pollution damage to vegetation in California has been estimated at more than $13 million annually (only $500,000 in 1953), affecting over 12,000 square miles. An estimated $18 million in visible damage occurs annually along the Atlantic seaboard from Boston to New York and Philadelphia to Norfolk, Va. Estimated national losses to crops and ornamentals from air pollution amount to $325 million each year.

Losses include both visible injury—foliage discoloration, stunting, abortion of blossoms, reduction in yield or quality, die-back of twigs and branches or death—as well as hidden injury—delayed maturity, early leaf drop, slow decline in vigor and growth suppression.

Smog first became known because of its damaging effects on vegetation. Plants make excellent indicators and compose a vast air-pollutant monitoring network.

Air pollution injury to plants, however, may be confused with disease, insect damage, nutritional imbalance in the soil, neglect and adverse effects of temperature or wind.

Since plants are much more sensitive to smog, sulfur dioxide and other pollutants than human beings and animals, they can serve as warning devices. Once air pollutant injury can be recognized, it will be possible to determine what toxicants are or were in the air, at what time and even the approximate concentrations. Plants become graphic records of the time and nature of past pollutants since each toxic gas produces different symptoms on different plants.

Many factors govern the extent of plant injury as well as the areas in which air pollution occurs. The kind and concentration of the pollutant depends upon the type and location of industry, fuel use and number of motor vehicles. Other factors include the distance from the source, length of time exposed, city size and location, meteoroligical conditions, land contour and drainage, soil fertility and moisture, age of leaf tissues, time of year, plant species and varieties grown.

Air pollution damage usually is greatest in clear, still, humid weather when barometric pressure is high. Toxicants build up near the earth when warm air aloft traps cooler air at ground level. This is called air inversion.

The most important plant-affecting air pollutants are sulfur dioxide, fluorides, ozone, oxidant damage or smog and ethylene. Other pollutants—hormone-type herbicides such as the vapors of 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T, MCPA and related chemicals, ammonia and chlorine fumes, nitrogen oxides, sulphuric acid mist, dust from cement plants and injury from manufactured illuminating gas—are not included in this discussion.

SULFUR DIOXIDE

Sulfur dioxide (SO_2) is the most widely known and studied air pollutant. It is formed by the combustion of nearly all fuels.

Exposure of broad-leaved plants results in dry, papery, white to straw-colored, irregular, marginal or interveinal blotches in the leaves. Yellowing or chlorosis and a gradual bleaching of surrounding tissues is fairly common. Injured grass blades develop long, light tan to white streaks. A reddish-brown die-back occurs at the tips of conifer leaves, usually with adjacent yellowish areas. Damage is easily confused with winter, drought or mite injury.

Damage to sensitive plants may occur at ½ part of SO_2 in 1 million parts of air (0.5 ppm). (1 part per million, 1 ppm, equals 1 ounce of salt in 62,500 pounds of sugar, 1 inch in nearly 16 miles, 1 minute in about 2 years, a 1-gm. needle in a 1-ton haystack or 1 penny in $10,000.)

Very sensitive plants include crabapple, aspen, birch, Douglas fir, hawthorn, larch, sumac, tulip, violet, smartweed, ragweed and curly dock. Somewhat resistant plants include maples, privet and pines.

FLUORIDES, HYDROFLUORIC ACID (F–)

Fluorides occur in smoke from the manufacture of certain metals, ceramics and superphosphate. Fluorides typically cause a killing (scorching) of the tips and margins of leaves of broad-leaved plants and a "tip-burn" of grasses and conifer needles. The tips of gladioli leaves turn white or yellow. A sharp reddish-brown or yellowish line may occur between living and injured tissues. Citrus leaves develop a yellow mottling or spotting prior to the typical burning. Injured areas in stone fruit (apricot, plum and peach) leaves may drop out leaving irregular shot holes.

Young succulent growth is most easily injured. Leaf-fluoride concentrations of 50 to 200 parts per million usually result in injury, although resistant plant species or varieties will tolerate concentrations of 500 ppm.

Very sensitive varieties of gladioli such as Shirley Temple and Picardy are injured by 0.1 ppb (parts per billion) of fluorides. (1 part per billion, 1 ppb, equals 1 inch in nearly 1,600 miles, 1 drop in 20,000 gallons, 1 ounce of dye in 7,530,000 gallons of water, 1 pound in 500,000 tons or 1 second of time in over 322 years.) Other more resistant varieties of gladioli can tolerate 100 times or more this amount F- in the air.

Sensitive plants include crabgrass, gladioli, iris, grape, Chinese apricot, Italian prune, peach, white and yellow pines, larch and citrus. Resistant plants include roses and pigweed. A tremendous variation exists in susceptibility to fluorides among varieties of the same plant.

OZONE

Ozone is a by-product of numerous manufacturing processes, causing collapse, killing of tissue, markings on the upper leaf surface known as stipple (pigment usually red-brown to black), flecking (white to straw-colored), chlorosis or bleaching. Growth is stunted and leaves drop early.

Injury occurs to most sensitive plants when exposed to air levels above 0.15 ppm of ozone.

Sensitive plants include lawn grasses, grape and white pine. Resistant plants include gladioli, geraniums and citrus. Great differences in susceptibility to ozone are often expressed by varieties or clones of the same plant. An active breeding program to develop ozone-resistant varieties of plants is in progress.

Ozone and sulfur dioxide can combine to cause injury at much lower concentrations that either pollutant could cause acting alone. Ozone damage is often found in combination with oxidant damage or smog in the Los Angeles area.

OXIDANT DAMAGE OR SMOG

Oxidant damage or smog was originally described in 1950 in the Los Angeles area. Many chemical compounds and reactions are involved, including precursors, but peroxyacetyl nitrate or PAN has been identified as the principal toxicant. PAN is now known to be a serious air pollutant in and around major cities where organic fuels are combusted in large quantities and vehicular traffic is heavy. Injury may increase as the temperature rises.

The typical leaf marking is a distinctive silvering, glazing or bronzing of the underleaf surface. Injury is often seen as a cross-leaf banding rather than as a blotching or streaking as associated with sulfur dioxide. In grass leaves, the collapsed tissue appears bleached, with tan to yellow lengthwise bands. Conifer needles turn yellow. Petunia leaves show whitish areas near the tip, in the middle or at the base. PAN exposure also results in stunting, early maturity or senescence, followed by early leaf drop. These latter symptoms are common on citrus, elms or other trees. Invisible damage may be more widespread than realized at present.

Very sensitive plants are lawn grasses, Swiss chard and petunias. Pansies are resistant. Atmospheric "oxidant" concentrations above 0.2 ppm are known to result in plant damage.

ETHYLENE

Ethylene once was a problem in greenhouses where manufactured gas was used in heating. With the shift to oil and natural gas, this problem is no longer serious, except where ethylene is an air pollutant.

Damage to broad-leaved plants occurs as a drooping of leaves and shoots, early leaf and

petal fall, chlorosis, stunting and a more spreading type of growth. Specific diseases due to ethylene are "sleepiness" in carnations, dry sepal in Cattleya and other orchids and blasting of rose buds. Damage somewhat resembles 2,4-D in certain plants.

Very sensitive plants include sweetpea, narcissus, snapdragon, orchids and carnations. Grasses are resistant. Orchids are injured at ethylene concentrations of 5 parts per billion or less. Exposure to 0.1 ppm causes injury to sweetpeas.

CONTROL

The solution to air pollution is not easy and involves enforced use of "blow-by" and other devices on automobiles, stopping emission at the manufacturing plant, state and federal legislation, plant breeding, a shift to growing less susceptible plants, passing air through activited carbon filters in greenhouses and possible spraying of high value crops.

Sprays of Ozoban or other ascorbic acid products, as well as fungicides containing zineb, maneb, ferbam, thiram and dichlone often reduce damage from oxidized hydrocarbons. Calcium oxide sprays prevent fluorides injury.

CONTROL METHODS

To learn how to best combat the problem, the Agricultural Research Service has established a new Plant Air Pollution Laboratory at Beltsville, Md.

Basic research in the laboratory will be directed toward a better understanding of how air pollutants act an agronomic, horticultural and ornamental plants; and toward developing methods for controlling damage to plants.

Until now, the ARS air pollution research at Beltsville has been limited to the effects of pollutants on tobacco plants. The new lab will enable scientists to expand the research to include a broad spectrum of plants—both cultivated and wild.

Initially, the scientists will use oats, alfalfa, petunias and beans as test plants. These are representative species known to be sensitive to air pollutants. Tobacco plants will be closely coordinated with other studies at Beltsville and ARS air pollution research in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service at Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

H. E. Heggestad, ARS plant pathologist and a pioneer in research on air pollution damage to tobacco plants, will head the new laboratory, to be staffed eventually with five scientists of various disciplines.

The scientists will concentrate on air pollutants in photochemical smog, including ozone, pheroxyacetyl nitrate (PAN), sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide. Fuel combustion and auto exhausts produce the major portion of these pollutants.

In their research, the scientists will:

Characterize pathologic, physiologic and biochemical changes induced in plants by air pollutants.

Study the effects of pollutants on plant pigments and stomatal action and their relation to premature development of leaves and yield and quality of flowers, fruits and seeds.

Identify species and varieties that are resistant or susceptible to air pollutants. Until the level of air pollution can be reduced by prevention at the source, identification and development of resistant plants is probably the best method of controlling damage.

Further explore the possibility of using chemicals as antioxidants to reduce damage.

Special fumigation chambers in the laboratory will help the scientists better understand what air pollutants do to plants. In these chambers, plants can be exposed to specific levels of pollutants for specific time periods.

The laboratory will also include greenhouses equipped with special carbon filters that will remove most of the air pollutants in photochemical smog from incoming air. Performance of plants grown under filtered air will be compared with plants grown under non-filtered air.

Carbon filtered greenhouses are now used experimentally and commercially in some parts of California. Research at Beltsville indicates that they may be necessary along the Eastern seaboard for growing sensitive plants without serious injury from polluted air

---

WASHINGTON POST PERFORMING OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE IN EXPOSING THE SECOND MORTGAGE RACKET IN HOME IMPROVEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the series of articles which began Saturday in the Washington Post by Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell on the victimization of low-income families in Washington by fast-buck operators peddling home improvement contracts, which turn out to be mortgages on the property at unconscionably inflated prices, is journalism at its best.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I am not a bit surprised by any of the information Mr. Downie and Mr. Jewell have brought to light. The names or individual cases may be different, but the pattern is one we are thoroughly familiar with.

I was glad to see a report over the weekend that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] wants to see legislation enacted to block these vicious practices. He has always opposed second mortgage rackets, I know.

TRUTH IN LENDING MUST COVER ALL MORTGAGES TO BE EFFECTIVE

Mr. Speaker, there is an excellent opportunity before the Committee to help solve this problem through the passage of effective—and I repeat the word, "effective"—truth-in-lending legislation. The bill which passed the Senate, S. 5, which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and some other minority members of the committee are cosponsoring in the House, would solve some of the problems brought to light by the Washington Post as they relate to disclosure of finance charges on second and third mortgages, and to balloon notes, blank contracts, and all of the other fraudulent practices described in these cases.

But S. 5 and Mr. WIDNALL's companion bill, H.R. 11602, exempt "first mortgages." As those of us who have sponsored the consumer credit protection bill, H.R. 11601, have repeatedly pointed out in our hearings, unconscionable contracts, such as the Downie-Jewell articles have been describing, become first mortgages whenever a previous mortgage is retired.

ELDERLY OWNING HOMES FREE AND CLEAR OFTEN VICTIMS

Elderly couples who have paid for their homes over the years and then find they do not have the funds for costly repairs are frequently victimized by the kind of schemes reported by the Washington Post. But under H.R. 11602 and similar truth-in-lending bills sponsored by six of the 12 members of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, such mortgages would nevertheless be exempt from finance charge disclosure requirements as long as they were "first" mortgages. On the other hand, under the Sullivan-Gonzalez - Minish - Annunzio - Bingham-Halpern bill, H.R. 11601, and H.R. 11806 introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and numerous other Members, they would not be exempt.

Mr. Speaker, following is the first article in the Washington Post series on mortgage racketeering, telling how low-income families purchasing homes of their own were sold improvement contracts which ended up costing them far, far more than they had been led to believe, at interest and finance charges bordering on the fantastic:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 30, 1967]

HOMEOWNERS LOSE MILLIONS IN MORTGAGE SCHEMES HERE—100 SUITS STIR PROBE BY FOUR U.S. AGENCIES

(By Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell)

Hundreds of low-income Negro homeowners in Washington are complaining that they are being bilked in second mortgage schemes that Federal authorities say net more than $1 million a year.

In more than 100 suits filed in General Sessions and U.S. District Court here, homeowners allege that these mortgages deeds of trust were obtained by a dozen home improvement businesses here through high-pressure salesmanship, fraud and, in many cases, false notarization. Two officers of one company have already been indicted for forging signatures of eight homeowners on deeds of trust.

A four-month investigation by a team of reporters from The Washington Post revealed that some second mortgages obtained here have been sold at a discount to a national credit firm. This company is also involved heavily in second mortgage business in Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati, Columbus, Texas, Indiana and New Jersey.

The home improvement companies who obtained the mortgages—and the creditors who bought and are now collecting on them—are being investigated by United States Postal Inspectors, the Federal Housing Authority, the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

The second mortgage practices have been going on since 1962, and many millions of dollars are involved.

INDICTMENTS EXPECTED

In the wake of this newspaper's investigation, U.S. Attorney David G. Bress said he expected indictments in the cases here within two weeks.

In case after case in Washington, home owners are being forced to pay exorbitantly or lose their homes:

Two elderly blind women who are paying $7500 plus interest say all they received was a black-and-white portable television set and installation of a small gas heater and a rusting radiator, worth a few hundred dollars.

A retired couple in their 70s told reporters they ended up with $15,000 in mortgages after having $7,500 in old mortgages paid off and an "American Townehouse Front" installed, which consisted mostly of aluminum siding, put on the upper part of the house front, paint on the rest, and a new front door.

A 67-year-old charwoman has two mortgages on her home totaling $9000 as a result

of two cash loans she received that totaled $5000.

TEN LOSE HOMES

At least ten families facing similar debts have lost their homes through foreclosures here in the past two years. Scores more are fighting in court to save their houses.

Many other homeowners who signed contracts for home improvements with any of a dozen local firms did not know—until contacted by reporters from The Washington Post—that their signatures were also on mortgages on their homes filed with the D.C. Government.

When questioned by reporters, these nearly 100 homeowners—selected at random from District real estate records—voiced nearly identical complaints as those found in the court suits.

The United State's Attorney's office here first began receiving complaints about some of these firms more than two years ago. Two isolated indictments—charging the officers of one firm with forgery and the notary public for another with false notarization—were handed down early this year.

[The practices complained of do not affect most of the several hundred home improvement contractors licensed to do business in the District. These contractors are reputable businessmen whose work is financed conventionally through normal commercial channels.]

On March 30, Federal investigators sent United States Attorney Bress a lengthy report on the activities of one firm.

The report also contained a strong indication that there were many other firms in the District engaged in similar schemes.

FRAUD SQUAD SETUP

In July, after The Washington Post investigation began at the courthouse, Bress decided to set up a special fraud squad in his office to work on the case "because of the voluminous nature of the investigation."

Bress said this week that the fraud charges are "not the crimes of violence that I am now primarily interested in, of course, but it is the kind of illegal conduct we will look into."

Named in many court suits as offenders are Custom House Construction Co., Monarch Construction Co., United Mortgage Co. (trading as Bankers Mortgage Co.) and United Home Enterprises Corporation.

A majority of the financial paper from these firms involved in litigation here has been sold the Atlas Credit Corp., of Philadelphia, a giant credit firm listed on the New York Stock Exchange, which was recently renamed Sunasco, Inc., as the result of a merger. Sunasco lists assets of $400 million.

The pattern was this:

The home improvement firm would sell the paper at a discount to a local Atlas broker. He in turn would sell it at a discount to Atlas in Philadelphia which would then turn it over to a wholly owned subsidiary company to make collections.

Two Federal agencies (the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice) are looking into Atlas' activities in a number of cities, including Washington.

Suits have been filed against four other local firms which also allegedly originated or passed on debt paper to Atlas during the past two years. Some other firms that have sold such paper to Atlas have gone out of business during that time. In some cases their officers have helped start other firms that have also dealt with Atlas.

NOTARY SUIT CITED

First public attention to these schemes came last year when one notary public from Maryland pleaded guilty in U.S. District Court here to falsely notarizing two D.C. mortgages in favor of Custom House Construction Co.

Deeds attested by the notary, Louise Beane, are involved in five suits filed by homeowners against Custom House. The suits say that no notary public was present when they signed, as the law requires.

One lawyer representing eight homeowners filed damage suits claiming a "money lending scheme" involving Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia and Bankers Mortgage Co. of 722 11th st. nw.

That lawyer, like many others who pressed their charges of fraud vigorously, won settlement exceptionally favorable to his clients.

Government investigators say that much of the financial paper generated by Custom House was sold for more than a 40 per cent discount, and some of it has been discounted by as much as 60 per cent.

CANVASS BY PHONE

Here is how some of the home improvement companies have worked:

They canvassed low-income Negro neighborhoods, generally by phone, seeking people interested in anything from home improvements to television sets, air conditioning or carpeting.

The telephone canvassing is usually done by women who use real estate directories and cross-indexes listing phone numbers by street address. One company called 6000 homes in 28 months.

A visit by a salesman usually occurs, complete with sales talk, and the quotation of a low price. The suits claim that some fast shuffling of papers to be signed follows.

If the homeowner is buying a product, it is delivered quickly. In the case of home improvements, work begins promptly. Weeks later, a payment book arrives in the mail from a finance firm the homeowner has never heard of.

PAYMENTS SOAR

If the homeowner bothers to multiply the monthly payments by the number of months he must pay, in some cases he may find the principal owed is anywhere from double to four times the amount he thought he had signed up for.

If he protests, he discovers that not only has he signed a note for this amount, but that he also has signed a deed to his home, and that there is not much he can do about it.

The holder of the deed (the firm that sent the payment book) has bought the note and mortgage and thus can claim that it is a "holder in due course." The law presumes that a holder in due course is entitled to his money, since he has paid for the paper "in good faith." He is merely the financier, and quality of work, for instance, is not his problem. The original salesmen, in effect, wash their hands of the affair.

DEBTS "CONSOLIDATED"

In some cases, a homeowner protests he can't afford whatever it is the salesman is selling because he already is heavily in debt.

At that point he is told he will be "helped" by debt consolidation.

The salesman arranges for him to get a loan to pay off all his old debts and also cover the cost of work to be done or an item purchased.

He is then told that the new monthly payment will be less than the combination of all the previous monthly payments on the other debts.

Sometimes, a few hundred extra dollars is added to the note for the homeowner to use as he pleases.

After the deal is signed, the homeowner sometimes finds the debts are not paid off and he winds up with a large new debt plus some of his old ones.

LOSS OF HOMES LIKELY

Scores of homeowners are in danger of losing their homes over the next few years because of a clause in the contracts relating to the method of financing involved.

It is called balloon payment and works like this:

Say a note is signed which, including interest and finance charges, totals $7000 to be repaid in five years.

The payments are $50 a month. Sixty months times $50 equals $3000.

This leaves $4000 yet to be paid. The clause in the fine print says that the full note is due and payable on the same day as the final payment.

In other words, if the victim cannot come up with the extra $4000 on month number 60 he can lose his home.

PRESSURE ON LOANS

Balloon payments are an accepted part of many bank mortgage loans. Most borrowers understand how balloon payments work, though, and assume they would be in a position to refinance their notes when they fall due. In the cases involved here, the homeowners often do not understand the meaning of the balloon payment arrangement.

In some cases in which banks make loans insured by the Federal Housing Authority to customers of the home improvement firms, the homeowner is pressured into signing a certificate that the work has been completed long before the work is done. The FHA warns homeowners against signing before completion.

The reason the firms press for the signatures is that banks will release loan money to the firms only after a signed certificate is presented.

BANKS HELD NEGLIGENT

Another factor working for the home improvement firms has been the apparent failure of some banks to investigate thoroughly the firms they regularly do business with.

According to FHA regulations, this investigation should find if the home improvement firm is "reliable, financially responsible and qualified to perform satisfactorily the work to be financed."

Thus the FHA is now investigating some of the local home improvement firms, as are the postal inspectors. The post office is involved because some of the firms advertised in newspapers that travel through the mail.

In 1961, the District Commissioners drew up regulations requiring local home improvement firms to register at the District Building and, when registered, to keep their sales practices within detailed guidelines.

The regulations have a loophole, though, according to an official of the District's Department of Licenses and Inspections. The rules say that firms do not need licenses if they do not collect their money until jobs are completed—precisely what some of these firms are doing: getting money after completion certificates are signed.

Several of the firms have registered anyway, but none has been prosecuted for violating the regulations.

A WOMAN'S COSTLY BARGAIN

One homeowner who signed up for more than she bargained for is Lucy Kinard, above. Mrs. Kinard is blind, and lives with her 76-year-old mother, Mary Williams, who is partially blind, at 1103 5th st. nw. She says that she and her mother bought a portable television set for her nephew and had a gas hot water heater and a radiator installed. The total cost, she thought, was $900, so she and her mother made their marks on a contract for that amount.

Soon afterward, Mrs. Kinard says, a man called her to tell her he had bought a note and a deed of trust against their home for $7500, plus 7 per cent interest. She told the man she hadn't signed for that much and couldn't afford to pay. Then, she says, the noteholder came to the house and threatened to foreclose on the mortgage.

Unable to afford a lawyer, Mrs. Kinard, who is 56, and her mother, are now paying $50 a month on the note, in addition to

payments on a first mortgage. They have now made 15 payments on the note, but still owe $7402.34 on the principal. The note was discounted, by the way, and the noteholder's price for it was $3494.

SECOND ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON POST SERIES QUOTES COURT RECORDS

Mr. Speaker, the second article in the series by Washington Post reporters Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell on mortgage rackets in the home improvement field appeared in yesterday's newspaper.

In addition to numerous interviews, the two writers went to the court records to find sworn statements on the methods allegedly used by home improvement salesmen in signing them up for work on their homes resulting in extremely high credit costs. This article follows:

FIRM DUPED THEM, SAY RESIDENTS

(By Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell)

A current Washington ghetto synonym for "you've been had" is "you've been Monarched."

The genesis of the term goes back to 1963, when the Monarch Construction Company began its massive canvassing here of low- and middle-class homeowners, selling private "urban renewal": the "American Townehouse Front," other home improvements, debt consolidation, the works.

By the beginning of last year—after Monarch disbanded and its president, Nathan H. Cohen, left town—Monarch had sold contracts to hundreds of Washington homeowners and grossed $2.5 million, according to one estimate.

Cohen said yesterday he would not answer any questions about Monarch operations, whether the company was still in business, or about court suits alleging fraud.

He was reached in Baltimore where he and his mother, who was also a Monarch officer, operate the Baltimore Business School, 303 E. Fayette st., a computer training school.

In more than 25 civil suits in General Sessions and U.S. District Courts here, homeowners have charged that Monarch used high-pressure salesmanship and fraud to get their signatures on contracts and home mortgages.

Monarch's Townehouse Front usually is a combination of white aluminum siding, black aluminum shutters, new windows and door, carriage lamps and trim put on the front of a row house. It can look handsome from a distance, but some owners have complained that the work is shoddy and deteriorating.

Interviews with dozens of Monarch customers draw similar complaints: the Monarch salesman mentioned something about urban renewal and being forced to make improvements; the Townehouse Front looked so nice in the photographs; there were apparent endorsements of Monarch by Negro leaders and Congressmen; there were so much shuffling and signing of papers; finally, there was the debt—often thousands of dollars more than the price they remembered quoted or the worth of the job. Almost always, the note was secured by a deed of trust.

In a civil suit in the Court of General Sessions, Judge Catherine B. Kelly found that Monarch was guilty of using "fraudulent representation" to procure the signature of Alberta K. Smith, 778 Irving st. nw., on a home improvement contract.

Mrs. Smith testified that the Monarch salesman said he was a "representative of urban renewal," that her home "would not be torn down" if she signed the contract and that "urban renewal" would pay $2000 of its cost.

When she called the Redevelopment Land Agency the next day, she testified, she was told it had no connection with Monarch. Mrs. Smith called Monarch immediately and ordered the firm not to do any work.

Monarch sued her for the contract price of $4500. Judge Kelly in July, 1966, awarded Mrs. Smith $1525 punitive damages instead. She has not been able to collect.

Monarch might be termed the "granddaddy" of the nearly dozen firms here that have engaged in second mortgage schemes. A number of companies are under investigation by four Federal agencies and by the U.S. Attorney's office.

Usually, Monarch got the customer's signature on a mortgage to his home, too. Several homeowners complained in the court suits and interviews with reporters that they did not know they were signing mortgages, that no notary public was present, or that the amount of the debt was not the same or did not cover all the work as they had been told.

When Monarch obtained mortgage loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration through a reputable bank, the amount was usually $3500 total cost for the job plus $837 financing charges.

MAXIMUM ALLOWED

The final $4337 amount on the mortgage is the maximum allowed by the FHA under its Title I home improvement program. Usually the customer received the American Townhouse Front which, court suits show, cost Monarch about $1500.

The FHA allows 15 per cent overhead and 40 per cent profit. This would total about $2500 for a Townhouse Front. Monarch usually charged about $3500, plus interest.

Like the customers of nearly a dozen other home improvement firms investigated by reporters from The Washington Post in the past four months, the homeowners who were "Monarched" must pay or lose their homes.

At least three homeowners have lost their homes after signing Monarch contracts. At least six more are in court trying to stave off foreclosures.

Clarence and Georgia Winters, who live in a modest row house at 1102 Park st., ne., are trying to fight that inevitable fate.

Winters, 61, has worked as a skilled laborer for a Washington construction firm for 20 years. His wife, who is 54, has worked for the past seven years as a cook for Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.).

GOOD CREDIT RECORD

In buying furniture, appliances and cars on time over the years, the Winterses have maintained a good credit record. During the 16 years they lived in the house on Park Street, they whittled the first trust on their home down to less than $1000. That is, until Monarch came along in December, 1964.

What happened since to the Winterses is recounted by them under oath in separate depositions filed in their suit in the U.S. District Court:

A woman had called Mrs. Winters talking about improvements to be made in her neighborhood. It was not until two men came to her house a few days later that she knew the call came from Monarch. (Monarch is believed to have called 6000 homeowners while it was in business.)

The salesmen "were so friendly and nice" and showed them photographs of other Negro homeowners, some prominent Washington Negroes and homes "improved" with an American Townhouse Front.

"They said that Roy Wilkins sent them there," Mrs. Winters attested.

One salesman "said he was going to do the whole entire front, and he was going to remove the windows and give us new windows, and build a brick wall all around the front, and a cement porch, and the aluminum siding."

The Winterses said their kitchen was what really needed work. The salesman told them that the kitchen work would be included, too, and the whole job would be $2000 cheaper than usual "by letting him write it up in December."

The Winters family says the prices quoted that night and on other nights by Monarch salesmen varied from $2500 to $4000. They said they signed one set of contracts the first night, which were taken away from them and replaced by others when the salesmen came back later.

Then, one night three months later, the salesmen came to the Winters home again and asked the couple to sign the top page of a "big pad" of documents.

In their depositions, the Winters couple states further that one of the men identified himself as Nathan Cohen and explained that the other papers were copies of the top page.

"It is just as much for your benefit as it is for mine," Mrs. Winters says Cohen told her as they sat at the dining room table. "We have to get some more copies."

When Winters asked why so many copies were necessary, a man who had accompanied Cohen told Winters to "calm down, you're getting all upset." He took Winters into another room to look at the Winters furniture. The man told him that some of it appeared to be "antiques."

Cohen placed the thick pad in front of Mrs. Winters and told her to "press hard, press real hard," according to her deposition. When Winters came back into the room, he saw his wife's signature and signed himself.

It was only later, the Winterses said, when they got a payment book from Citizens Building and Loan Association of Silver Spring, that they discovered their signatures were on a mortgage (deed of trust) on their home for $4337 and on a completion certificate for the work.

As work progressed on their home, the Winterses found several things that displeased them: cement splashed on the front door, rags and other refuse left on the front lawn, sticky windows, a loose lamp.

Winters, who worked as a carpenter's helper on his construction job, was particularly upset by "the rough job" a workman was doing in his kitchen: such as wooden panels installed upside down, with wide gaps between them.

REFUSED TO PAY

He stopped Monarch's carpenter from doing anything further on the kitchen and began calling Monarch to complain. The Winterses said they never got a satisfactory answer to their complaints and, when they received the payment book from the bank, called to say they would not pay until the job was finished right.

That was when they found the Citizens Building and Loan had already paid Monarch its $3500 out of the $4337 loan insured by the Federal Housing Authority. The bank said Monarch had presented a signed completion certificate required by the FHA.

The Winters insist they never signed a completion certificate since the work was never finished. The completion certificate the bank's attorney has introduced into the court record has no date on it, in violation of FHA regulations.

The bank has introduced into the suit the mortgage it holds to secure the Winters loan. It bears a different date than the mortgage recorded with the District Recorder of Deeds.

Complaints about Monarch first surfaced in the autumn of 1964, after it had been in business for a little more than a year.

In a story published in The Washington Post on Nov. 1, 1964, several owners of homes on unrestored fringes of Capitol Hill complained about Monarch's sales tactics. One woman had already filed suit in U.S. District Court, charging Monarch with "trickery" and "false pretenses."

The homeowners said that Monarch's telephone solicitation, sprinkled heavily with references to urban renewal and "talking to you about schedules for your property and your street," led them to believe the Government was somehow behind it.

NO MONOPOLY

Cohen told a reporter then that "we don't think the Government has a monopoly on the words." He said then: "Our program is to rehabilitate a large part of Washington over a period of ten years. If we'd remodel the insides of houses nobody'd see them, while on the outside you can see the change right away."

At the same time, the Capitol Hill Restoration Society complained about Monarch to Government agencies. Some homeowners and a former Monarch salesman went to talk with prosecutors in the U.S. Attorney's Office about Monarch in 1964.

Yet Monarch's business continued to flourish. In January and February of 1965, it took out full-page newspaper advertisements criticizing Federal urban renewal as "far more urban removal" and boasting its own "private urban renewal program" as having "created $2,149,500 in new first trust loans" and $300,000 worth of approved Title I FHA loans."

But the FHA was investigating Monarch by then and, on May 11, 1965, placed the firm on its "precautionary measures list."

Notice went out to all banks handling FHA-insured loans that FHA had information "indicating that the subject has not conducted his operations . . . consistent with the purposes and objectives of the FHA Property Improvements Program."

Banks were instructed to deal with Monarch only in cases in which bank officers personally checked the contractors' work and to have completion certificates signed in the presence of bank officers.

Monarch no longer obtained FHA insured loans. Instead, it sold some of its second mortgage notes to Allstate Mortgage Corp., now of 1111 Massachusetts ave. nw. Allstate, in turn, sold some of the mortgages to the Atlas Credit Corporation of Philadelphia (recently renamed Sunasco as a result of mergers). Atlas assigned the notes to its subsidiaries to collect payments from the Washington homeowners.

Monarch also was still able to obtain, from reputable banks, new first mortgage loans not insured by the FHA for its customers. Money from these mortgages was used to pay off the customers' old mortgages and, in some cases, also to pay Monarch for home improvements.

In many of these cases, records indicate that Monarch also obtained the customers' signatures on a new second, and sometimes a third, mortgage. Money from these also went to Monarch for home improvement contracts.

After being involved in more than 50 suits in Washington's courts—more than 25 involving charges of fraud against it—Monarch has suffered one judgment against it and lost four other times on dismissals when it failed to answer questions filed by opposing attorneys.

Monarch and the dozen other firms under investigation are a minority of the home improvement contractors who do business in the city. Most contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers just what they are getting and how much it will cost.

NOMINEE IS MONARCH AGENT

Margaret Haywood, one of nine Washingtonians selected Thursday by President Johnson for the new City Council, has been registered agent and attorney for the Monarch Construction Co. for the past two years.

Mrs. Haywood, a Republican, said yesterday she plans to "reassess" her relationship to Monarch and her other clients in view of the nomination which is subject to confirmation by the Senate "to make sure there is no conflict of interest."

As registered agent, she is available to accept service of suits against the firm. She represents Monarch in court, as well, but performs no other functions of the concern, she said. The lawyer-client relationship precluded her commenting on the reports in The Washington Post about Monarch's activities, she said.

Her total earnings from Monarch last year were less than $2000, she said.

BILL EYED TO PROTECT UNWARY HOMEOWNER

A ranking Republican House member yesterday said he will seek legislation to prevent recurrence of "the despicable conduct" of home improvement and finance companies who have obtained millions of dollars from low-income homeowners in the Washington area.

Rep. William B. Widnall of New Jersey, referring to the series on home improvement schemes presently running in The Washington Post, said he was "shocked to learn that allegedly reputable firms have made millions by taking advantage of the unwary and uneducated."

Widnall said he was calling for an immediate investigation of the entire industry and its method of doing business. Widnall is the ranking Republican member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and also of the special House subcommittee on Housing.

"At the same time," Widnall said in a statement issued by his office, "the Congress should investigate the matter to determine what remedial legislation is needed to prevent such despicable conduct from recurring."

Rep. Charles McC. Mathias Jr. (R-Md.) said the revelations "have far more than local significance. They are part of the national picture of the deliberate attempt of widely organized forces to single out the urban poor as targets."

Mathias said the newspaper series pointed up the need for an increased force of Federal lawyers and enforcement officers to press the campaign against exploitation of the urban poor.

TODAY'S WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE REPORTS HOW SALES CONTRACTS TURNED INTO MORTGAGES

Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Washington Post carried the third article in the series on home improvement frauds written by Leonard Downie, Jr., and David A. Jewell. It tells about homeowners interviewed by the reporters who had no knowledge, until the reporters informed them, that there were second mortgages on their homes as a result of their signing contracts for home improvement work.

The material in this series of articles is incredible, but those of us who have been investigating these rackets over the years are certainly not surprised by any of the revelations. I am convinced that these articles will provide tremendous momentum for the kind of truth-in-lending legislation for which former Senator Douglas, of Illinois, worked so hard and so long, and which Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, has sponsored in the Senate—including coverage of first mortgages. The Senate-passed bill, however, does not include first mortgages.

After reading these articles, I do not see how any Member of the House could oppose inclusion of all mortgages under the coverage of this legislation, as H.R. 11601 would do.

The article in this morning's Washington Post follows:

SUITS HIT MORTGAGE PRACTICES—MISLED ON LOAN TERMS, CLAIM HOMEOWNERS

(By Leonard Downie Jr. and David A. Jewell)

Custom House Construction Co. went into the business of home improvement construction on March 3, 1966, in an office at 7849 Eastern ave., Silver Spring.

Almost six months to the day later, Custom House went out of business, according to its president, Harvey W. Davis.

Records in the D.C. recorder of deeds office show 55 second mortgages worth $250,000 made out to Custom House.

In the past four months, a team of reporters from The Washington Post interviewed 23 Custom House customers.

All are low-income Negroes, elderly and often widowed, and in each case the price of the job done or products received (such as a paint job or a color television set) was secured by a mortgage on their homes.

DIDN'T KNOW OF MORTGAGE

Four Custom House customers said they had no idea there was a second mortgage on their homes until they were told so by reporters. The other 19 said they first learned of the mortgages from United States postal inspectors, who are investigating Custom House.

At least one customer, Chester Thompson, has lost his home through foreclosure on the second mortgage. Six others—faced with foreclosure—filed court suits charging that their signatures on the mortgages were secured through fraud.

A pattern appeared in the complaints:

The customers were contacted by Custom House, not vice versa.

The customers said they signed what they thought was a contract but later turned out to be a note and mortgage.

The customers said there was no notary public present when they signed the "papers" although the mortgages on their homes bore notarization seals.

All said they received payment books in the mail from companies they had never heard of demanding payment of notes they didn't know they had signed.

The 23 additional Custom House customers interviewed by reporters said the same points apply in their cases.

Custom House is one of nearly a dozen home-improvement firms under investigation by Federal authorities for their second mortgage dealings in Washington. The U.S. attorney's office expects grand jury action within two weeks.

The vast majority of home-improvement firms in Washington enjoy good reputations.

PRICE ABOVE APPRAISALS

Sources said that one professional appraiser who dealt with Custom House said that when he had done appraisals for Custom House the firm automatically increased its prices well above the appraisals.

Suits in court indicate that Custom House would then quote prices to the customers but give them contracts to sign, the face values of which would be double the quoted prices.

In two court suits, customers have claimed notes and mortgages were filed against their home for at least double the amounts quoted on the jobs by the Custom House salesman.

The contract in one case tells the story:

One customer had the front of his house painted "for the total sum of $2350." The contract says that the customer agrees "to pay the sum of $2350 upon completion, secured by a note of $5875 plus 8 per cent interest in monthly installments of $58.75."

When reporters asked the customer, an elderly man who cannot work because he is being treated for cancer, why he agreed to pay $5875 for the work that cost "the total sum of $2350," the homeowner replied:

"I thought just the monthly payment was $58.75."

USED TELEPHONE SALESGIRLS

Custom House employed a battery of girl telephone solicitors. One of the girls told an investigator about the sales talk:

The girls were given phone numbers of houses in low-income Negro areas selected from a cross-index file.

They were told to hang up if they judged a white person had answered.

Otherwise, they were to find out within 60 seconds if the resident of the house owned or was buying the house.

If it was discovered the resident was only renting, they were under orders to terminate the conversation and make another call.

Otherwise, they would try to interest homeowners in anything from a television set to a new roof. If the prospects seemed good, they would then turn the files over to salesmen.

One of Custom House's first jobs was on the home of Albert and Mattie Smalls, at 401 11th st. se.

SMALLS FILE SUIT

After being threatened with foreclosure, the Smalls filed suit againt Custom House charging "willful, deliberate and malicious fraud."

The Smalls' suit says the salesman told them he could fix up the front of their house for $800.

They thought that would be nice, but lamented that they already had debts of $4900 and didn't feel they could afford it.

The salesman then said he could arrange to get them a loan that would permit them to pay off the $4900 as well as cover the cost of fixing up the house front, according to the suit.

They agreed to this, and signed papers they thought were contracts and loan application forms.

The job was done. They learned later, however, that only $575 worth of outstanding debts were paid off, leaving them with $4397 in old debts plus a mortgage on their home for $5000 that they didn't know they signed, the suit says.

The couple paid $1000 on this note until they contacted attorney John J. Carmody, Jr., who filed suit. On July 24, 1967, U.S. District Court Judge Joseph C. Waddy issued a temporary restraining order against the present holder of the Smalls' note, prohibiting the holder from making any further collections until the court case is decided.

ACCEPTANCE CORP. NAMED

The Smalls' suit also named as defendant a company called Universal Acceptance Corp., located at 6400 Georgia ave. nw.

According to official D.C. records, a founder, a director and president of Custom House is Harvey W. Davis of 8313 Raymond st., Potomac.

According to these same records, Harvey W. Davis is also secretary, treasurer and a director of Universal Acceptance, with an address at that time of 8804 Lanier dr., Silver Spring.

Davis told a reporter: "I really can't answer your questions I really don't know much about that. I took in a partner who knew the home-improvement business. He did the selling and I did the bookkeeping. I never knew any contracts were fraudulent."

All notes and mortgages generated by Custom House were sold immediately, sometimes within hours, to second parties, known legally as "holders in due course."

The Smalls' case was no exception. Their note was sold to Universal Acceptance. Much of the paper generated by Custom House went to Universal.

The Smalls' suit contains the following allegation:

"Davis conspired with both Custom House and Universal to hatch a scheme whereby Custom House would fraudulently obtain a promissory note, reinforce its right to enforce the terms of the note by fraudulently obtaining a deed of trust (mortgage) against the property, fail to perform the consideration for said note, sell the note to Universal at a fraudulent discount rate, allow Custom House to lapse into insolvency thereby defrauding potential creditors and hide the whole behind the sham shield of the 'holder in due course' defense of Universal."

NOTE DISCOUNT CLAIMED

The suit also alleges that Universal bought the Smalls' $5500 note from Custom House for $2200—at a discount of 60 percent.

Many Custom House notes were sold at discounts ranging from 40 to 60 per cent.

The U.S. Court of Appeals here has characterized discounts of 40 per cent or more as "outrageous" and stated that such discounts, if there are also circumstances such as the purchase of notes executed by unknown persons whose credit has not been investigated, constitute a "badge of fraud."

An answer to this suit was filed on behalf of Universal by Bernard T. Levin, a local attorney. The answer denied all allegations of fraud and maintained that Universal had purchased the note in the ordinary course of business.

In its answer, Universal argued that it was merely a "holder in due course," and it also filed a counterclaim against the Smalls for $5119.55 not yet paid on the note, plus attorney's fee.

Custom House Construction Co. has not yet answered the allegations contained in the Smalls' suit.

The signature of the notary public who swore she witnessed the Smalls' signatures' on the $550 mortgage on their home was Louise Beane.

In January of this year, Louise Beane, a licensed notary public in Maryland, was indicted and charged with the false notarization of two mortgages in Washington.

NOTARY PLEADED GUILTY

Mrs. Beane pleaded guilty and received a suspended sentence in U.S. District Court here.

Those two mortgages had been generated by Custom House. Mrs. Beane notarized a total of 27 mortgages generated by Custom House.

In six court suits, homeowners have claimed that they did not know they signed mortgages, that no notary public was present when they signed papers and that they had never seen anyone named Louise Beane, either in their homes or in Maryland. Numerous other homeowners made similar claims to reporters.

Seven Custom House notes were purchased by a District realtor named Leonard Freedman, of 761 17th st. nw., for what investigators say were 40 per cent or greater. Freedman denies the discounts were that large.

One of those mortgages was on the home of an elderly widow, Alberta Kibler, of 1737 D st. se.

After her home was threatened with foreclosure, she filed suit against Custom House and Freedman, charging that her mortgage was secured by fraud through a conspiracy between Custom House and Mrs. Beane.

Her suit alleges that Custom House's dealings with her were "part of a conspiracy in which Louise Beane similarly made many false notarizations for Custom House."

It says that she was quoted a price of $2750 for a new kitchen and discovered a mortgage against her home she didn't know she had signed for $5550.

FIRM DENIES FRAUD

Custom House answered this suit with a denial of fraud and conspiracy and denied that Mrs. Beane was an agent of Custom House.

Freedman answered by saying he was without sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the charges since he was merely a "holder in due course" and he denied any conspiracy existed. He said yesterday that "all I can do is check the District records to see that it's a legitimate mortgage. I dealt with Custom House the same way I dealt with everybody else."

One Custom House customer, Amanda Green, 56, of 829 Sheridan st., nw., bought four air conditioners for what she thought was "a little over $2000" and later learned there was a mortgage on her home for $5800, plus 7 per cent interest.

Her paper was purchased from Custom House by Freedman. He showed her a note bearing her signature that called for payments of $33.50 a month for 60 months.

At this rate Mrs. Green could not have paid off the interest due on the note by the end of the 60 months, much less the principal.

Since by the 60th month she would have only paid $2,010, much of it having gone to pay off interest, Mrs. Green stood to lose her home unless she could pay the balance or obtain a new loan for it.

If she refinanced the note for the same schedule of monthly payments, she would not have been able to pay off the principal due in her lifetime, Federal investigators say.

Mrs. Green hired an attorney before making any payments. He hired an appraiser who valued the air conditioners at $974. U.S. postal inspectors had them appraised for $971.

Mrs. Green's attorney reached an agreement with Freedman whereby he wiped off the mortgage on her home in return for a payment of $1,000.

LABORER SUES

Frank Harris, of 124 10th st. ne., an illiterate, elderly laborer has filed suit saying he was tricked into signing a $7,450 mortgage on his home and received only $500 worth of work in return.

His suit claims he signed certain papers because Jack Shulman, Davis's partner and the salesman in this and many Custom House transactions, promised him that Custom House would pay off two previous mortgages on his home.

On the original two mortgages, he was paying a total of $100 a month, Harris said, in the suit. He also said that he had to pay $80 a month on the new mortgage held by Custom House, plus the same old $100 he had been paying.

He earns $65 a week.

Shulman, of 5300 Westbard Ave., Bethesda, and Custom House answered the suit and denied any fraud or wrongdoing.

MENTIONED IN SUITS

Shulman is mentioned in most of the Custom House suits as the salesman involved and by most of the customers contacted by reporters.

Shulman told a reporter that none of the mortgages signed up by him were obtained by fraud.

"You will find they were all legitimately said," said Shulman.

Shulman said that in each instance he was accompanied by a notary public, including those in which Louise Beane's signature appears on the mortgage.

The activities of Custom House, and several other home-improvement contractors, are being looked into by Federal authorities. Most home-improvement contractors are reputable businessmen who tell customers what they are getting and how much it will cost.

Five Custom House mortgages ended up in the hands of Atlas Credit Corp. of Philadelphia, which has been renamed Sunasco, Inc., following a merger. Atlas is now also under investigation by Federal authorities.

Atlas buys second mortgage paper from

firms in 40 states and two Canadian provinces.

PAINT JOB

Custom House painted the front of a Northwest rowhouse. As a result of signing a contract "to pay the sum of $2350" to Custom House for the work, the homeowner now has a $5875 mortgage on his home. And, if he continues to pay the $58.75 monthly payment set up by Custom House, several thousand dollars will still be due on the note when it matures in 1971. If he cannot pay the balance, or get a new loan for it, he stands to lose his home.

BAD NEWS FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on the weekend of September 9 and 10, 1967, more than 2,000 persons, including Communists, Socialists, and black power advocates, gathered in New York City for what was called the third annual conference of Socialist scholars.

Few Americans are aware of the frightening things that transpired during the weekend meetings, and for the simple reason that the conference was ignored by the Nation's major news media.

The only report I have seen on the conference was written by Alice Widener, the publisher of U.S.A. and a nationally syndicated columnist. Her report ought to be read by every American.

She tells of the plans which were made for a "military struggle" in the streets of 20 American cities next year and of the discussion about "defense courses" to train "serious activists" for future guerrilla warfare in our urban communities.

One of the more incredible facets of the conference was the fact that some speakers gloated that many of those who plan to organize the "military struggle" in 1968, including the burning of some 20 cities, are receiving money from the Johnson administration's so-called war on poverty.

Why would this important conference not only receive the attention of the national press, radio, and television? Perhaps Alice Widener has the best answer to that question when she says in her report:

> The news, it seems, is based on what happens, not on what is being planned. But when what is being planned happens, it will be very bad news for America.

The full report by Alice Widener appears in the September 8–22 issue of U.S.A. Extensive excerpts from it appear in "Barron's Weekly" for September 25, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

LONELY WEEKEND—A REPORT ON THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF SOCIALIST SCHOLARS

The Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars took place at the New York Hilton Hotel, Rockefeller Center, Manhattan, during the weekend of September 9 and 10. There were more than two thousand registrants, including Communists as well as Socialists; two guests from the Soviet Union, Timor Timofeev and Yuri Zamoshkin, Institute of World Labor, Moscow; and a guest of honor Owen Lattimore, the University, Leeds, England.

In 1952, the U.S. Senate Security Subcommittee reported unanimously, after conducting an exhaustive inquiry into the activities of the Institute for Pacific Relations, that Dr. Lattimore, a leading figure in the IPR, had been "a conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

The official printed program of the Socialist Scholars carries ads from the Communist publication, Science and Society, the Communist publishing firm "International Publishers," and the American Institute for Marxist Studies, of which Herbert Aptheker of the Communist Party, U.S.A., is director.

The program flyleaf states: ". . . Formed in 1965, the Socialist Scholars Conference is an independent association bringing together scholars from many disciplines to stimulate research, analysis and theory. A Steering Committee elected by the members invites scholars to present papers and comments on the basis of known competence in a particular area and not according to political or ideological criteria.

"The Conference is not a political organization; meetings are intended for expression of ideas unencumbered by partisan purposes, political rhetoric or polemic. As a scholarly association, it is not a forum at which political organizations may propound their views, nor is its purpose to organize or guide political activities.

"All those sharing an interest in scholarly analysis from a socialist perspective are invited to join the Conference."

On its face, the Socialist Scholar's program statement is self-contradictory and deceptive. A socialist perspective is per se political and ideological. Moreover, not a single paper written from a capitalist perspective has been presented at any panel discussion in the first, second or third Socialist Scholars Conferences.

At the New York Hilton, Socialist Scholars from more than two dozen U.S. and Canadian institutions of higher learning took part in the weekend Conference, including McGill, Alberta, Temple, Yale and Boston universities; Queens, St. Mary's and Bennington colleges; St. Thomas Seminary; the universities of Illinois, Michigan, California, Pennsylvania and others. The Conference program included the following topics for panel discussions: Marxism and International Economic Relations; Mass Media and Radical Critics; Marxism and Sociology; Radical Intellectuals in the 1930s; Class, Party and Revolution; Poverty in America; Soviet Society; Planners for the Ruling Class; Black Power; Marx and the Industrial Proletariat; Anthropological Studies of Peasants; Historical Studies of the Cold War; the Working Class in the World Arena; Radicals and Hippies; Catholicism and Socialism; the Welfare State.

A very large audience attended the Saturday afternoon discussion on "Poverty in America," which featured Michael Harrington, board chairman of the socialist League for Industrial Democracy and author of "The Other America," the book that is conceded generally to have inspired the government's Poverty Program. Discussion panel chairman Russ Nixon alluded to the fact in introducing Mr. Harrington, but both gentlemen were quick to let the assembly know of their thorough contempt for the Poverty Program as totally inadequate for what they conceive to be nation's needs.

Eloquently, Michael Harrington argued that "the poor" alone cannot make a successful revolution in the U.S. Evidently bearing in mind results of the National Conference for New Politics' (NCNP) convention in Chicago, which was controlled by a minority of Communists and Black Power militants, he pleaded passionately for the democratic socialist reformist way of changing our society.

His was the classic "soft socialism." He was a Menshevik, a revolutionary who believes in legal means, among an audience that was most Bolshevik, revolutionaries who believe in attaining their goal "by any means." At the end of the discussion, however, Michael Harrington evidently changed his mind, after fellow panelists Hyman Lumer, national education secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and Stanley Aronowitz, chairman of the West Side Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA) in Manhattan, had argued for radicalism rather than reformism in the path toward U.S. revolution.

"Okay," Harrington conceded finally, "If you think it will work, I'm all for it."

Though most of the audience was much more responsive to Lumer and Aronowitz, it was hard to understand what prompted Harrington to surrender. He is a witty, articulate, dynamic speaker. Hyman Lumer offered only a deadly dull standard Communist dialectical commentary in a thickly monotonous voice. Aronowitz was humorless, fanatical and polemical (despite the Socialist Scholars' disavowal of "political rhetoric or polemic").

Tearing into Harrington's paper, Mr. Aronowitz identified himself with "a revolutionary action group," and said only such a group could attain socialist objectives in America. Whereas Harrington had discoursed on "the need for racial entrance into American society of the industrial working class," and had insisted that "welfare recipients are a class and have a relation to authority," Aronowitz called for destruction of existing authority. "Racism is based on the profit system," he declared.

The police, claimed Aronowitz, are the arm of the ruling class in the ghettos. "They are the oppressors," he said, adding that Negroes in urban areas, South and North, have self-defense communities of their own. Violently, Aronowitz attacked the entire Poverty Program except for a single aspect which he described as "a valuable tool" for the radical movement. "At least," he said, "it has given employment to the organizers."

The audience burst into laughter, applause and cheers. "That's right, man," called out someone from the floor. "It gave our organizers some bread." In Leftist slang, bread means money.

Certainly there seems to be no shortage of bread in either the Old or New Left. Not only the leaders but also the rank and file travel from coast to coast and city to city with the greatest of ease. Over Labor Day weekend, they were assembled in such posh capitalist surroundings as the Wabash, Crystal and Scarlet room of the Palmer House in Chicago; a week later, hundreds of the same people were in the Gramercy and Murray Hill suites of the New York Hilton, and in its Sutton Ballroom, where a capacity crowd of fashionably dressed Socialist Scholars and friends dined by candlelight at $12.50 a head and then sat back, full of food and in a relaxed spirit of camaraderie, to listen to Dr. Owen Lattimore.

Nothing could be more understandable than the intellectual spell that Owen Lattimore seems to have cast over U.S. foreign policy makers during the crucial years between 1941 and the fall of China to the Communists. The mild-mannered, smiling way in which he says the ugliest things about our country must be very disarming to all those intellectuals who believe that it isn't what is said that counts, but the way it is said.

Dr. Lattimore is a past master at making offensive statements inoffensively. He is an artist in knowing what to highlight and what to obscure during an alleged historical analysis. He is civilized, cultivated, cultured and urbane. He looks like a bank president, not a professor. Above all, he is very, very clever.

Listening to Owen Lattimore in the Sutton Ballroom of the New York Hilton, one could grasp the full significance of what the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had in mind when it reported to the Amer-

ican people, 15 years ago, that he was one of the persons active in and around the Institute of Pacific Relations who "knowingly and deliberately used the language of books and articles which they wrote or edited in an attempt to influence the American public by means of pro-Communist or pro-Soviet content of such writings."

Dr. Lattimore's main thesis at the Socialist Scholars dinner was that it is the U.S., not the Soviet Union or Red China, which is "expansionist." The borders of the Soviet Union and of Red China are merely their historic ones, he alleged, dating back to the great eras of the czars and Chinese imperial dynasties. He never mentioned Czechoslovakia, East Germany or Tibet as being subject to Red expansionism, but he identified as subjects of present day U.S. expansionism, "Guam and Japan and the Philippines." He accused the U.S. of seeking to make Asia "the privileged reserve of white men." He derided the intellectual ability of American scholars and foreign policy molders, and he lauded "the great Lenin's mature, sophisticated understanding of world politics."

Lattimore described the Chinese Communist Party as "nationalistically patriotic." He also belittled the notion that the present civil chaos in Red China and dissension among Communist leaders signify a breakdown there. He said that what is taking place is "turbulent debate—not the precursor of general massacre."

All notions that there will be a Sino-Soviet conflict over border regions between the Soviet Union and People's Republic of China are sheer nonsense, according to Dr. Lattimore. He said the present frontiers of both Communist nations "are of an enviable stability." He said neither nation seeks expansion. "Expansionism," he said, "is in the areas where American forces are."

After his speech, the audience of Socialist Scholars was invited to ask questions. Someone inquired when the Chinese are going to take Hong Kong from the British imperialists.

Dr. Lattimore beamed with delight at the question. A most apt historical analogy, he said, could be found in a true story about Lawrence of Arabia. When Lawrence was defending the Arabs against the Turks, he would bomb the Turkish railroad across the desert in intermittent attacks, a strike here, a strike there.

A subordinate asked, "Why don't you blow the whole bloody thing all at once and get it over with?"

"Ah," replied Lawrence, "I want them to suffer a permanent hemorrhage."

Dr. Lattimore paused and looked all around the Sutton Ballroom, beaming at the Socialist Scholars and the dinner guests. "A permanent hemorrhage," he repeated, with utmost satisfaction, smiling benignly as if he were a minister pronouncing the benediction.

Those were just about his last public words to the Socialist Scholars at their Third Annual Conference. They found them inspiring. Their applause was rapturous. Dr. Corliss Lamont of Columbia University, seated next to Yuri Zamoshkin of the Soviet Union, looked pleased as Punch.

While comfortable, complacent capitalist Americans went to church or played golf or lolled around at home reading the papers or watching television, Sunday morning, September 10, a Black Power panel session at the Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars was talking about burning down 20 American cities next year and waging "a military struggle in the streets."

The session took place in the Rhinelander Gallery, which seats 1,000 and was filled to overflowing. Chairman of the panel session was James Boggs of Detroit; the panelists were Raymond S. Franklin of Queens College, who delivered a paper on "The Political Economy of Black Power"; Ivanhoe Donaldson, campaign manager for Julian Bond in Georgia and a member of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (Snick); and Gilbert Osofky of the University of Illinois, Chicago.

James Boggs declared, "Black Power is a scientific concept whose time has come." He described it as "clashing with every segment of society," and said it must "bring the struggle to the streets." Black Power forces, he continued, will force existing authority in America to "increase militia and police" beyond its capacity by bringing the struggle "not to a few cities" but to 20 next year. He said there will be "military battles" in these cities. Addressing himself directly to the Socialist Scholars, Boggs said, "There is no in-between. You are either with the revolution or you are not. The U.S. as a nation is a counterrevolution."

James Boggs said the Black Power revolution is talking "a language the American people don't understand and say they won't understand, but that they've got to be made to understand." He said, "All revolutions start with a minority, from Haiti on down. I don't think over 3% of the Russians were ready for the revolution."

Ivanhoe Donaldson of Snick, who was a member of the steering committee for the National Conference for New Politics' recent Labor Day convention in Chicago, declared from the Socialist Scholars Conference dais: "The struggle of the Sixties isn't the ballot or having jobs—it is a physical struggle." He said about the present social and governmental structure in the U.S., "Our position is—tear it down because we don't want to be part of it!" Donaldson said, "In Detroit we defeated the police and the National Guard." He said Newark and Detroit put a strain on existing police and military forces, and that next year "two or three Detroits at the same time are going to pin down the American forces."

Donaldson said that in the struggle in 10 or 20 cities next year, the revolutionary forces would not be confined to burning down the black areas, that the forces would "go downtown" and "begin to burn down the white ghetto banks and ghetto draft centers." He said, "There's a Chase Manhattan Bank at 125th Street in this town. We're trying to get jobs in a bank we ought to destroy."

During the question period from the floor, Boggs and Donaldson explained why urban areas in the U.S. are more favorable to the success of guerrilla warfare than the countryside, unlike Cuba and elsewhere. They explained in coldly calculated terms that from the strategic point of view, guerrilla warfare is much more likely to be successful in the cities, where a combination of "violence, sabotage and traffic tie-ups can bring down the system."

From the floor, a questioner asked Ivanhoe Donaldson, "When do we start a guerrilla war?"

James Boggs grabbed the microphone and said, "If he started to answer that, I'd shut his mouth!"

That was the end of the Sunday morning meeting, which began at 10 o'clock and lasted for more than two and a half hours. As soon as Boggs had officially adjourned the meeting, he announced over the microphone that another Black Power meeting would take place immediately in the Morgan Room, "to plan how to do things now and next year."

A gray-haired woman in a brown dress said, "Did you say we're meeting in the Morgan Room?" "Morgan Room is right," he answered. "But not 'we.' Our meeting is for blacks only."

A tall, professorial-looking man stepped up and asked him something. "Sorry," Boggs said. "I'm catching a plane at four o'clock. I've been to Cleveland and Columbus. They put us down in Cleveland last time. But I'm riding out to the airport with someone who's going to tell me how we can fix it so they won't be able to next time."

In America, in 1967, after Watts and Cleveland, after Chicago and Rochester, after Newark and Detroit, most people still believe a Red-Black Power revolution can't happen here.

"Are you sure that's the way it was?" ask some readers of this reporter's newspaper columns and magazine articles. "I don't mean to question your accuracy or integrity, but are you sure? I mean, was there any kind of printed program or something you could send me a copy of?"

At the Sunday morning meeting of the Socialist Scholars Conference at the New York Hilton, there was distribution to the more than one thousand persons present a single-page, orange-colored leaflet with the following text:

"Please inform your members—some may want to take advantage of this. Then post.

"Demonstration defense course

"Techniques in crowd control and demonstration defense against:

"*Individual *group *horse and *police attacks!!*

"1st Session: 13 Classes—7 weeks + $7.00 (Applicants must be approved by instructor.)

"This course is being provided for serious activists who wish to develop and participate in coordinate defense techniques for future street actions.

"Class will be led by a former U.S. Marine 'D.I.' having training and experience in these areas."

The full class schedule is printed, with the date and time of a series of 14 sessions during September and October 1967. Among the subjects taught are: "Coordinated Movements; Tactics; Hand and Foot Techniques; Crowd Control; Defense Against Clubs and Horses; Inter-Group Actions."

In the Lower Plaza at Rockefeller Center on Sunday evening, crowds of law-abiding, contented Americans watched the fountain water splash and listened to the sound of music. The traffic flowed smoothly.

High up in skyscraper offices of CBS, NBC and ABC, and in upper floors of the Time-Life Building, lights were on as editors, cameramen, writers and researchers busily worked on regular weekend schedules to accomplish the communications media objective of bringing the up-to-the-minute news to America.

On Monday morning, September 11, there were no reports in the press or on television or radio about the Red-Black Power session that took place Sunday morning at the Third Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars in the New York Hilton. For all Americans knew, the weekend had been relatively uneventful, except for street demonstrations in Milwaukee and the Brownsville section of Brooklyn.

There was not a word in the press or over the air about plans for "a military struggle in the streets" of 20 American cities next year. Nor was there a word about demonstration "defense" courses to train "serious activists" for future guerrilla warfare in our urban communities.

The news, it seems, is based on what happens, not on what is being planned. But when what is being planned happens, it will be very bad news for America.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARL HAYDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today is the 90th anniversary of the birth of Arizona's beloved senior Senator, the

honorable CARL HAYDEN. I have taken this time to wish him a very happy birthday, and many happy returns of the day. I know my colleagues in the House, in which CARL HAYDEN served for 15 years, join me in extending felicitations to our distinguished friend and colleague, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Senator HAYDEN was born at a place then known as Hayden's Ferry. This place has grown into the thriving and important city of Tempe, Ariz. He was educated in the public schools of Tempe, attended the Normal School of Arizona, which is now Arizona State University, and later attended Stanford University, being a member of the class of 1900.

CARL HAYDEN was elected treasurer of Maricopa County in 1904, and sheriff in 1906 and again in 1908. He held the position of sheriff of Maricopa County when Arizona became a State. In fact, he left that office to come to Congress as the first Representative of the fledgling State of Arizona. Senator HAYDEN told me that the hardest adjustment he made in coming to Washington was getting used to the absence of the weight of his six-shooter, and the feel of it against his thigh.

CARL HAYDEN married Nan Downing on February 14, 1908. Never were two people better suited for each other, or better equipped emotionally and intellectually for the great career which they shared. Mrs. Hayden was beloved by all who knew her, and the high regard the people of Arizona had for her manifested itself many times during her long illness which ended in her death on June 25, 1961.

In 1926 CARL HAYDEN was elected to the U.S. Senate. He is now serving his seventh term as a Member of that body. He has served longer in the Congress of the United States than has any man in the history of the Republic. He now serves as President pro tempore of the Senate, and as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

CARL HAYDEN'S legislative activities have covered a very broad scope. Perhaps his greatest accomplishments have occurred in the legislation with regard to Federal aid to highways and for the development of the water resources of the West.

CARL HAYDEN has always been an ardent champion of reclamation. His efforts have been decisive in authorizations and appropriations to build many reclamation projects. Among these are the upper Colorado storage project, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, the Bonneville project, and the great central valley project of California. Federal funds in excess of $4 billion have been invested in the central valley project alone, largely through the efforts of CARL HAYDEN.

Ever since he came to Congress, CARL HAYDEN'S fondest dream has been the construction of a Federal project to bring water from the Colorado River into central Arizona. He was active in the fight within the State of Arizona which finally culminated in the ratification of the Sante Fe Compact in 1942. This compact purported to divide the waters of the Colorado River, and its ratification was a necessary prerequisite to any Federal effort aimed at helping Arizona to use its water. Immediately after ratification CARL HAYDEN went to work on getting a project in shape for authorization. The central Arizona project was the subject of legislation in 1948 and again in 1950. In both of these years the bill to authorize this project passed the Senate, but died in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In 1952 Arizona filed suit against California to quiet title to its share of Colorado River water. This suit became necessary because of the doubts in the minds of Members of Congress as to whether or not Arizona really had a legal title to the water. The suit finally culminated in a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States handed down in June of 1963 which gave title to the State of Arizona to 2.8 million acre-feet of water each year from the mainstream of the Colorado River.

Almost the next day, Senator HAYDEN and the rest of the Arizona delegation introduced bills to authorize a central Arizona project. Hearings were held in the Senate that year, but no further action was taken until 1965, when exhaustive hearings where held in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The effort in the House culminated in the approval of H.R. 4761 by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in late 1966. The chairman of the Interior Committee did not see fit to ask for a rule to bring the bill up in the 89th Congress, and therefore it became necessary for the whole procedure to begin again in the 90th Congress.

In this Congress, Senators HAYDEN and FANNIN introduced their bills early, and action came on the Senate side of the Capitol which culminated in the passage of S. 1004, again authorizing the central Arizona project. Concurrently, hearings had been held by the House Interior Committee, but once again that committee has adjourned for the year without doing anything whatsoever about voting out a central Arizona bill. For reasons which he apparently deems to be good and sufficient, Chairman ASPINALL has once again decided that Arizona shall have no water from the Colorado River.

This week, Senator CARL HAYDEN will begin one of the great battles of his career. He has decided to try to put his S. 1004, authorizing the central Arizona project, on to the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968. Such an amendment can be accomplished in the Senate by two-thirds vote. When the House and the Senate go into conference on the public works appropriation bill, House conferees cannot accept Senator HAYDEN'S amendment, assuming he has been successful in attaching it to this bill. The rules of the House provide that any material in a bill which is not germane to the bill itself must be brought back to the House in technical disagreements. This will be done by the House conferees. Then a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be made. After 1 hour's debate, this amendment will be voted either up or down.

This procedure is unusual, but not without precedent. The Colorado-Big Thompson project was authorized in an appropriation bill. There have been other instances in which legislation has been put on appropriation bills, and the House has concurred in such legislation.

Senator CARL HAYDEN and the entire Arizona delegation have always favored legislating by orderly means. However, when a State and a civilization are drying up, and when committees of the Senate and House have held exhaustive hearings on a project and, when both committees have from time to time reported out bills favoring the project, it seems that emergency action to nullify the blocking action of one man is reasonable. We ask for the support of our colleagues in this effort, which we take more in sorrow than in anger.

I have taken this occasion of Senator CARL HAYDEN'S birthday to inform the House as to his plans and the plans of the Arizona delegation. You will be receiving further details on this undertaking, and the reasons for it as time goes by.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in my admiration and respect for the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He is one of the noblest, grandest, and most effective persons it has been my experience to meet in my political life. Since 1939 when I became a member of the Appropriations Committee, it has been my responsibility to work with him on numerous occasions. Since I have become chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, my work has thrown me more and more frequently in contact with this great personality of the Senate, CARL HAYDEN, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. No one could be finer to work with.

I am grateful to the gentleman now addressing the House for calling attention to this memorable event. I join him and others on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to the life and record of this great statesman from Arizona who has done so much for America.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, few Americans ever stay around long enough to celebrate their 90th birthday, and no American has ever been around on his 90th birthday or any other birthday to complete 55 years of service in the Congress of the United States.

Yet today CARL HAYDEN celebrates his 90th birthday, and he celebrates 55 years of outstanding service to this country and to the Congress of the United States.

In Arizona, CARL HAYDEN is more than just a man. He is an "Arizona institution." We have to stop and really pause to grasp the fantastic span of his years of service. This man has served 15 years in the House of Representatives and 40 years in the U.S. Senate. He was born as the transition was being made from the

administration of Ulysses Grant to that of Rutherford B. Hayes. He has lived under 18 Presidents and served in the Congress with 10.

I can best put in my own perspective the length of this congressional service when I stop and contemplate that he was serving here in this House 10 years before I was born.

CARL HAYDEN, Mr. Speaker, is a quiet man, but one of the most effective Members the Congress has ever seen. He has often said that Congressmen are divided into workhorses and show horses, and that he decided a long time ago to be a workhorse. He speaks infrequently. I have heard him say many times that he never heard of a Member who was beaten in an election by a speech he never made, and I have heard him say many times, "What is the use of making a lot of speeches when you have the votes?"

So CARL HAYDEN operates and has operated in quiet, honorable and effective fashion throughout these years.

Mr. Speaker, this House may soon have an opportunity to demonstrate to Senator HAYDEN the good faith of the people of the United States and the Congress in keeping a promise long delayed and long withheld.

As my colleagues know, Senator HAYDEN has practically made a career of trying to pass the central Arizona project, a reclamation undertaking which would enable Arizona to utilize its legal share of the waters of the Colorado River. After many years of effort and passage twice by the Senate this project was delayed in 1951 with a demand in the House that Arizona go to the Supreme Court to prove its right to certain waters of the Colorado. For 12 years Arizona fought that case, and in 1963 Arizona won. But the project still eludes us, and to Senator HAYDEN this is a bitter pill.

Before Arizona set out on its long, expensive, and harrowing legal suit it had assurances from its neighbors that, once the court had ruled, obstructionism would end. Three years before that painful decision was made to go to court, Governor Earl Warren of California had said:

> Whenever it is finally determined which waters belong to Arizona, it should be permitted to use that water in any manner or by any method considered best by Arizona.

And similar assurances came from the other Western States for whom Senator HAYDEN had fought many a reclamation battle. Yet today two of those Western States which Senator HAYDEN has helped are exerting every possible pressure to prevent passage of that project for which Arizona has waited so long. And they are doing it for the same reason they opposed the project before that legal battle was fought. The reason is simple: they want to continue to use Arizona's share of the water.

Mr. Speaker, for an octogenerian, now turned nongenerian, Senator HAYDEN has shown amazing energy in advancing Arizona's cause in the 4 years since the Supreme Court handed down its decision. He has devoted long hours to negotiations, hearings, writing, and rewriting sections of the bill, entertaining new approaches, conferring with the administration and leaders of the various Western States. He has displayed a capacity for work that a man half his age could be proud of. And yet the project is still not a reality.

Mr. Speaker, let me review the developments that have occurred since the Supreme Court handed down its decision in 1963.

Immediately following the decision Senator HAYDEN and the Arizona House Members introduced identical bills similar to the bill put on the shelf at the start of the Supreme Court litigation. Hearings were held on that bill both in the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees in 1964. It was reported favorably by the Senate committee.

In 1965 a more comprehensive bill, seeking to solve water problems of the seven Colorado River Basin States, was introduced, and hearings were held in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Nearly a thousand pages of testimony were printed. In 1966 additional hearings were held, and another 700 pages of testimony were printed. In August 1966 this bill was reported by the House committee on a vote of 22 to 10, but it was blocked before it could get to the House floor.

This year more hearings were held, and another 700 pages of testimony were printed, but again this has been to no avail. Markup of the bill has been delayed indefinitely because of a new alliance that has developed between the States of California and Colorado.

Meanwhile, the Senate has passed the central Arizona project bill. By an overwhelming margin the Senate has indicated its approval of this long-delayed reclamation project.

Because of this frustrating legislative history on a project, nearly everyone agrees is meritorious, Senator HAYDEN has decided to take an unusual, though not unprecedented, course of action next week. He plans to ask the Senate to suspend its rules and amend the Public Works and Atomic Energy Appropriation Acts to include authorization of the central Arizona project.

This is not the way Senator HAYDEN would prefer to bring this matter to a vote in the House. But at the age of 90, having been working on this legislation since he was in his 40's, Senator HAYDEN has lost just a little of his patience. He is all for the seniority system and proper procedures, but he also believes the National Legislature ought to be able to work its will—at least once in 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Senator HAYDEN, and I intend to do all I can to see that his years of dedicated service are rewarded, not only with a vote but with a victory for the cause of reclamation in Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to join today with my colleagues as well as the people of the great State of Arizona in wishing a very happy birthday to our senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN, on this, his 90th birthday.

Born in 1877, this remarkable gentleman has spanned, with the exception of 13 years, the entire history of the Territory and the State of his native Arizona.

He has served that State since 1912; 15 years as a Representative and 40 years as a Senator, a record not likely to be duplicated—ever.

We happily tip our hats to the distinguished Senator and wish him many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Arizona in wishing the distinguished Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, a happy 90th birthday. Senator HAYDEN is one of the most amazing men in history. He was serving in this House before most of the Members now serving were born. He has broken all records for legislative service in this country. But he will be remembered more by the quality than by the length of his service.

America is richer because of his long tenure in the Congress. He is a great and noble man. All the Members love this distinguished American. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], has said that Senator HAYDEN is an institution in his State. I say, Mr. Speaker, he is an institution in this House. He is an institution in our country. He has earned the respect and admiration in which he is universally held.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add to and supplement the wonderful words on behalf of Senator HAYDEN just expressed by my distinguished friend the majority leader in reference to Senator HAYDEN.

There is an old saying that aristocracy is of the soul, not of the word. That statement, I believe does indicate the kind of a person Senator HAYDEN is.

He says very few words on the floor of the Senate or in other legislative deliberations.

I have had experiences in conferences, where he was the chairman of the conference between the House and the Senate, and he would sit at the head of the conference table, with Members of the House and the Senate on either side, and barely say a word over many hours of deliberations, where compromises were sought between the different versions of an appropriation bill. It was his patience which in the long run would inevitably bring the differences to a point of compromise, which could be justified in sending a version back to both Houses for subsequent approval.

For those of us who are many years younger, many years less experienced, and in many respects probably less wise, it was a wonderful lesson in how our system can best work for the benefit of all.

I can say, as one Member, that I benefited immeasurably from my associations with him. I know, on his 90th birthday, there are literally hundreds of others either here or elsewhere who can say the same concerning their experiences with a great statesman, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Arizona.

I wish him well on his 90th birthday.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my friend and colleague from the great State of Arizona, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], who is today paying tribute to one of the great men in U.S. congressional history.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, the man who has served in Congress longer than any other man in history, a man who was sent to the Senate when Arizona became a State 56 years ago, is celebrating his 90th birthday.

It has been a great privilege and honor for me in the last 14 years of my own service in the House of Representatives to have come to know, respect and admire CARL HAYDEN. Because I serve on the House Appropriations Committee, I have had the great opportunity of serving on many conference committees with the Senate on appropriations matters. As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, CARL HAYDEN has always impressed me with his vast knowledge of the very complex Federal programs that we in Congress are called upon to finance each and every session.

CARL HAYDEN has been a great voice for his beloved State of Arizona, an inspiration to Members of Congress in both bodies and from both parties for more years than many of us have been privileged to live on this earth.

I am grateful for the opportunity to join the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] in paying a well-deserved tribute to the dean of the U.S. Senate on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

May God grant him many more.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to echo the words of praise which have been given to the senior Senator, not only of Arizona but, I believe, of the Senate of the United States, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN.

The West, including the State of Arizona and including the State of California, certainly owes to this great man a great deal of praise and a great deal of appreciation over the years for the cooperation we have had. We are unstinted in our praise of this great man because he has been one of the great leaders.

If the words of Daniel Webster, which are engraved in stone above us here, mean anything at all, they certainly apply to this great man.

Let me read them:

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

I used those words once upon a time in praise of MIKE KIRWAN, of Ohio, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations. I use them with the same feeling of genuine approbation in applying them to the works of this great man.

My good friend, my Democratic colleague [MOE UDALL] mentioned a number of things which I believe call upon me to say that although we revere and respect this great man, there have regrettably been instances between the great State of California and the great State of Arizona where there were differences of opinion. These differences of opinion have never in any instance descended to personalities or recriminations between the members of the Arizona and California delegations. Nevertheless, those differences have obtained. They have been honest differences between honorable men, and some of those differences still remain. This is not the time or the place to go into the areas of failure to agree which undeniably exist. I shall not utilize the time that the gentleman from Arizona has granted me for that purpose but will just end by saying that I believe every member of the California delegation respects and honors this great senior Senator from the State of Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank my good friend from California. I assure him it is as deep a source of regret to the Arizona delegation as it is to him that we have had these differences between our two States. They are sister States and neighbor States and should be working together instead of separately. The gentleman knows I have felt that way for many years, and I know he has, too. I know he joins with me in the hope that the day will dawn, and soon, when this will occur and we may have these vital issues settled. Possibly they will not be settled to the satisfaction of either group, but so that we can face the future together instead of apart.

Mr. Speaker, when I called the senior Senator from Arizona this morning to wish him a happy birthday, I said, "How do you feel?" He said, "Well, I will tell you. I hope you feel as good when you are 90 as I do right now." My answer to that was, "Senator, I hope that when I am 90 I am half the man you are."

I believe this is the way we all feel toward a great statesman, a great American, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and privileged to join with my dear friend, and able and esteemed colleague, Congressman JOHN RHODES, in hailing and saluting on his 90th birthday one of the truly great Americans that it has been my privilege to know during my service in the Congress, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, outstanding U.S. Senator from the great State of Arizona.

Senator HAYDEN is unique. There is no one like him in Washington today. His service in public life commenced about the turn of the century and has continued since that time with steady advancement to high and higher levels of service, culminating in the House and U.S. Senate. He has served for the past 55 years with outstanding distinction, fidelity to duty, great ability, extraordinary diligence, and an exceptional spirit of devotion.

CARL HAYDEN is a great American. His country, his State, and all of us who know him may well be very proud of his illustrious career in the public service and be grateful for the opportunity to know and to serve with such a great public servant who is admired by all.

The Senator served in public office with some great people from his State. It was my privilege as a young man to meet him with my own great, patriot-statesman friend, the late, lamented Senator David I. Walsh, and another great illustrious figure from the State of Arizona, and one time distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the later renowned Hon. Henry Fountain Ashurst.

Senator HAYDEN is physically rugged and inexhaustible and is blessed by the good Lord with a very keen mind, untiring energy, and the ability and patience to tackle and handle multifold duties and an incredible volume of official work with hardly the wink of an eyelash.

I could not pay adequate tribute to such a great man, but must observe that he is truly incredible, not only in the amount of work he can accomplish, but also in his amiable, relaxed personal qualities and great respect for the dignity of his colleagues and fellow men and women.

I want to thank my valued, very able friend, Hon. JOHN RHODES, an outstanding Member of this House, for giving me this opportunity to join in the wholehearted, deeply-felt tribute of esteem and high regard that Members of the House are paying on this occasion to this great Senator of the United States, who has served his country over such a long period of time with such unflagging devotion, loyalty to the people from whom he has sprung, and the Nation, and deep concern for this great system of Government and for the American people.

I wish for Senator HAYDEN, esteemed national leader and friend to very many, continued success in his work, good health, real happiness, and peace for many years to come. He is, indeed, one of God's noble men and a great credit to his State, his Nation, and the Congress of the United States.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to

extend their remarks on the subject of the 90th birthday of Senator CARL HAYDEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

PROPOSES WAY FOR CONGRESS TO RESOLVE VIETNAM DILEMMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in his statement on Vietnam policy last Friday in San Antonio, President Johnson raised an important question when he asked:

> Is the aggression (in Vietnam) a threat, not only to the immediate victim but to the United States and to the peace and security of the world of which we are a part?

The answer of course must be affirmative. The expansion of Communist territorial control any place does indeed constitute a threat to the United States as well as the immediate victim, and it is therefore an event of deep concern to our people.

The affirmative answer, however, does not automatically define the form and extent that our response to the threat should take. Proper definition is both crucial and complicated.

The President also asked, appropriately, "What would be the consequence of letting armed aggression against South Vietnam succeed? What would follow in the time ahead? What kind of world are they (who question whether present policies are worth the price) prepared to live in 5 months and 5 years from tonight?"

These question do not yield easy answers, partly because they pose only one side of the grave dilemma now facing the American people. They can be considered and answered satisfactorily only in conjunction with other, more fundamental questions.

For example:

What would be the consequence of permitting the costly military stalemate in Vietnam to continue along present lines for another year, 5 years, or even longer?

How would continued stalemate affect our national interests elsewhere in the world, especially in Western Europe—which, by all standards, must be considered as the most important dimension of our foreign policy?

How would continued stalemate affect South Vietnam, its people, and their attitude toward us?

How would continued stalemate affect our response to mounting problems at home—inflation, high taxes, civil strife, and the influence of the military-industrial complex of which former President Eisenhower warned in his farewell address?

How would continued stalemate affect the willingness of the American people to share in future world responsibilities? Would they, in bitterness, turn their backs elsewhere on our 20-year-old policy of Communist containment? Would they compromise their commitment to NATO? Would they duck the costly and continuing chore of helping to avert worldwide famine as the food-population crisis worsens?

What would follow in the time ahead? What kind of a world would we then live in?

These questions—together with the ones voiced by the President—show the awesome and tormenting scope of the American dilemma in Vietnam.

As we ponder the consequence of letting armed aggression against South Vietnam succeed, as the President put it, we must also ponder the consequence of continuing along the present lines.

Must we choose between those two unattractive alternatives? If so, the choice is a grave one, and in making the decision all evidence must be weighed with the greatest care. I, for one, do not accept the conclusion that America must necessarily choose between present policies, on the one hand, and letting the Communists take over, on the other.

Because both of these alternatives, on their face, seem to be unacceptable—other possibilities must be carefuly explored and evaluated.

One such alternative is for Congress to place reasonable new conditions on further U.S. military action in Vietnam. The conditions could take various forms, of course. One possibility would be to require broader participation by other Asian powers—including South Vietnam—in meeting the cost of the war, in terms of both combat troops and money. This would likely mean that an allied high command would supplant the present U.S. command to make basic decisions on strategy and tactics, but so much the better.

In all important respects, these new conditions—if fulfilled—would have the effect of de-Americanizing the war. The advantages of this transformation are obvious.

Is it attainable? No one can foretell with certainty, of course, but if the proposal is presented formally as an absolute condition of further U.S. military operations in Vietnam it might well shock the other Asian powers at long last into taking up their proper share of the burden. If they reject the proposal, then they would, in a sense, share the responsibility for whatever consequences might result from the cessation of present U.S. military policies in Vietnam.

If that bleak consequence should come, then all major Asian powers and not just the United States alone would, in effect, have decided that the military defense of the Saigon regime is not worth the price.

No doubt other alternatives are possible, and certainly all should be thoroughly explored.

The President's statement shows clearly that he is caught on the horns of dilemma. He sees only two possibilities—present policies, or pullout—and therefore plans no basic changes in Vietnam policies. Judging by his speech, it is his intention to continue along the present lines indefinitely.

This underscores the importance of the Congress itself taking a new look at basic policy in Vietnam. Accordingly, I will press this week for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 508, which would instruct the appropriate committees of the Congress to do just that. As the first step, I will ask Chairman COLMER of the House Rules Committee to schedule hearings.

In this resolution, I now have the support of 55 other House Members. In addition to the 50 names—46 Republicans and four Democrats—appearing on the resolution introduced a week ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and myself, these House Members have introduced the same identical resolution: Representative OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York, Representative KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia, Representative MARGARET M. HECKLER, Republican, of Massachusetts, Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of California, Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr., Democrat, of California. In addition, Representative RONALD E. LUKENS, Republican, of Ohio, announced his support for it.

The Congress itself must resolve the Vietnam dilemma: first, because it is the most representative branch of the Government and, therefore, best suited to deal with the complicated, vital question of war; and second, because it bears the clear constitutional responsibility to do so.

No Representative and no Senator will relish the task. In fact, several have told me privately, and with feeling, that they are determined to avoid having to vote on any question of basic war policy. This reluctance is understandable. But can any Congressman honorably neglect the constitutional duty to which he is sworn, especially this one, touching as it does so intimately the lives and well-being of all our citizens?

INFORMATION NEEDED

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, there is a nationwide organized plan to destroy our draft laws. I know that the Members of the House will be interested in reading the Friday, September 29, editorial from the Dallas Morning News, which is as follows:

> INFORMATION NEEDED
>
> An ironic footnote to the John Birch Society's failure to get booth space at the State Fair is establishment of the "draft information center" across the street from Fair Park.
>
> The purpose of the center, according to Dallas' Rep. Joe Pool, is to advise young men how to dodge the draft. This is being done by "counselors," he said.
>
> One such "counselor" told The News that "we only make information available to anyone with questions."
>
> He said that he himself is presently trying to get his draft board to classify him as a conscientious objector. He is active in the

Dallas Committee for a Peaceful Solution in Vietnam.

There are a good many questions about this activity that occur, such as:

Who is sponsoring this center? Who is paying the costs? What organizations are involved?

Rep. Pool, who has introduced a bill to prevent disruption of Selective Service operations, suggested that an investigation may be made soon to learn the answers to these and other questions about the center.

At a time when the nation is involved in a shooting war, an investigation seems to be needed. And legislation to outlaw organized draft-dodging campaigns is needed as well, and as soon as possible.

The left wing will jump on Dallas' Pool and the committee, as usual. And as usual, Pool and the committee are justified in making investigations like these.

DEALING WITH URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, following the outbreak of civil disorders in many of our urban centers, there has been a rash of proposals for governmental action. Nearly all of them are characterized by the common denominator of more Federal aid. This is a very disturbing trend for those of us who are interested in maintaining a strong Federal system.

The ultimate in these proposals was made on July 31 in a Daily Bond Buyer editorial which suggested that the Federal Government take over not only the financing of most urban poverty problems but their administration as well. The effect of this proposal would be to put many municipal employees on the Federal payroll.

This outrageous suggestion was strongly attacked by one of my colleagues on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Honorable William O. Beach, county judge of Montgomery County, Tenn. The Commission is a bipartisan body created by the Congress to study questions of Federal-State-local relations and to make recommendations to the appropriate levels of government for their resolution. I have the privilege of serving as one of the Representatives of this House on the Commission along with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD both the editorial from the Daily Bond Buyer with which I take strong issue, and Judge Beach's very persuasive letter to the editor:

RELIEF FOR THE URBAN AGONY

The nation is still so stunned by the raw physical catastrophe inflicted by race riots and armed insurrections that little thought has yet been given to appraising the financial consequences.

The money payoff in due course will no doubt be felt soon in the closely related insurance community and the public market for municipal bonds.

Fire and casualty insurance companies now own about $13 billion of the $105 billion of outstanding bonds of state and local governments. In recent years, they have been the market's second largest institutional buyer of such securities.

It is feared in market circles that the casualty companies will not be as big buyers in the future as before. What is more, it seems certain that some insurance companies may have to sell blocks of local government bonds to raise cash to meet underwriting losses sustained in the recent disorders. Who will buy these liquidated portfolio holdings and at what price?

Perhaps some losses can be spared the insurance companies if they can show that the losses were the result of planned armed insurrection, rather than the casualty of impromptu riot. Armed insurrection should not be hard to prove in view of the public calls to riot and arms that are being reported almost daily in the New York Times and other general circulation newspapers. But even so, the arson-and-pillage bill will have to be paid by pretty much the same people, if not in higher insurance premiums for everybody, then through public taxation. In finance, it doesn't seem to make much difference how slums are cleared.

Meantime, the wounded cities are left nursing these distressing questions:

Will private insurance continue to be available for dwellings and business quarters in the pillaged and burned-out areas?

Who will buy the bonds of the stricken cities, and on what price terms? How does an investor feel about owning the bond of a city in flames?

Who will continue to dwell in such cities if they can move out? How can business and industry in such cities be persuaded not to go away?

Is not the urban neighborhood ghetto destined to mushroom into the ghetto-city, or even the ghetto-state? What will dissuade propertied families from quitting urban areas? What will dissuade propertyless families from continuing to move in?

In the wake of the urban disorders is a great disenchantment.

There no longer can be warrant for the wishful thought that municipal government of itself can cope with the problems of mass poverty, mass unemployment, and swelling spiritual bankruptcy that abide in the postwar city slums.

Municipal government has neither the financial means for ministering to the urban congestion of this social sickness, nor the police power to protect the community as a whole from the violent impact of social protest and revolt.

It is a Federal problem.

And if the issue is to be faced squarely as a Federal Government problem, a new approach may be in order.

Perhaps the current makeshift of money grants and loans to the cities, and the collateral state and Federal Government investments in such things as public housing, hospitalization, education and urban renewal should be re-examined with soul-searching thoroughness.

Is it not still true that "everybody's business is nobody's business"? Has it ever been good sense either economically or politically for one government jurisdiction to raise money and for another government jurisdiction to spend it?

It will take time for a Congressional investigation to establish the extent to which the riots and insurrections have been due to the social despair of unpropertied and jobless Negroes, to the naked hooliganism of juveniles; and how much to the conspiratorial tactics of dedicated revolutionaries, whose first and perhaps only aim is to discredit and break down public authority.

While such an investigation is going on, perhaps a new approach to the urban ghetto problem might be explored.

One suggestion stems from the rapidly-spreading conviction that the relief of the propertyless and jobless urban population is a financial responsibility of the Federal Government.

If this is so, why should not the Federal state undertake not merely to *finance* the relief of the propertyless and jobless, but to *administer* such relief as well? This would take an immense financial and political burden from the local government part of the public sector.

The only precedent at present for Federal administration of community affairs is in Washington, where the nation's Federal business is administered through a Federal district—the District of Columbia.

It could be that the time has come to experiment with a regional application of the Federal district idea. Why could not the whole urban problem of relief to the unpropertied and jobless be transferred to regionally-established Federal districts?

These districts need not be in urban areas. Like the District of Columbia, they could be models of city planning. Conceivably they could come to house not only recipients of public relief, but could be "demonstration cities" that would attract not only people on the Government payroll or the Government relief rolls, but, like Washington, lure into residence a host of discriminating outsiders who would cherish the new Federal district cities for reasons of voluntary choice rather than compulsion.

AUGUST 25, 1967

THE EDITOR,
The Bond Buyer
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I have read your editorial, "Relief for the Urban Agony," in the July 31st issue of *The Daily Bond Buyer*. I am shocked at your suggestion that the Federal Government take over the *administration* as well as the financing of urban poverty problems.

If the Federal Government is better fitted to administer programs designed to remedy poverty, then what argument is there that it would not also be better fitted to administer any and all other local affairs that happen to be beyond the financial capability of local government?

I grant that there are some inherent difficulties in the American federal system, one of which is that in some cases one governmental jurisdiction must raise money and another spend it. The situation of course arises from the imbalance between the great resources of the federal government and the relatively meager resources of state and local governments.

But is this defect so serious or so basic as to warrant the overthrow of our federal system of government—our three-level federal-state-local partnership, which, with whatever defects it may have, provides a substantial amount of government close to home and thus assures broader citizen concern, participation and control? These important features of democratic government would be absent in any scheme of national administration of local problems, it seems to me.

Nor is it enough in my opinion to say that poverty is a national problem rather than a local problem. The fact that it exists in many places throughout the nation does not necessarily mean that it can be effectively attacked only through a single national administrative agency. For in every locality where ghettos, sub-standard housing, inadequate educational opportunity, and other poverty-begetting conditions exist, the remedies must come from the efforts of an aroused and concerned local citizenry, or they will not come at all. No team of federal administrators are as likely to be able to provide the leadership that will motivate and arouse the people at the grass roots level

as the officials who are elected and known at home.

Admittedly local leadership has fallen short of the mark in solving the problems of urban blight. I do not know how we are to be sufficiently motivated. But of one thing I am convinced; the Federal Government with all its money and expertise cannot get the job done alone.

I can find nothing in my experience as a county administrative official on which to base any support for your proposal. Also it runs counter to what I believe to be the philosophy of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member, which gives constant and continuing study to the problems of the relationship of the three levels of government in the American Federal System. (I must make it clear, however, that I do not presume to speak for the Commission.) Your proposal might at first blush give appealing promise of greater administrative efficiency, but I believe it would soon prove to be both stifling to local initiative and concern and unproductive of any real remedy for the urban agony.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM O. BEACH.

THERE ARE MANY LEGITIMATE FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I have recently charged that many of the Nation's farmer cooperatives are perpetrating a fraud upon the American farmer and American taxpayers. These co-ops have issued to their members between $4 and $6 billion in worthless patronage dividend certificates, instead of issuing cash from their profits.

I would like to point out that there are many legitimate cooperatives throughout the country which are run by farmers for the benefit of farmers. Intercounty Cooperative, Woodbridge, which provides feed and marketing services for farmers in Sullivan and Ulster Counties, is an example of a legitimate co-op. The Dairymen's League is another example. I am certainly not referring to co-ops like these.

My charges are directed toward those co-ops which practice the following abuses:

First. Co-ops which are controlled by gigantic corporate entities so that member farmers do not have an honest voice in the operation of the co-op.

Second. Co-ops which issue dividend certificates and do not redeem them for 30 or 40 years, even upon the death of the patron.

Third. Co-ops which take over independent taxpaying businesses, bring them under the tax exempt umbrella, and drive private competitors out of business.

The worst offenders seem to be the Farm Bureau co-ops and other gigantic co-ops in the Midwest—in Ohio, Illinois, and Iowa. There are many co-ops which provide much needed services to the American farmer, and are a valuable part of rural America. We must stop the abuses of the Farm Bureau-type co-op so that the legitimate co-ops can continue to serve the American public.

INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 years much concern has been expressed by the U.S. Treasury Department, as well as some of my colleagues, regarding industrial revenue bond financing. Opponents contend that such financing is an abuse of the tax exemption privilege granted State and municipal bonds.

However, the advantages and contributions which this form of financing provides our States, must not be overlooked. Southern and Midwestern States have found industrial revenue bond financing of tremendous value in obtaining new industry, and consequently, a wider geographical distribution of industry is emerging. It has also made a major contribution in raising the standard of living in rural and distressed areas by bringing in new industry, and broadening the tax base of such communities.

Because of these advantages, 40 States now have industrial revenue bond laws, and my own State of Florida is now seriously studying this type of financing.

I commend to my colleagues the following letter from the Committee for the Evaluation of Industrial Aid Financing which further explains, with the use of data from the Federal Reserve flow of funds, the use and advantages of industrial revenue bond financing:

THE COMMITTEE FOR THE EVALUATION OF INDUSTRIAL AID FINANCING,
Washington, D.C., September 8 1967.

LETTER MAILED SEPTEMBER 8, 1967, TO ALL U.S. SENATORS, CONGRESSMEN, AND STATE GOVERNORS

DEAR ———: The use of Industrial Revenue Bonds to finance a relatively small portion of the industrial construction in the United States is being criticized in some quarters of Congress and, in particular, the Treasury Department. Ignoring the many benefits derived from such economic expansion by the states and their municipalities, and even the Federal Government, the criticism is based on the belief that Industrial Revenue Bonds deny the Treasury additional income in the form of "lost taxes."

The municipalities, for their part, by encouraging and assisting in financing of plant construction increase economic productivity within their locality, thus incurring the benefits of increased employment, expanded commercial activity and the development of a larger tax base. The net result is the minimizing of welfare costs and the maximizing of the municipality's ability to finance other local government services.

It is notable that the Economic Development Administration and the Office of Regional Economic Development were established in the Department of Commerce to create new jobs by attracting business and to rural communities. For the period ending June 30, 1966 EDA approved . . . a total of $383 million for the construction of facilities on the justification that "when these facilities are completed the industrial and commercial firms using them will create thousands of new and permanent jobs." It is ironic that little or no recognition is given to the role that Industrial Revenue Bonds play in attaining the same basic economic goal.

The statement that the tax-exempt Industrial Revenue Bond constitutes a "tax dodge" by the business corporation leasing the facility is untrue. Granted that such financing provides a lower rate of interest in today's tight money market; the belief that the Treasury would derive greater benefit if these undertakings were all financed with taxable corporate bonds is open to serious question. Consider, for example, that in 1965 the total volume of corporate financing approximated $8.1 billion and according to the Federal Reserve flow of funds only $3 billion went into the hands of investors where the interest income was fully subject to taxation. What many fail to recognize is that the taxable-bond market is dominated by purchasers such as pension funds, foundations, life insurance companies and mutual savings banks who have themselves been granted full or partial tax exemption by the Federal government.

Let us examine the postulated loss of income taxes to the Federal Government on the $504 million Industrial Revenue Bonds which the Investment Bankers Association of America estimates were issued in 1966. Assume that these bonds were issued as taxable securities and that the holders of the bonds were also fully taxable; taxable income at an interest rate of 6% would only amount to $30 million. However, if one wishes to assume the ratio of taxable-nontaxable ownership of securities aforecited by the Federal Reserve, the taxable income on the $504 million securities would be reduced to $11,250,000. Assuming, further, a 50 per cent tax bracket for the holders of these securities, the government would have received only $5,625,000 total gross income. One cannot help but compare this minimal amount with the $383,600,000 expenditure by EDA to attract new industry.

Therefore, by this very simple comparison, it appears that there are those who are using Industrial Revenue Bond Financing as a "straw man." The Federal government, with the tremendous burden of Viet Nam is limited in its assistance to such battle scarred communities as Newark, New Jersey. Needless to say that if the state of New Jersey had an Industrial Revenue Bond law it could prove to be of great service in providing new industry in rebuilding this community and in eliminating pockets of unemployment.

The incentives offered by states and their municipalities to attract new business via the Industrial Revenue Bond route are no less tempting than the incentives offered by the Federal Government, the difference being that there is no interference with local and states rights and no direct expense upon the Federal Government.

LESTER M. HADDAD,
Washington Representative.

QUEST FOR PEACE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this time in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times the United Nations frequently comes under

attack because it does not always have a ready answer and instant solution to complex and difficult problems, which the world faces.

It is my feeling to the contrary that the United Nations has provided a very important focal point for all international discussions and peace efforts and accordingly deserves a large measure of credit for what stability and peace we do have today.

A short time ago William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, Hearst Newspapers, summed up the situation in an "Editor's Report" which I feel is an outstanding declaration of the strong points and merits of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place this report in the RECORD at this point:

SAN FRANCISCO.—Out here in this naturally air-conditioned city—easily the most beautiful in America—the doings back at the United Nations in New York are geographically remote.

Nevertheless, the opening of this session is news of interest to every literate human being.

Twenty-two years ago this summer, I was here when this organization—created to help the nations of the world settle their problems through reason and logic—was born.

The atmosphere of hope which prevailed at that time around the shining new baby was a far cry from the gloomy air hanging this week in New York over its big, cold, marble and glass slab of a building on the East River.

As the delegates gathered to again begin hashing over the problems of this messed-up world, the professional cynics, doomsayers and other pessimists had a field day. And with good cause. The outlook for any constructive action again was as bleak as any sourpuss could hope for.

In fact the outlook is even more dismal than usual in recent years. Exactly as predicted by the handwringers, opening statements by the United States and Russian spokesmen in essence were mere restatements of previous positions on the overriding problems of the Middle East, Vietnam and disarmament.

This means the present stalemate not only probably will continue during three months of fruitless talk ahead but is likely to become more and more bitter. Literally nothing meaningful can be done by the assembly—or the Security Council—where the U.S. and the Soviet Union are not in agreement.

So, it may well be asked, of what value is this gathering of 122 nations which are anything but united? And if it may be on the verge of following the old League of Nations into oblivion because of impotence, as some of the doomsayers believe, what of it?

Being neither a cynic nor a pessimist but by nature rather an optimistic realist, I would like to try to answer those questions by doing what Al Smith always recommended—taking a look at the record. When you do that you find that the UN despite its depressing failures, has a very real value indeed. Its demise, further, would be a real tragedy in man's continuing quest for peace.

* * *

The underlying trouble with the UN—the reason it never has been able to function fully as the peacekeeping body it was supposed to be—is that none of the big powers, understandably, has been willing to give up their sovereignty. Thus it has all the trappings of a superstate and none of the authority.

In actual operation the General Assembly has been primarily a world forum for general debate. The 15-member Security Council, which does have power to enforce peace, in actuality has largely been hamstrung by the veto right accorded to five permanent members—the U. S., Russia, Britain, France and Nationalist China.

Yet despite these basic hobbles the UN has been able to snuff out many dangerous situations by sending truce teams, fact-finding missions and what it calls "neutral-nations commissions" to various parts of the globe. It was responsible for the 1965 cease-fire between India and Pakistan. And on five major occasions it has intervened with UN forces in the interests of peace.

Those occasions began with actual warfare in Korea, from 1950 to 1953, a joint undertaking against Communist aggression made possible only because Russia was boycotting the Security Council and thus was unable to cast a veto.

The interventions include the buffer force set up in the Middle East between 1956 and this year to help keep peace between Israel and the Arabs. Removed at the request of Egyptian President Nasser just before the outbreak of new hostilities last June, the UN is now back as an "observer" of the shaky truce line.

Still other on-the-spot peacekeeping operations included the Congo, from 1960 to 1964, which ended when Russia and France refused to pay their share of the costs, and Cyprus from 1964 to the present. A force of 7,000 UN troops was sent to Cyprus to end fighting between Greek and Turkish Cypriots and is still on the island.

In addition to these direct interventions to restore peace or halt aggression, the UN since its formation in 1945 has helped greatly in maintaining what world stability there is through a tremendous variety of economic and social uplift programs. The fact that the U. S. has borne the lion's share of the cost, as usual, does not detract from the fact that these efforts represent international cooperation.

So, on the record, the UN has been far from a complete washout. It has and is helping millions of underprivileged people throughout the world understand what mankind can do when it works together. And so far as the big crises are concerned, there is little doubt it repaid its investment just by averting an almost inevitable major East-West showdown over the Congo in 1960.

Certainly, the UN has proven a disillusionment to many who thought it could police the world. Certainly it is depressing that the UN has failed in so many situations, past and present. One thinks not only of Vietnam and the continuing Mideast mess, but of Tibet, Czechoslavakia, Hungary, Goa and many others, including Berlin.

But the disillusion is the result of over-optimism. The properly optimistic view to take of the UN—indeed the practical view—is to judge it not by its failures but by its successes. They have not been inconsiderable.

It is not the fault of the UN that the world has not known real peace since the end of World War II. It is the fault of the Communists. Every major crisis since 1945 has been the direct result of Communist aggression, or aggression encouraged by the Communists in keeping with their policy of stirring up trouble for non-Communist states.

Communists—whether Russian, Chinese or Cuban—simply are not interested in peace. Moscow claims it is, but the truth is demonstrated by the more than 100 vetoes it has cast in the Security Council in the past 22 years. The U.S., by contrast, has never used its veto power even once.

Between now and the adjournment of the General Assembly on Dec. 19, Russia and her supporters will be continuing their campaign of vilification against the U.S. and our allies. They apparently will keep repeating the same tired and futile demands for this country to get out of Vietnam and for Israel to surrender the territory she was forced to occupy for her own continued existence.

The aim of the verbal attacks, of course, will be to attempt to win some kind of a diplomatic victory to replace failures of force. The attempt will not succeed, nor will anything at all come about until reality replaces delusion.

And end to the Mideast crisis could come quickly if Moscow would stop abetting the Arabs in their unrealistic attitude toward Israel. An end to the war in Vietnam would come even quicker if Moscow stopped supplying arms to Ho Chi Minh and his armies of aggressors.

Russia, obviously, is not yet willing to do either. Her Communist masters will take such steps only when they decide it is in their best interests to do so.

Meanwhile the non-Communist world continues its quest for peace. Part of that quest—an important part—consists in the battle of words being waged in the world forum of the UN.

There, at least, certain rules must be followed and objective observers from all corners of the earth therefore can listen and separate the truth from the lies.

Even if it served no other purpose but this, the UN would be indispensable for all who retain hope for eventual peace among nations. There can be no lasting peace without universal freedom. And it is hearing the truth that can set men free.

TO REBUILD THE SLUMS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, that there is an unmet need for decent housing within the means of low-income families is by now axiomatic. How best to meet the need is the question. Recent proposals lean heavily on greater Federal incentives to private capital to enter the low-income housing field. The New York Times on September 25 analyzed these proposals and concluded that the involvement of private capital is not a substitute for public housing. With regard to the Percy and Kennedy proposals, the Times pointed out that "The subsidized interest rates, tax concessions, and other inducements are a roundabout way of doing what the Government could do straightforwardly if the public understood that decent housing for the poor cannot be a goldmine for private profit."

I think my colleagues will be interested in the respected Times' analysis of various housing proposals, and I place the full text of its September 25 editorial, entitled "To Rebuild the Slums," in the RECORD at this point:

TO REBUILD THE SLUMS

In the task of rebuilding the urban slums neither Congress nor the nation itself has looked squarely at the housing problem.

The underlying truth remains what it was twenty years ago when the late Senator Robert A. Taft became a convert to public housing and set out to persuade the real estate industry to relax its doctrinaire opposition. There is no way, Mr. Taft often said, that private enterprise can build housing for the very poor at a profit. But Congress has never been willing to appropriate sufficient money for a large-scale public housing program.

Federal housing officials and city mayors have complicated the problem by pursuing unrelated objectives. They have pushed for so-called "middle-income housing" to persuade a remnant of the middle class not to flee to the suburbs. They have promoted urban renewal programs to revitalize the rotting downtown commercial areas and lure shoppers back into the centers of cities. These are both worthwhile purposes, but they do nothing to rehouse slum-dwellers and may actually reduce the supply of housing available to them.

The political impasse which has long existed in the housing field, now made more visible by the budget stringency of the Vietnam war, has stimulated enterprising politicians in both parties to devise ways of luring private business into this unpromising activity. President Johnson has a committee at work studying the possibility of a mixed public-and-private Comsat-type corporation, Senator Percy, Republican of Illinois, and Senator Robert Kennedy have introduced ambitious, complex bills to encourage the entry of private capital into the field.

None of these plans will directly help the people in the slums who are worst-off—the 32 million Americans, or one person in every six, who live in families where the breadwinner is unemployed, on welfare or whose income hovers at or slightly above minimum wage levels.

Senator Kennedy concedes that under his bill apartments would rent for $70 to $100 a month, which is more than the really poor can afford to pay. The same is true of Senator Percy's bill, which is nominally intended to convert slum residents into homeowners. As with most existing Government housing programs, except public housing, these proopsals would most help white-collar and blue-collar workers in the $4,000 to $7,000 bracket.

Private capital's involvement, however, is not a substitute for public housing, much less a panacea. The subsidized interest rates, tax concessions, and other inducements of the Percy and Kennedy plans are a roundabout way of doing what the Government could do straightforwardly if the public understood that decent housing for the poor cannot be a goldmine for private profit.

NEW APPROACH GIVES NEW HOPE FOR THE JOBLESS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is well known by now that the key to solving the problem of poverty in the central cities and in our rural poverty pockets is to find jobs for the jobless and to train those who are not equipped to find jobs. Accordingly, the announcement yesterday by President Johnson of a new pilot program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help solve the job problem will be welcomed by everyone concerned about the state of health of this country. If anyone wondered about the seriousness of purpose of the President and the speed with which this new program would be launched, those doubts must have disappeared today when Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge and Secretary of Labor Wirtz held a joint news conference to set forth in detail the proposals made yesterday by the President. Present at the news conference today was Mr. William E. Zisch, a highly respected business executive in the aerospace industry, who will serve as Secretary Trowbridge's Special Representative to get this program moving with all speed. Through Mr. Zisch, the businessman will have a single point of contact in the Federal Government. This pilot program has many aspects, but there is a common theme—deep involvement by private enterprise in the creation of job opportunities. I am particularly pleased to learn that San Antonio is one of the five cities where initial contacts have been made by Secretary Trowbridge. A Federal team will be going to San Antonio to take a look at prospective new uses for surplus Federal property and facilities, new uses which would aid in the creation of jobs and the training of potential workers. I can assure the President and Secretary Trowbridge that this Federal initiative will be matched with equal enthusiasm and cooperation by the people of San Antonio. In my view, this program is an example of creative federalism and business responsibility at their finest. I unhesitatingly predict fruitful results from the steps that have been taken yesterday and today.

MEMORANDUM FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

To: The Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Administrator of General Services Administration, Director of Office of Economic Opportunity, and Administrator of Small Business Administration.

We are launching today a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

The heart of this new effort is to reach the forgotten and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by inadequate education, hindered by years of discrimination and by-passed by conventional training programs.

To succeed in this venture will take more than promises or good intentions. It will require—on an unprecedented scale—the concerted action and involvement of the private sector, working closely with the Federal Government.

As we embark on this new course, let us be clear about what is involved: our purpose is not to hand out but to help up, to help provide every American the opportunity for a good job at a good wage.

Our goal is to replace the waste and failure of unemployment with the productivity of meaningful work.

We call upon private industry to join us in tackling one of America's most urgent domestic problems. I have no doubt that the private sector will respond. For we have witnessed in the past few months a remarkable series of events which attests to the dedication of American business in meeting the needs of the society in which it flourishes:

On September 12, 1967, the insurance companies in this country agreed to commit $1 billion of their funds for investments in city core areas to improve housing conditions and to finance job creating enterprises. Some of these resources are already financing promising housing projects and insurance company executives and officials of this Administratin are working together to develop other projects.

A project has been launched to use surplus Federal lands to meet the housing needs of our cities in which the efforts of private developers will be the most important single element.

A Committee, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser and composed of distinguished industrialists, banker, labor leaders and specialists in urban affairs is examining every possible means of encouraging the development of a large-scale efficient construction and rehabilitation industry to reclaim the corroded core of the American city.

Upon the recommendation of the Kaiser Committee we have begun the "Turnkey Plus" project to encourage private industry not only to develop and build, but also to *manage* public housing.

In this effort, we will again attempt to bring the great resources of the private sector to bear on a critical national problem. Through the great talents and energies of private industry, with full support from the Federal Government, we hope to:

Bring new job training opportunities in existing plants to the hard core unemployed.

Create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Encourage new enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to provide jobs and job training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To initiate this effort, the resources of the Department of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration will be combined to provide maximum assistance and to minimize the added cost of these in private industry willing to assume responsibility for providing training and work opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged.

Initially, nearly $40 million from a wide variety of existing programs will be made available, as will millions of dollars worth of surplus Federal property and excess Federal equipment.

We will offer to private industry:

A full spectrum of aid to assist them in recruiting, counselling, training, and providing health and other needed services to the disadvantaged.

Aid which will enable them to experiment with new ways to overcome the transportation barriers now separating men and women from jobs.

Surplus Federal land, technical assistance and funds to facilitate the construction of new plants in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Excess Federal equipment to enable them to train more disadvantaged people.

Assistance to joint enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to bring jobs and training opportunities to the disadvantaged.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to direct this test program and insure that all available Federal resources are utilized. The Secretary of Commerce will designate a full-time Special Representative as the single point of contact for private employers participating in this project. The Special Representative will provide employers with one-stop service for the entire Federal Government and will make whatever arrangements are appropriate with the various Federal agencies for all forms of Federal assistance.

The Secretary of Labor will designate a full-time officer in the Manpower Administration to work with the Special Representative of the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the training and employment elements of these projects.

I have also asked the Secretaries of Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration to assist the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor in this test program and to assign a single official in their agencies

who will coordinate their efforts in support of this program.

Provision will be made for continuing liaison with local projects and for careful research and evaluation to crystallize field experience into guidelines for future action.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to invite corporations throughout the country to join this new effort to bring meaningful employment to disadvantaged citizens both in existing plants and, where feasible, in new locations near areas of concentrated unemployment.

I have directed each Department and Agency of this Government to give top priority to all phases of this important effort.

PRIVATE HOUSING MONEY SHOULD BENEFIT CITIES

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, our American insurance companies' plan to invest in the building and improvement of housing in the Nation's deteriorated slum areas is indeed noteworthy. I join the applause that greeted it, and I ask that the RECORD include the editorial remarks of the Nashville Tennessean which, on September 16, also praised the companies' involvement in the problems of the Nation's cities. The editorial is as follows:

PRIVATE HOUSING MONEY SHOULD BENEFIT CITIES

The Nation's life insurance industry has agreed to invest $1 billion of mortgage money to build and improve housing in the big city slums.

The decision is a hopeful step toward greater involvement of big business in the problems of the nation's cities—an effort in which business has as great an interest as anyone else.

The 350 insurance companies participating in the plan will incur little risk to their investment, since the loans will be guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration. But the companies will have to accept somewhat lower interest rates than they could get in other investments. This represents a financial sacrifice for the companies in a commendable effort to serve the public interest.

The $1 billion which the companies will put into the plan represents a considerable percentage of the approximately $16 billion which the companies have to invest each year. There may be additional investments in slum housing later, but the companies are not committing themselves on this yet.

The plan does not involve government spending, except for the guaranteeing of the loans by the FHA. Each participating life insurance company will negotiate individually with each borrower, and there will be no centralized machinery for coordinating the program. The money will go for projects in slum areas which would ordinarily not be financed under normal business practices.

The plan has possibilities of becoming a positive effort between business and government to clear slums and improve the housing conditions of millions of Americans.

One possible stumblingblock to be avoided is the threat of establishing segregated housing patterns and recreating ghettoes out of the old slums. This problem is great enough in redevelopment involving all government funds. The situation could be even more troublesome where private funds are involved.

Federal housing officials, in meetings in Nashville Wednesday night, appeared to be confused about this aspect of the Edgehill urban renewal project.

Mr. Deane C. Tucker, member of an advisory team from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, said the project probably would create a ghetto unless the Nashville Housing Authority alters present intent. "We would prefer that it not end up in all-Negro housing," he said, "but it probably will."

Mr. Gerald Gimre, executive director NHA, said the agency intended to rebuild the ghetto. "We want to preserve the neighborhood but create a better environment."

Slum clearance and the redevelopment of ghettoes obviously present many agonizing problems. If private funds are to be invested to the best advantage, it seems that the federal agencies are going to have to decide on some clear agreement for investing government funds.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES CONTINUATION OF RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the insurance companies' declared intention to invest large sums in rent supplement housing is good indication that private enterprise is enlisted in the Nation's total effort to improve living conditions in our cities. The Chicago Sun-Times on September 24 discussed this development and suggested that the House cannot ignore the companies' show of faith in America, and should provide the means for continuing the rent supplement program. With permission I insert the editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE HOUSE MUST AID THE CITIES

The Senate has responded to the reality of the times by approving enough model-city and rent-supplement funds to get the program under way. Now it is up to members of the House to reverse themselves and follow the Senate's lead.

The Senate last week allotted $537,000,000 for model cities. The House in May set the figure at $237,000,000. The Senate approved $40,000,000 for rent subsidy, the House approved nothing. The Senate bill now goes to House conference, and it is incumbent on the conference either to adopt the Senate figure or offer a reasonable compromise.

The administration has pledged to cut some non-war spending, and it should. Yet there are programs that must be given overriding priority, because they benefit both the poor and the general economy. Model-city and rent-subsidy programs mean slum clearance and new construction, with resultant jobs, private profit and tax revenue.

The life insurance industry recently pledged $1 billion as backing for construction of housing whose tenants would be aided by rent-supplement money. That's a billion dollars worth of faith in common sense that the House simply can't ignore. It's time to allow a cure for urban sickness to begin.

NEW HOPE FOR DICKEY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. Speaker, New England needs it and the vast majority of New England people want the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project.

To those of my colleagues who have supported my efforts to bring about construction of this needed project, I extend my deepest gratitude. Their votes for Dickey have been votes for New England's welfare and progress.

To those esteemed colleagues who have seen fit to oppose me and have sought to prevent or delay Dickey's construction, I issue another call that they reexamine the facts. There is no legitimate basis to justify opposition to this project. The need for it has been fully demonstrated, and its merits established beyond any doubt.

Especially do I urge those of my New England colleagues who have opposed the Dickey project to reconsider their position. I do so confident that their opposition does not reflect the wishes of the majority of their constituents. The many expressions of support I have received from labor, consumer, and other organizations as well as from numerous individuals throughout New England have persuaded me that this is the case.

Leading New England newspapers share my view of the importance of this project and the broad support it enjoys in the area. The Providence Journal is one of those newspapers.

On September 19, 1967, it published an editorial endorsing Dickey, reiterating the fact that it is important to all New England and strongly urging its support by all Representatives of the area. In a desire to share this excellent editorial with all my colleagues, and in the hope that some of them may be persuaded to lend me their support, I place this editorial in the RECORD:

NEW HOPE FOR DICKEY

Hope for the buffeted Dickey-Lincoln School public power project in northern Maine is flickering again. The White House itself has taken the lead in gathering supporters of the big dam for another effort at winning approval in the House of Representatives.

Deletion of the modest 1.7 million dollar appropriation for this project from the giant four billion dollar public works bill by the House carried a sad commentary on the state of regional cooperation in New England. The negative vote of 16 New England congressmen of both parties was an example of the kind of regional "split personality" that New England no longer can afford. The region already has fallen behind other sections of the country in economic growth; and long-range forecasts indicate that dramatic measurers will be needed to halt that trend.

The arguments for the Dickey project are straightforward enough. It will provide up to 700,000 kilowatts of "peaking power" that is needed for high demand periods and emergency use—the kind of demand for which

steam plants are uneconomic. It is needed as a "yardstick" against which to measure the performance and rates of privately generated power in an area that has the highest electric rates in the nation. It is an opportunity to get a needed facility for New England with the aid of federal funds which, in the power field, have all gone elsewhere—to the South and the West—in the past.

The private utilities have lobbied Congress hard on this issue. The irony of the split New England position in the House is suggested by the fact that the Dickey appropriation was the only one deleted on the house floor from a huge bill containing projects for all other parts of the country. The argument of the private companies that they can provide the needed power without Dickey would ring less hollowly if the mere threat of the project, plus the abortive proposal to import two million kilowatts of Canadian hydro power, had not already resulted in some voluntary rate reductions.

Nor does the 11th-hour opposition of a Maine conservation group sit well with many supporters who are equally concerned about preservation of natural resources. In fact, to some this opposition smacks of breach of faith because many backers of a St. John River power dam concurred in curtailment of the project in order to preserve the recreational treasure of the tributary Allagash River.

While the Senate can be expected to restore the appropriation that will keep the Dickey project alive, the more conservative cast of the House this year leaves the final outcome still in doubt. House members would be performing a high public service to take their cue from the White House when the report of the conference committee comes back to them for approval. A vote for Dickey will be a vote for progress in New England.

CALL TO CONGRESS FOR ACTION NOW

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and a vice president of the AFL–CIO, recently declared that there is strong public support for stepped up congressional action on housing, education, and employment.

Mr. Beirne based his statement on early reaction all over the Nation to the union's nationwide petition to Congress. He said in an interview on "Labor News Conference," AFL–CIO public service program, heard on the Mutual Broadcasting System, that most Americans seek effective answers to the problems of slums.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the text of the broadcast interview be reprinted in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Mutual Broadcasting System, "Labor News Conference," Sept. 26, 1967]

CALL TO CONGRESS FOR ACTION NOW

Guest: Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and a vice president of the AFL–CIO.

Panel: Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine Murray Seeger, economic correspondent for Newsweek magazine.

Moderator: Harry W. Flannery.

FLANNERY. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL–CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL–CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and a vice president of the AFL–CIO.

Early this month, the Communications Workers launched a nationwide drive for petitions calling on Congress to provide jobs, housing and education to meet the needs of the cities. Here to question Mr. Beirne about the progress of the union's petition effort and what it is hoped will be accomplished by it, are Murray Seeger, economic correspondent for Newsweek magazine, and Alan Adams, Washington correspondent for Business Week magazine. Your moderator, Harry W. Flannery.

And now, Mr. Adams, I believe you have the first question.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, your union has launched this signature campaign—this petition to Congress—why does your union feel that such a petition is necessary at this time? These issues have been before Congress for some time now.

BEIRNE. Well, for a number of reasons, Mr. Adams.

First and foremost, we are concerned about what is happening in the country. The riots in many cities during the summer pinpointed the neglect of areas in our big cities, as well as the neglect of millions of people throughout the country.

Our concern stems from the reactions that have appeared in Congress—reactions typified by the vote of the House on the original rat extermination bill in July—the reaction in Congress in handling riots by passing, or trying to pass, a law controlling riots—to send people to jail for fomenting them.

And, finally, we believe that a hardening of attitudes is setting in among Americans toward the problems that we have. The hardening would make it impossible for the kind of progress needed in the areas of poverty that actually exist.

So, thinking about ways in which we could affect Congress—ways in which we could go to our own members and have them think about the problems that face us in this nation—we latched upon this method of educating our own members on the need for jobs and housing and education by getting signatures of the public to present to Congress. We hope to thereby persuade Congress to do what I believe, way down deep, most of the American people want to do—the right thing—to solve the problems stemming from our disadvantaged citizens.

SEEGER. Mr. Beirne, what is wrong with Congress? Why did Congress react in such a negative way to the events of this summer? Why has Congress turned down bills like the rat extermination bill?

BEIRNE. Well, my personal opinion, Mr. Seeger, is that they reacted as they did because they had no answers to the problems. And, having no answers, it is quite understandable. Congressmen, I have noticed, perhaps more than any other group of people in America, are apt to react to their own frustrations in a most negative way. Now, most people do that, but I have noticed that Congressmen, because they are in a fish bowl, tend to show their reactions more than others do. Having no answers, and recognizing that something must be done, in their frustration, they howled instead of quietly thinking about the things that might be answers to these problems.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, your petition will be circulated throughout most of September. When the signature drive is over, do you think it will reflect that the people's views are really hardening on the subject, or, do you think it will show that they are concerned and want Congress to do something positive in this area?

BEIRNE. Well, we are going out for more than a million signatures. I have every reason to believe that we will succeed in getting many more than a million signatures in some 46 of our 50 states. Many governors have signed our petitions and it is our hope that we can persuade them to accompany our people to Washington to meet with the Congressional delegations of their states. Meeting with the Congressional delegations, we want to talk about the points that are made in the petitions—jobs, for instance—having the federal government become the employer of last resort. In other words, if a person is willing and able to work, but can't find a job in private enterprise, then it is the obligation of society to provide gainful employment at a fair wage for that person. And, we hope to educate the Congress on that point.

Now, we believe that our own members, getting behind this drive and taking the time to tell people what is behind each of these three major items—jobs, housing and education—is an educational process. We have had so many stewards of our union who have enthusiastically gone out to get signatures that we know the educational program works. We already have reports from stewards about some of the resistance they run into. But, when they explain it to the people, they sign the petitions. So, there is no doubt in my mind that our organization, in its own small way, is making a terrific impact with this educational process.

FLANNERY. Do these stewards get only signatures of members of the Communications Workers? You don't have a million members.

BEIRNE. No—they are not limited to just our own membership. There are some 440,000 members of the Communications Workers of America—and there are at least two or three other people in the families of our members. This brings us to more than a million people in the family of the Communications Workers of America. But, we are going beyond our own jurisdiction as a union. We are reaching the public. This is a public problem, so, the members are reaching as many citizens of their communities as they can.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, how are these petitions being circulated? Where will the public see them, look them over and, perhaps, sign them?

BEIRNE. Well, it is handled in different ways in various parts of the country. We want to involve as many of our stewards as possible in the program. Very often, they take the petitions to the people in their own neighborhoods.

FLANNERY. Stewards are union officials of some kind?

BEIRNE. Union representatives at the lower echelon of the union structure. They work alongside other members day in and day out. They handle the small problems that arise each day when humans are working together. We have some 60,000 stewards throughout the country. They will be seeing their own neighbors. Many of them belong to clubs of one kind or another and will circulate petitions there. I know of an instance where one of our members, a veteran of Korea, went to his post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and got the members of that organization to sign the petition. I know that in New York City they have a table on the street. In the first week that they had the table there they got the signatures of thousands of people who took the time to stop and read the big sign that carried our message. After reading it and talking to the person manning the table, they found that they were in agreement with what we were trying to do and signed the petition.

SEEGER. What kind of jobs would you have the government provide, Mr. Beirne? Are we

talking about the old leaf-raking idea of the depression days?

BEIRNE. If all we have to do is rake leaves, then let's rake the leaves. At least our streets and our parks would be clean.

But, there is so much unfinished business that only the federal government can tackle, that you would finally get to leaf-raking, way, way down the line.

I'll give but a few examples.

Back in the '30's, when the WPA (Works Progress Administration), the PWA (Public Works Administration) and all the other initiated organizations began, great fun was poked at the building of bridges. Everyone remembered the raking of leaves. But, any motorist traveling on our highways, if he would take the time to stop, would see that many of the sturdy bridges in use today were built by the WPA back in 1934 and 1935. Those bridges certainly have served a very useful purpose, and they are there long after the leaf-raking has been forgotten.

But, if it gets to leaf-raking, yes, if this will keep people off the streets, particularly young men and young women. One statistic we ought to burn into our memories is this—for every Negro in poverty there are two whites in poverty. So this is not a race question, although the riots last summer would lead many to believe that everything connected with poverty and disadvantage is a race question. It is not.

Congress is seeking right now to cut into the Appalachia program. Well, there are hundreds of thousands of white citizens whose forebears came to this country early in its life who are absolutely desolate now—people who have absolutely nothing except what comes out of the Appalachia program. They are human beings. They are Americans. They are white. No race is involved. They are of sturdy stock that has been in this country since its founding days. The rest of society in our judgment, owes those human beings the best it can give them. If Congress cuts down on the Appalachia program, the degradation of children would be even worse. This is unthinkable, as far as we are concerned.

ADAMS. Mr. Beirne, jobs, with the government as the employer of last resort, is just one phase of your program. You talk about education and housing. How do these fit into what you feel Congress should do?

BIERNE. Well, take housing. I believe that every person should walk into the slums in our cities—walk into the slums in the countryside—the rural slums—and take a look at the kind of housing many Americans live in. I have heard people come back from visits to other countries, and say they have seen the slums—in Lima, Peru, for example. They were just astounded at the filth. They were just astounded at the way human beings are living at the animal level.

Well, you don't have to go to Peru to see that sort of thing. You can go, here in Washington, D.C. You can go in New York City. You can go in Chicago, in Detroit. You can go in St. Louis. I could name countless cities in which you would find exactly the same conditions—where human beings are living just a short step above the level of animals.

Now, how do you take care of that? Well, there is only one way.

So long as private enterprise, so long as real estate operators look at the almighty dollar and forget that the dollars they are collecting—and many of them welfare dollars—are being collected from people who don't even have four decent walls or a decent roof over their heads—when the private sector will not take the steps needed to clean up these areas—when the cities do not have the money—when the state cannot tax enough to take care of it—then we say that the federal government, working in conjunction with the states and the municipalities and the private sector, has an obligation to take the lead. It is the only organized group in America with the strength and the wealth capable of taking the lead to clean up these slums. If these areas can't be repaired, then get the bulldozers and level them—build the kind of houses that human beings should live in.

Now, that is on housing. It will take a couple of billion dollars to get it going, but I am sure that we have the kind of talent in the private sector that once the federal government took the lead, would come forward with their skills, with their expertise, and with their dollars and make our slums decent places.

On education, we happen to believe that public education is worth fighting for. In the latter part of the last century, many people screamed that if we had public schools, there wouldn't be enough money to send all the children in America to school. Well, that has been proven wrong and we now have required public education, usually, up to the 16th year—about half way through high school, or about 10 years of basic education.

Well, a century has gone by since that was established. We think it is time to re-examine our education policies.

In this age of space, when we are thinking of defenses against China, with missiles that go so fast that the eye can't follow them—when we are thinking of a communications system with but three satellites to connect the entire world in split-second, instantaneous electronic connection—in this kind of age, it is time for us to go beyond the concept that every child up to the age of 16 is entitled to a free public education. It is time for us to ask ourselves, is not every child entitled to a free education from pre-kindergarten to the doctorate degree, if the ability and desire of the person leads to it?

In the Communications Workers of America, we have answered that. We have said yes. Every person is entitled to a free public education from pre-kindergarten through the doctorate degree, with only desire, motivation and ability as the criteria.

Now, we can afford it. And, we will get more back in taxes from people who are equipped to earn more money than we will by piddling around trying to revise an antiquated school system. It needs revision.

SEEGER. Mr. Beirne, the Administration has legislation before Congress covering most of these areas you have been talking about. Are you going to tell your people that these pieces of legislation are what they should be supporting, or, don't these go far enough? What is your feeling about that?

BEIRNE. My feeling is twofold.

First, to go back to my opening remarks, we think there is a hardening in Congress as a result of the riots. There is a frustration that causes them to duck the real hard answers that are self-evident. The hard answers are the three I mentioned. And, most people agree on that.

We hope to unfreeze the approach that Congress has taken. It is so awfully negative.

Now, the bills that are before the Congress in these three areas—and there is no Administration bill that I know of on employment—but on housing and education, yes, they are insufficient. So, we go beyond supporting what the Administration has proposed. We go much beyond that. We need massive action. What is being proposed is just the normal, routine, political approach to problems—keeping the hard economic view as the criteria, rather than the soft human problem. In Roosevelt's day, property rights versus human rights was the big issue of public dialogue. Well, it's back with us. I believe, and always have, that human rights and human needs are the great areas in which our federal government must give leadership. Yes, we go beyond what is being proposed. In one area they haven't urged anything—namely employment—and we think this is a big key.

ADAMS. Well, there is a pragmatic issue that goes along with this, Mr. Beirne. Does your union have a solution to how the bill for these programs is going to be paid by the federal government?

BEIRNE. Yes, this is a very simple thing that gets awfully confused at times. But, to face right up to the answer, you pay all bills through taxes and in no other way. It has always been that way, and it always will be that way, where a group of people get together in their own society and want a government to keep order. And so, we will pay the taxes. It is just that simple.

FLANNERY. Would it save money in the long run?

BEIRNE. Of course it would save money. It has been proven time after time after time, that the greater the opportunity for people to earn higher salaries and better wages, the more money automatically flows into government through taxes, because they are participating in the economy, they are participating in the affairs of the country, they are paying their way.

FLANNERY. Would you also say that if these programs went into effect this year that there wouldn't be any riots next year?

BEIRNE. No, because again, we have to go back, and keep emphasizing so that everybody will understand, that the riots are only an effect. We have to get at the cause of the riots. And the cause of the riots is deprivation. Now, I have lived long enough to know that the federal government is not going to move fast enough to eliminate the utter deprivation that exists in so many of our cities by next year. So, therefore, the possibility of riots has to be looked at squarely. It is there.

SEEGER. We keep hearing from Congressmen the argument that these kinds of programs are butter, when the big bills that we are trying to pay now are for guns in Vietnam. What is your answer to that argument?

BEIRNE. Well, I think we can have butter and bread, and also live up to our international obligations. To me, it is again the question of how much taxes can we afford. The last proposal was a 10 percent surtax, and we certainly can afford a 10 percent surtax. We can afford much more than that. These are the things we have to start taking a look at, so that the critics of America who say we have such a materialistic society, that we have lost our soul, will be proved wrong. In America, it is the spirit of the people who have come together in this country of ours that is the real wealth of the nation.

FLANNERY. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America and a vice president of the AFL–CIO. Representing the press were Alan Adams, Washington Correspondent for Business Week magazine, and Murray Seeger, economic correspondent for Newsweek magazine. This is your moderator, Harry W. Flannery, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL–CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Radio Network.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN STARR COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues a recent report prepared by the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Com-

mission on Civil Rights. The report deals with the administration of justice in Starr County, Tex., as a consequence of the continuing efforts by farmworkers in that area to organize for the purposes of collective bargaining, and wage and fringe benefit guarantees.

The facts as set forth by the Texas Advisory Committee are clear, as well as highly revealing. Hearings conducted in Starr County bear out the charge of repression and brutality by law enforcement personnel. Moreover, it is plain that law enforcement officials are not conducting themselves in an impartial manner.

Are not the days of the company detectives over and done with? It appalls me that American citizens seeking to organize themselves into unions in this year of 1967, are faced with such hostile actions as those displayed in Starr County, Tex. I hope that we will see an end to such activity soon. I am confident that once the public at large is apprized of the facts, they will show an indignation similar to that of a great many of the Members of this House.

I would remind those present, Mr. Speaker, that farmworkers are still not protected by the National Labor Relations Act. This inequity can be corrected by approval by the 90th Congress of H.R. 4769 and S. 8.

The report follows:

[A report prepared by the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights]

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN STARR COUNTY, TEX.

INTRODUCTION

On May 25–26, a Subcommittee of the Texas Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights held closed meetings at the Starr County Courthouse, Rio Grande City, Texas, to receive information relating to allegations of denials of equal protection of the laws in the administration of justice. These meetings were undertaken in response to requests from the League of United Latin American Citizens; the American G.I. Forum; the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee AFL–CIO; the Texas State AFL–CIO; Texas Advisory Committee members; and interested individuals. All the persons who appeared at the meeting did so voluntarily and their statements were not made under oath.

Members of the Subcommittee present were Garland Smith, attorney, Weslaco; Rafael H. Flores, attorney, McAllen; Albert Armendariz, attorney, El Paso; and Carlos Truan of Corpus Christi. Assisting the Subcommittee in its investigation was Mr. William B. Oliver, Field Representative from the South Field Office of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Approximately 30 persons appeared before the Subcommittee to testify and submit sworn statements relating to the administration of justice. Among the persons who appeared were representatives and members of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO (UFWOC); religious groups; private community organizations; attorneys for the unions; growers; attorneys for the growers; the County Attorney; the District Attorney; and individual citizens. Although the Texas Rangers received a written invitation to participate in the meeting, none appeared.

Early in 1966, the UFWOC began a campaign in Starr County to organize persons employed by growers and packers. Since the beginning of this drive, there have been reports alleging sabotage of farm machinery and other reports alleging physical violence. As a result of these allegations, the Starr County law enforcement officials requested the assistance of the Texas Rangers. About the time of the appearance of the Texas Rangers, the Committee began to receive requests to investigate allegations of denials of equal protection of the laws in the administration of justice.

The Texas Advisory Committee has forwarded this report and recommendations to the United States Commission on Civil Rights in Washington, D.C., with a request that they be made public. The Staff Director of the Commission has approved this request.

REPORT

On May 25 and 26, a Subcommittee of the Texas Advisory Committee held closed meetings in Rio Grande City. At these sessions, the Committee received information including sworn statements submitted by members of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO (UFWOC) and other citizens. On the basis of this information, the Committee concluded that members of UFWOC and other citizens active in the organizing campaign have been denied their legal rights in Starr County.

These denials included:

1. Physical and verbal abuse by Texas Rangers and Starr County law enforcement officials;

2. Failure to bring promptly to trial members and union organizers against whom criminal charges have been alleged;

3. Holding of union organizers for many hours before they were released on bond;

4. Arrest of UFWOC members and organizers on the complaints of growers and packers without full investigation of the allegations in the complaints. In contrast, law enforcement officials made full investigations before acting on complaints filed by members and officers of UFWOC;

5. Encouragement of farm workers by Rangers to cross picket lines;

6. Intimidation by law enforcement officers of farm workers taking part in representation elections;

7. Harassment by Rangers of UFWOC members, organizers, and a representative of the Migrant Ministry of the Texas Council of Churches which gave the appearance of being in sympathy with the growers and packers rather than the impartiality usually expected of law enforcement officers.

The majority of the farm workers and members of the Farm Workers Organizing Committee are Mexican Americans. To many Mexicans, the Texas Rangers are a symbol of oppression; their appearance in Starr County only served to aggravate an already tense situation. While the Committee supports fair and objective law enforcement and recognizes the possible need of Starr County law enforcement agencies to seek outside assistance in this situation, it questions whether the Texas Rangers are the appropriate source for such assistance.

The Committee also collected information indicating that many Mexican Nationals who possess alien-resident receipt cards (Green Cards) but who are living in Mexico, are being utilized as a source of labor on farms which are being picketed. Several persons alleged that this practice constitutes a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of Federal Immigration Law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings, the Committee recommends to the United States Commission on Civil Rights:

1. That the information received by the Committee be transmitted to the U.S. Department of Justice;

2. That the Commission request the Attorney General of the United States to undertake immediately an investigation of the denial of equal protection of the laws in Starr County; and further, that if the Attorney General's findings corroborate the information obtained by the Committee, the Department of Justice take immediate action to secure injunctive relief in Federal District Court.

3. That the Commission request the U.S. Secretary of State, the U.S. Secretary of Labor, and the U.S. Attorney General, through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to re-examine the regulations and policies which permit and encourage persons residing in Mexico to cross the border and engage in agricultural labor in the United States on a daily basis to the detriment of citizens or other persons permanently residing in the United States.

4. That the Commission continue its investigation of denials of equal protection of the laws to farm workers in South Texas and other Southwestern states.

The Texas Advisory Committee intends to continue its exploration of the problems affecting farm workers and at an early date will seek meetings with State officials to explore possible remedies to the situations in Starr County and to prevent similar situations from arising elsewhere in the State of Texas.

VIETNAM

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night last the President spoke to the Nation from San Antonio, Tex., on the subject of Vietnam. The speech was generally considered to be an effort to allay the mounting doubts of the American people concerning our involvement there. The comments made after the speech by the press and political figures were largely to the effect that nothing new was said, and that not many doubters would be convinced.

I watched and listened to the President as he spoke. I have read his speech in detail. There is one impression that comes through clearly. The President believes, strongly and sincerely, that the course on which he has directed this country is the right course. By whatever path he may have reached this belief, and there are many, he has apparently now so committed himself to it that he cannot draw back.

This is unfortunate for our country, for the Democratic Party, and for President Johnson. I strongly believe that our country has made, and will continue to make, its greatest progress under Democratic leadership. I respect and admire the ability of President Johnson to develop and to achieve new goals for the progress of the American people. But on the issue of Vietnam, I believe that this country has been both wrong in its approach and mistaken in its judgments of success from the beginning. In escalating our commitment to these errors, President Johnson is losing the support of the American people, as well as most of the peoples of the world. And in making clear the sincerity and strength of his commitment to these errors, the Pres-

ident is making it more difficult for his supporters to maintain their opposition to his Vietnam policies without opposing him as a leader and as a candidate for reelection.

The mounting disenchantment of the American people with the administration's Vietnam policy rises from a rapidly growing awareness of its increasing impact on our society—increased taxes, greater casualties, and a deferment of action on many pressing domestic problems—and an increasing awareness of the tenuous grounds on which this impact is justified. The President provided nothing in his speech that would stem this disenchantment.

Thoughtful Americans are today questioning the very assumptions on which our involvement is based, assumptions which the President projects as almost to be taken on faith. Let me discuss briefly the nature of some of these assumptions, stressed repeatedly by the President in San Antonio, and many times before.

He said:

> Vietnam is also the scene of a powerful aggression that is spurred by an appetite for conquest.

The American people, and most of the rest of the world, know that the Vietnamese are one people, with an overwhelming desire for national identity, and that they were promised that national identity by the Geneva Conference of 1954. We have collaborated in frustrating that desire because we believed it would result in a Communist-dominated state. But the American people are now asking whether a deep Vietnamese commitment to national unity, which we support in principal throughout the world, can be transformed by the words of the President into "an appetite for conquest" merely because it is led by Communists. The President fails to answer, or even ask, this question.

The President has used the term "moral commitment" to describe American entry into the Vietnam war. Here again the American people, with a profound desire to be guided by morality, are questioning any moral result from this involvement. How can we judge as moral a course which destroys a people we claim to be helping to freedom and democracy? How can it be moral to attempt to convince a people of the rightness of our cause by destroying their villages, corrupting their cultural values, buying their young women, maintaining in power a government with only the most tenuous support of its people, purchasing the support of that government and its supporting elite class by closing our eyes to the most flagrant enrichment of its officers by graft and corruption? Again the President's speech does not answer these questions.

The President attempts in his speech to make the keystone of our involvement the matter of our own security. He says, "But the key to all we have done is our own security." And the American people could be convinced of the worth of our effort if they could see that one point—even if they questioned all other points. But they cannot see how the fate of one-half of a backward Asiatic country can affect the security of the greatest power on earth.

If our security is threatened by the possibility of a neutralist or Communist-leaning South Vietnam, why was it not equally threatened by the militantly Communist North Vietnam? If we are, in fact, threatened by North Vietnam, why do we not act to destroy North Vietnam and replace its government by a military dictatorship favorable to us, as we are doing in South Vietnam? If the loss of South Vietnam would threaten the stability of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, and the rest of Asia and the Pacific, why did not the loss of North Vietnam pose a similar threat?

The fact is that these questions have no satisfactory answer, so they are swept under the table by the President and his spokesmen. Our original support of France in Indochina, and opposition to the nationalist aspirations of that region, was based on our policy of the containment of Russian communism and our fear that the fall of China to communism strengthened the U.S.S.R. We know today that such is not the case. Russia is as threatened by Chinese Communist nationalism as we are, and Vietnamese Communist nationalism is of little aid to Russia. While the facts changed, our policies did not. Instead we created the new specter of Chinese Communist wars of national liberation as the vast, new conspiracy against which to guard. We ignored the fact that wars of national liberation are endemic to mankind, and will flourish wherever a people are repressed. The leadership of such wars may come from a George Washington or a Simon Bolivar, or it may come from a Fidel Castro or a Mao Tse-tung—depending on the course of history. But it will come to every people who see hope for progress only in the violent overthrow of the status quo.

Yet we persist in equating our security as a nation with the repression of revolution, when over most of the world we should be supporting revolution—peaceful, where possible, but revolution nevertheless. Our repeated and stereotyped identification of all revolution as Communist-inspired, and our adherence by our actions to the myth of monolithic communism as the ultimate evil in the world only separates us further from the aspirations of the masses of mankind oppressed by both tyrannical governments and the even worse tyranny of poverty and ignorance.

The true enemy of freedom and democracy is this latter tyranny. The magnitude of this problem can be illustrated simply. If all of Asia were to make economic progress at their present rate for a hundred years they would be further behind the economic level of the United States—assuming that the United States continues to advance at its present rate—than they are today, many times over. If the Asian countries were to progress at twice their present rate of increase in GNP/capita, for a hundred years, their level would still be below what the United States is today. This is the massive fact that overshadows all others in the world today. This is the real threat to the security of the people of the United States. And our insistence on mouthing the cliches of the cold war in the face of this overriding reality is the certain path to our own ultimate loss of that leadership to which we may be entitled by history, and the loss of any security for our people.

The citizens of this country are increasingly aware of this threat to our security, and they look to the President for meaningful answers to these questions. He has neither given the answers nor posed the questions. Instead, he has called the roll of client states whose subservience to our policies we have bought, or pressured, but whose own problems of achieving freedom and democracy, with a few exceptions, remain unsolved, and tried to use their support as justification for our own mistakes. The danger to our children and grandchildren, with which the President and all of us are concerned, is vastly greater in a world of skyrocketing population and decreasing rates of economic progress for the poor nations than from any other possible cause.

The last comment I must make on the President's speech is his repetition of our desire to negotiate, and Hanoi's unwillingness to meet with us. To quote him:

> It is Hanoi's choice—not ours, not the world's—that war continues.

To believe such a statement, as I am sure the President does, requires a total conviction of the rightness of our course in Vietnam. It requires a conviction that the National Liberation Front has no legitimacy in representing some of the aspirations of the people of Vietnam, for we have made it clear we will not negotiate with them. It requires a conviction that they should have no voice in the Government of South Vietnam, or any part of it, for we have made it clear that we will not tolerate such a voice. It requires a conviction that the people of South Vietnam are best served by a government of generals, made rich by their willingness to serve first France and then the United States, for we will consider no other government. It requires a conviction that these values are so great as to justify the military devastation of all Vietnam if necessary, for we have made clear our intention to do this rather than negotiate any alternative possibility. And because Hanoi and the National Liberation Front reject these basic conditions underlying our offer to negotiate unconditionally, we place the blame on them for continuation of the war.

I think that the American people increasingly understand the nature of this impasse, and want it resolved by a simple offer by the President to accept any government for South Vietnam in which all the people vote without coercion, and any candidate may run without fear. They have to date received no such affirmation by the President.

Thus the President's speech, while it revealed his own sincere commitment to the course we are following, gave the country little hope for the success of that course—or even a more convincing justification for it.

Perhaps just by coincidence, shortly after the President spoke, two widely read and greatly respected columnists ap-

peared in print with analyses, drastically different from those of the President, of the war in Vietnam and America's role in the world. Joseph Kraft, returning to the United States after 2 months in Vietnam and elsewhere, wrote a column entitled, "We Can't Win in Vietnam." Calling for a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam, Mr. Kraft says, in two key paragraphs:

Then there is the matter of political objectives. Since the President has never spelled these out in detail, the field has been dominated by men in Washington and Saigon who give the impression that the American aim is an anti-Communist South Vietnamese state.

But the other side will negotiate only if there is some prospect that at some time in some way its political objectives can be obtained. Thus, as a further prelude to talks, Washington and Saigon will have to lower their political objectives. They will have to open a channel whereby the insurgents on the other side can re-enter South Vietnamese political life, and maybe even come to power.

In another column, Walter Lippmann, comparing the role and problems of President Johnson and Charles de Gaulle in a philosophical vein, tries to explain the unpopularity of military and diplomatic adventures abroad. He concludes by saying:

France cannot remake Europe and President Johnson cannot remake Asia. They have to remake France and America.

And if this be isolationism, so be it. It is nevertheless an almost universal human sentiment in the world today.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the entire Joseph Kraft column and the last portion of the Lippmann column at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in these tragic times when no sane man can claim final answers to the problems which confront us, one sometimes fears to speak out at all. Yet this fear has brought us to where we are today. Now is the time to speak out.

WE CAN'T WIN IN VIETNAM—UNITED STATES MUST NEGOTIATE A WAY OUT AND IT WON'T HELP TO PERSONALIZE THE ISSUE AGAINST L. B. J.

(By Joseph Kraft)

Returning to this country after two months in Vietnam and elsewhere, I find one striking change. There has been a dramatic hardening of temper against the President on Vietnam.

What useful purpose this shift of mood can serve is not clear to me. Not that I think the war is going well. On the contrary, I am more than ever convinced that the United States cannot achieve a military victory in Vietnam.

One measure of the outlook is the situation around Danang. For more than two years, that city and its environs have been a base for about 10,000 American Marines. The Marines have been active in the area not only militarily, but equally in civic action programs designed to assert control over the local population.

Still, hardly a night goes by without some small-scale enemy assault on the Marine positions. The attacks generally come from close in—sometimes a mere 1000 yards away. The attackers can come that close only because they have the support of the local population.

This means that our best troops operating in force in not unfavorable terrain over a period of two years have not been able to break up the enemy's local support. At that rate, I do not think the United States will force the other side to fade away for years and years. And thus it seems to me imperative that we negotiate our way out of Vietnam.

But negotiating out, while perhaps possible, is surely not easy. For openers, there has to be a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. Without it, there will be no talks with the other side.

But would there be talks if the bombing stopped? The President is certain there would not be. Some well-informed officials around the world disagree. But even they acknowledge that to yield talks, a stop in the bombing would have to be managed with great skill—particularly as to timing.

The more so because Hanoi would probably use any bombing pause to rush new supplies to its forces. That would increase the vulnerability of American troops, and cause American commanders, not unnaturally, to demand resumption of bombing.

To forestall these demands, American troops would have to be insulated against whatever advantage the other side might take of a bombing halt. They would have to be less exposed—which, at a minimum, means pulling back from the belly-to-belly encounter along the Demilitarized Zone. But deliberately relinquishing territory is not easy either.

Then there is the matter of political objectives. Since the President has never spelled these out in detail, the field has been dominated by men in Washington and Saigon who give the impression that the American aim is an anti-Communist South Vietnamese state.

But the other side will negotiate only if there is some prospect that at some time in some way its political objectives can be obtained. Thus, as a further prelude to talks, Washington and Saigon will have to lower their political objectives. They will have to open a channel whereby the insurgents on the other side can re-enter South Vietnamese political life, and maybe even come to power.

These are the minimal arrangements which have to be made for negotiations to have a chance. No President would find the course easy to follow; a beleaguered one least of all.

And so, while I think President Johnson has made mistakes, while I think he has been led to exaggerate the strategic importance of Vietnam out of all proportion, it does not seem to me to be helpful to personalize the issue.

The sad truth is that for those of us who favor a political settlement the best hope lies in support of that part of the President's instinct which also seeks to resolve the war by negotiations.

UNLIKELY PAIR BOTH PLAY LOSING GAME

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Gallup polls recently have been bad reading both in the Elysee and in the White House. They are showing that popular confidence cannot be won by actions abroad.

By the traditional standards of power politics, President Johnson has all the material resources needed for a successful diplomatic policy. But, unhappily for us all, he has landed this country in the most serious trouble it has had to face for at least a hundred years. And Gen. de Gaulle, the most prophetic and experienced of living statesmen, has somehow entangled himself in costly and dangerous miscalculations both in Europe and in the Middle East.

One is tempted to say that the traditional game of power politics has become unplayable. For not only in Washington and Paris but also in Moscow, Peking and London, the Foreign Offices and the diplomatists are in trouble. The Soviet Union finds itself vulnerable on its long Asian frontier with China and it has made a humiliating hash of its opportunities and its interests in the Middle East.

Britain is in full retreat from what remains of its empire and also from its pretensions and obligations as a world power. Yet Britain has a long travail ahead of it before it will be able to play a satisfying part in Europe.

The powers who feel that they have duties and ambitions to fulfill abroad seem unable to prevail abroad. The United States has to put up with Castro's Cuba and it is unable to carve an independent South Vietnam out of Indochina. The Soviet Union has to put up with Israel. And Britain and West Germany have to put up with the Russians and the Americans.

A FRIGHTENING REVOLUTION

The frustrations of power politics are reflected everywhere in what is a strong tide of isolationist sentiment. To speak of isolationism in this connection, however, is not to say very much that is illuminating. I venture to think that we can begin to say a little more only when we start with the idea that the people everywhere are very preoccupied with the problems, with the pains and the pleasures, which confront them because they are living in the midst of the most radical revolution in the history of mankind.

This revolution is a transformation of the human environment and of man himself by technological progress which, beginning about two centuries ago, has now acquired enormous momentum. It is changing the way men live, not only their work and their houses, their food and their communications and their pleasures but it is changing also the structure of the human family and the chemistry of the human personality.

These changes are bewildering. They are frightening, and it is no wonder that the masses of mankind are too much absorbed in their own lives to care very much about what happens in some other country.

This experience accounts, I think, for the unpopularity of activity abroad. It is also a cause, perhaps the main cause, for the ineffectiveness and the failures of foreign activity. Nations cannot now be ordered around by coercing their governments or cajoling their governments or bribing their governments. For the masses of the people are too much preoccupied with the problem of living in the modern world to respond to and to think about the abstractions, about foreign ideologies and even of distant national interests.

The game of power politics may again become playable some day if mankind can come to terms with the technological revolution. But this will not be in our time, and what we all have to realize—President Johnson and President de Gaulle and Chairman Kosygin and the rest of us is that the solution of the internal problems of modern living must have priority over foreign affairs.

France cannot remake Europe and President Johnson cannot remake Asia. They have to remake France and America.

And if this be isolationism, so be it. It is nevertheless an almost universal human sentiment in the world today.

INCREASE ASSISTANCE TO HOSPITAL DIPLOMA SCHOOLS OF NURSING

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce today along with Mr. CORBETT of Pennsylvania an amendment of the Nurses Training Act of 1964, which provides for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing.

There is no doubt in my mind that with the great shortage of nurses today, we must find a way to assist those schools who are carrying the burden of educating our nurses. With the rising costs of hospital care, and with no relief seen in the near future from even higher costs, I believe we must make this assistance available to our hospital diploma schools of nursing.

It is with great interest and concern that I join Representative FRED ROONEY, Representative CORBETT and many other sponsors of this measure in urging speedy passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I include as part of my remarks a copy of this legislation:

A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 806 of the Public Helath Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 806. (a) In order to prevent further attrition and promote the development of public and nonprofit private diploma schools of nursing, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the four succeeding years to defray a portion of the cost of training students of nursing.

"(b) From the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), the Surgeon General shall pay to each public or nonprofit diploma school of nursing for each fiscal year in the five-year period beginning July 1, 1967, an annual grant of $12,000 for a full-time student enrollment of fifty or fewer, $15,000 for a full-time student enrollment of fifty-one to one hundred, $18,000 for a full-time student enrollment of one hundred and one to one hundred and fifty, $21,000 for a full-time student enrollment of one hundred and fifty-one to two hundred, and $24,000 for a full-time student enrollment of two hundred and one or more; an annual grant not to exceed $6,000 on a 50 per centum-50 per centum matching basis for library resources, and an annual grant of $400 per full-time student. The Surgeon General shall make such amounts available to those diploma schools of nursing as approved by the appropriate State agency.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, a diploma school of nursing shall be deemed accredited upon approval by the appropriate State agency recognized by the Surgeon General.

"(d) That an annual grant of such sums as may be necessary on a 75 per centum-25 per centum Federal-State matching basis be made toward the establishment and operation of a State comprehensive planning committee for nursing education. Such committee shall be appointed by the appropriate officer of each State and its membership shall include equal representation from baccalaureate associate degree and diploma schools of nursing. Such committee should develop a State master plan for nursing education which includes consideration of the following objectives:

"1. avoid costly duplication of programs;

"2. insure strategic location of new, expanding programs;

"3. create and maintain balance among various kinds of educational programs;

"4. provide a balanced supply of all kinds of nurses needed;

"5. determine statewide needs for nursing personnel of all kind on a succession of target dates;

"6. plan an educational system which will provide the needed personnel, with specific recommendations about individual institutions and their capacities;

"7. recommend the means of attracting students and sources of financial support for capital and operating expenses of programs;

"8. maintain continued planning and evaluation of progress.

"(e) For the purpose of this section, the full-time enrollment in any school shall be determined as of February 15 of each fiscal year."

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, added evidence of the growing support for the war on poverty was expressed last week in an editorial of the Westerly Sun of Westerly, R.I.

Two statements in this editorial from a conservative, Republican-oriented newspaper stand out significantly. I quote from the first sentence of the editorial:

Despite the blasts of critics, the War on Poverty must be doing something right.

The second comment in the editorial that drew my attention is—

There is also negative evidence encouraging to the War on Poverty. In the 32 cities that did experience riots, only 16 of the more than 30,000 CAA employees in those cities were arrested for taking part in it.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is telling evidence of the merit and worth of OEO and all of the many community action programs. I do not think we in the House of Representatives can afford to discourage or to disappoint those people who are to benefit by these programs. I also think we cannot afford to deny the many local officials this valuable right hand.

Without objection, I ask for inclusion of this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Westerly (R.I.) Sun, Sept. 28, 1967]

GAINS IN WAR ON POVERTY

Despite the blasts of critics, the War on Poverty must be doing something right.

In 32 cities in which there were no riots or civil disorders this summer, most of the local authorities credited the summer programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for helping to prevent violence.

This is what they told the OEO in a nationwide survey in which OEO inspectors talked to mayors, police chiefs, juvenile judges, heads of local Chambers of Commerce and other leading citizens.

Not one police chief or mayor blamed War on Poverty programs for heightening tensions, and in 15 cities, local Community Action Agencies were praised for calming down bad situations in specific instances.

In 14 cities, municipal police departments and CAAs had joint programs to prevent riots. In eight cities, the juvenile arrest rate went down this summer as a result, it is believed, of increased availability of summer jobs.

There is also negative evidence encouraging to the War on Poverty:

In the 32 cities that did experience riots, only 16 of the more than 30,000 CAA employes in those cities were arrested for taking part in them.

More than $300 million worth of property damage was done in riot cities, says the OEO, yet not one of its 244 buildings in the riot areas was burned or destroyed.

Total damage to Community Action buildings was $1,840 for seven sets of broken windows.

URBAN POVERTY

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, September 25, Mayor Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., of Providence, R.I., in a prepared statement pinpointed the failure of the Republican Party to act constructively in the matter of urban poverty.

I have wondered for some time as to the reason why Republican Governors who favor such urban programs as model cities, rent supplements, and the war on poverty, do not make an extra effort to influence some of the Republican Members of the House who represent their States. I am beginning to feel that, in truth, the Republican Governors are more interested in making political hay at the expense of worthwhile Federal programs rather than undertake an effort to persuade their fellow Republicans in the House to see beyond the 1968 elections:

Mayor Doorley says, and I quote:

It is ironic that Republican Governors have so little influence over their congressional representatives. It is also ironic the Republican Party, which only last August called for more aid to eliminate urban poverty, now one month later is about to destroy the hope and aspiration of all the nation's ghetto dwellers.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Doorley's comments are well timed and speak eloquently of the hypocrisy that is involved in this situation.

Without objection, I include this editorial from the Providence Evening Bulletin in the RECORD:

DOORLEY SLAPS CONGRESS GOP ON POVERTY

Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr. sharply criticized congressional Republicans today for their opposition to antipoverty legislation now before Congress.

The mayor said in a prepared statement news reports indicated the administration-sponsored bill now in the House is in trouble because of the Republican opposition.

He said this is "ironic" in the light of a recent statement by the policy committee of the Republican Governors' Conference that the federal government had failed to allot sufficient funds for its programs dealing with urban poverty.

"It is ironic the Republican governors have so little influence over their congressional representatives," the mayor's statement said. "It is also ironic the Republican Party, which

only last August called for more aid to eliminate urban poverty, now one month later is about to destroy the hope and aspiration of all the nation's ghetto dwellers.

"The politically motivated utterances of the governors' policy committee show clearly the Republicans are more interested in developing a national candidate than they are in helping the impoverished people of the nation's cities.

Mr. Doorley said Providence has one of the most comprehensive poverty programs in the country. He called on the residents of this and other cities to "marshal their resources" against the Republicans.

The Doorley statement came in response to a report from Washington which said an effort in the House education and labor committee to reach bipartisan agreement on a bill had failed, jeopardizing the bill's chances of passage in the House.

"If we can't go on the floor with a bipartisan support, we can't pass a bill," one of the Democratic members said. Actually, observers believe Republican opposition to the bill is so intense the GOP may not support the bill even if Republican members of the committee do.

FORMER U.S. SENATOR CLARENCE C. DILL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent speech by a very distinguished citizen of the State of Washington, former U.S. Senator Clarence C. Dill.

The occasion of his remarks was the 40th anniversary of a luncheon at Saddle Mountain in the Columbia Basin, where pioneers of another era made the plans which later resulted in development of the mighty Columbia River for power and irrigation.

Senator Dill is truly an amazing man and he played a key role in the efforts to launch the development of the Pacific Northwest's water resources.

A native of Ohio, he received his law degree at Ohio Wesleyan University in 1907. After working briefly as a newspaper reporter in Cleveland and as a teacher in Dubuque, Iowa, he came to Spokane, Wash., in 1909 and began the practice of law there in 1910.

His long career in public service began in the following year when he became a deputy prosecuting attorney for Spokane County. He then served in 1913 as private secretary to Gov. Ernest Lister, of Washington, but resigned after a few months to return to Spokane to run for Congress.

When he was elected in 1914 he was the first Congressman to represent the Fifth District which had just been created and he was the first Democrat to be elected to the House from the State of Washington. He served in the 64th and 65th Congresses. He was the youngest Member of the House at the time.

Mr. Speaker, it was more than 50 years ago that this outstanding American represented the same district that I now have the honor to represent.

When his second term expired, he returned to the practice of law. He was elected to the Senate in 1922 and served with distinction for two terms.

Senator Dill served on a special committee which in 1924 investigated the leasing of naval oil reserves.

The Senator was the coauthor of the Dill-White Act, passed in 1927, which established Federal regulation of the radio industry. He also sponsored a 1934 law which established the Federal Communications Commission.

In his Senate career, he ranks in stature with such progressives as Robert LaFollette and Burton K. Wheeler.

Senator Dill's greatest achievement, in the memories of the people of the Pacific Northwest, was his effort in personally persuading President Franklin D. Roosevelt to have the Public Works Administration allocate $63 million to build Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

Low cost power from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dam, downstream on the Columbia, made it possible to develop the aluminum and atomic products industries in the Pacific Northwest during World War II.

Grand Coulee Dam, for which Senator Dill did so much to get started, is now being enlarged with the addition of a third powerhouse that will boost its generating capability from the present 2 million kilowatts to 9.2 million kilowatts. It was my privilege to sponsor legislation in the 89th Congress to authorize the third powerhouse.

Senator Dill has continued his active role in public affairs since his retirement from the Senate. He served on the Washington State Columbia Basin Commission from 1945 to 1948 and was a special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General from 1946 to 1953.

He is widely acclaimed for his abilities as an orator and he regularly receives more invitations to speak than he is able to accept.

Senator Dill continues in the active practice of law in Spokane. His keen mind, vigor, and enthusiasm surpasses that of men half his age.

Mr. Speaker, with this preface I include in the RECORD the text of Senator Dill's address at the Saddle Mountain Luncheon on September 23, 1967:

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SADDLE MOUNTAIN LUNCHEON, SADDLE MOUNTAIN, SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

(By Clarence C. Dill)

A nation or a community without an anniversary is a nation or a community without a history or a heart. The people of the Columbia Basin area have both a history and a heart, and we meet today to celebrate the results of the struggle which this anniversary commemorates.

It is a historic fact also that a nation or a community advances as it develops and uses the resources with which Providence has endowed it. Providence blessed the Pacific Northwest and especially this Columbia Basin area, with oceans of sunshine, vast areas of level land whose soil is super rich and most of all, with the great Columbia River carrying an abundance of clear, unpolluted water from the ice fields of Canada and Glacier National Park, over a rock bottom for nearly all its course.

Those are the resources which Nature provided. The white settlers, and especially their children and grandchildren, with the immigrants from the East and South, who came during the first years of the 20th century, were dreamers and planners. They conceived plans to bring an abundance of water to those vast areas of level dry lands. They planned to change the literally millions of acres of sage brush and sand into God's own gardens with flourishing fruits and unbelievably large production of grains and vegetables. They also dreamed of the great Grand Coulee dam, not only to furnish the necessary water, but also to provide the lowest cost electric power in the world which would bring a great industrial empire along with the agricultural production to the whole Northwest. Those were the people who greeted the 24-man delegation of Congressmen and Senators from Washington, D.C. to inspect the proposed project forty years ago.

It is not my purpose today to review the struggle of forty years ago of the supporters of the so-called gravity plan to bring water from the Pend Oreille Lake, 140 miles away, and the supporters of the pumping plan to build a dam at Grand Coulee which would furnish both unlimited amounts of water and millions of kilowatts of the lowest cost power in the nation.

I was the prime target in public life in this state forty years ago of the Spokesman-Review, the Washington Water Power Company, and allied chambers of commerce and private power companies, but I am thankful I learned long ago never to burden myself with the memories of abuse and misrepresentation in political contests. Hate is a greater burden to the consignor than to the consignee. A man who fights must carry scars and those scars may serve as momentoes of contests lost or won. In this contest they can remind me of the great victory we all won.

Time gives perspective and looking backward I have often thought that probably the fierce opposition of those who opposed the building of Grand Coulee dam was in fact a blessing in disguise because it made the supporters of Grand Coulee work the harder to win. Suffice it to say that the Spokesman-Review, the Chambers of Commerce and those allied with them not only joined in supporting the final drive to have the dam built under Mr. Roosevelt's leadership, but they, private power companies most of all, have profited rather than lost by the miraculous development of the Columbia River.

Returning now to those who provided the luncheon in 1927, they set a table with food and drink here on Saddle Mountain so the Congressional delegation would see thousands of arid acres from this point. Had our dreams of those days not come true, we would not celebrate here today. Men do not celebrate failures. But we did not fail. We persisted and persisted until we found a Moses in the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the president who dared to start the great Grand Coulee dam as a work project with WPA money, without waiting for specific authorization by Congress.

As I listen to this program today describing and depicting the way of life in this region before the water came, we enjoy being reminded of the good old days, but should all realize that the best thing about them is, they're gone. Now my memory recalls the leaders who contributed their time, energy and real money to carry forward the struggle that brought Grand Coulee dam the use of which already amazes the nation and best of all opens the door to the unlimited possibilities of the future.

If those who have gone before can look back and know what happens after they are gone, I'm sure the spirits of Rufus Woods, Billy Clapp, Gale Mathews, Nat Washington, Sr. and the thousands of others they induced to help carry on the fight are looking down upon this scene and rejoicing in the skies. They not only celebrate with us, but are no doubt urging us on to enlarge and improve

the way of life for all the people of the Pacific Northwest.

We still have with us one of that galaxy of leaders, Frank T. Bell, who is here today. He was my secretary in Washington, D.C. He always urged me on to fight continuously for Grand Coulee dam. He defied its opponents and enthused its supporters. I say to you, he did more to help originate and agitate for this great project than any man still living in the Columbia Basin today.

Forty years ago two plans were proposed to bring water to these dry lands. One by gravity and one by pumping. The gravity plan was to bring water by 140 miles of canals from Pend Oreille lake in northern Idaho. We all know now the gravity plan could not have supplied the water needed for this vast project. The dam at Albeni Falls would have impounded only one million acre feet of water. Today, with only 420,000 acres of land under irrigation, the Columbia River is furnishing 2,150,000 acre feet. Each acre of dry land requires five acre feet of water. Thus the gravity plan to bring only one million acre feet would have supplied a total of two hundred thousand acres. How puny and insufficient that seems now. It would have irrigated only one-tenth of the two million acres that will some day be furnished with water from the Columbia River. That two million acres will require at least ten million acre feet for irrigation.

Yet we should not be too scornful of those who worked for the gravity plan simply because they had no conception of the amount of water that would be needed. None of us who then supported the Grand Coulee plan, had even the faintest conception of what the furnishing of low cost power would mean to this region. The use of atomic energy had not even been imagined then. Nobody could foresee a president who would dare to start the great dam without specific authorization by Congress. By so doing, Roosevelt saved at least three or four years in starting the dam Congress would probably have consumed arguing over its authorization. Saving that amount of time enabled the government to provide power for the atomic plant at Hanford in time to produce plutonium, the explosive part of the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima and ended the war. Nowhere else on earth could plutonium have been produced then. Not only that, but it made available large amounts of low cost electricity soon enough to bring the great aluminum plants to the Northwest to produce the aluminum for one third of the airplanes used in the war. When the war was over, private corporations bought and enlarged them and other aluminum plants were built. We could not foresee that this low cost power would bring the great Boeing airplane factories, the largest in the world, and many other manufacturing plants. This low cost power has made possible the distribution of electricity by REAs and PUDs, so that 98% of the farm population of the Northwest is using power furnished by the Bonneville Power Administration.

Our people and our business organizations of every kind have become extremely power minded. Although we have built ten more dams on the Columbia River since Grand Coulee and are storing the flood waters of Canada, the Bonneville Power Administration is now planning five immense atomic energy plants to supply the power that will be needed five to ten years from now. This increased demand for power in the Pacific Northwest has no counterpart in any similar sized area in the world.

It was a rare privilege for me to have had a part in helping to start this great development. I am forever indebted to the people of the state of Washington that they sent me to the United States Senate at the time when the door of opportunity opened and I walked through it, as it were, to present the proposal to Franklin D. Roosevelt, the greatest builder the world has ever known. The Grand Coulee dam is only one of the great material projects he caused to be constructed in all parts of the United States. He did even greater service by the laws he led Congress to enact that created a new world for the plain people of the nation. The guarantee of bank deposits, social security, and old age pension, are institutions which he induced Congress to establish and which revolutionized not only the lives of those then living, but of generations yet unborn.

Those of us who were here forty years ago at the luncheon that marked the high point of the struggle to win Grand Coulee dam, can proudly say, "We were there."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S INITIATIVE TO INVOLVE PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN JOB RETRAINING IS TO BE COMMENDED

Mr. UDALL. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today President Johnson has taken another important step to involve private enterprise in the work of helping to cure the Nation's stubborn domestic problems.

The White House has announced a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of unemployed Americans.

This new program, using existing resources and available funds, will provide new job training opportunities for the unemployed in plants that will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment. The program will also encourage new enterprises combining the resources of large and small businesses working together to provide jobs and jobs training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To coordinate the efforts of the Federal Government the Secretary of Labor has appointed an outstanding American businessman, Mr. William E. Zisch of Aerojet Corp.

The Federal involvement in this program will include SBA loan guarantees for leases by small business; EDA funds for planning and technical assistance; maximum use of surplus lands, factories, and equipment; HEW health and education funds; and Transportation demonstration projects like the pioneering program in Watts.

This test program will involve five cities and two or three rural areas, to be named later.

I believe private industry's willingness to participate in this program stems from the recognition that full employment means a stronger more dynamic economy.

We have growing evidence that American business wants an opportunity to share in building the Nation. Last month, the American insurance industry agreed to commit $1 billion of their funds to invest in jobs and housing in the cities.

A project now underway to use Government surplus lands to fill housing needs will be planned and managed by private developers.

These are very hopeful signs, indeed. For the fact is that Washington cannot go it alone in the massive job of rebuilding American cities or in ridding the Nation of long-term unemployment.

This must be a partnership effort between Government and business. And the record will show that the Johnson administration is doing everything it can to make this partnership bloom and prosper.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent request I include a memorandum from President Johnson to the heads of various Federal agencies announcing this new program:

MEMORANDUM, OCTOBER 2, 1967

To: the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of General Services Administration, the Director of Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrator of Small Business Administration.

We are launching today a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

The heart of this new effort is to reach the forgotten, and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by inadequate education, hindered by years of discrimination, and by-passed by conventional training programs.

To succeed in this venture will take more than promises or good intentions. It will require—on an unprecedented scale—the concerted action and involvement of the private sector, working closely with the Federal Government.

As we embark on this new course, let us be clear about what is involved: our purpose is not to hand out but to help up, to help provide every American the opportunity for a good job at a good wage.

Our goal is to replace the waste and failure of unemployment with the productivity of meaningful work.

We call upon private industry to join us in tackling one of America's most urgent domestic problems. I have no doubt that the private sector will respond. For we have witnessed in the past few months a remarkable series of events which attests to the dedication of American business in meeting the needs of the society in which it flourishes:

On September 12, 1967, the insurance companies in this country agreed to commit $1 billion of their funds for investments in city core areas to improve housing conditions and to finance job creating enterprises. Some of these resources are already financing promising housing projects and insurance company executives and officials of this Administration are working together to develop other projects.

A project has been launched to use surplus Federal lands to meet the housing needs of our cities in which the efforts of private developers will be the most important single element.

A Committee, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser and composed of distinguished industrialists, bankers, labor leaders and specialists in urban affairs is examining every possible means of encouraging the development of a large-scale efficient construction and rehabilitation industry to reclaim the corroded core of the American city.

Upon the recommendation of the Kaiser

Committee we have begun the "Turnkey Plus" project to encourage private industry not only to develop and build, but also to *manage* public housing.

In this effort, we will again attempt to bring the great resources of the private sector to bear on a critical national problem. Through the great talents and energies of private industry, with full support from the Federal Government, we hope to:

Bring new job training opportunities in existing plants to the hard core unemployed.

Create new jobs and new training opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged in plants which will be established in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Encourage new enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to provide jobs and job training opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To initiate this effort, the resources of the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration will be combined to provide maximum assistance and to minimize the added cost of those in private industry willing to assume responsibility for providing training and work opportunities for the seriously disadvantaged.

Initially, nearly $40 million from a wide variety of existing programs will be made available, as will millions of dollars worth of surplus Federal property and excess Federal equipment.

We will offer to private industry:

A full spectrum of aid to assist them in recruiting, counselling, training, and providing health and other needed services to the disadvantaged.

Aid which will enable them to experiment with new ways to overcome the transportation barriers now separating men and women from jobs.

Surplus Federal land, technical assistance and funds to facilitate the construction of new plants in or near areas of concentrated unemployment.

Excess Federal equipment to enable them to train more disadvantaged people.

Assistance to joint enterprises combining the resources of big and small businesses to bring jobs and training opportunities to the disadvantaged.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to direct this test program and insure that all available Federal resources are utilized. The Secretary of Commerce will designate a full-time Special Representative as the single point of contact for private employers participating in this project. The Special Representative will provide employers with one-stop service for the entire Federal Government and will make whatever arrangements are appropriate with the various Federal agencies for all forms of Federal assistance.

The Secretary of Labor will designate a full-time officer in the Manpower Administration to work with the Special Representative of the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the training and employment elements of these projects.

I have also asked the Secretaries of Defense, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration to assist the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor in this test program and to assign a single official in their agencies who will coordinate their efforts in support of this program.

Provision will be made for continuing liaison with local projects and for careful research and evaluation to crystallize field experience into guidelines for future action.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to invite corporations throughout the country to join this new effort to bring meaningful employment to disadvantaged citizens both in existing plants and, where feasible, in new locations near areas of concentrated unemployment.

I have directed each Department and Agency of this Government to give top priority to all phases of this important effort.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JOB CORPS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KAZEN] 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, there are still some people in this country who think that the members of the Job Corps are nothing but a bunch of thugs and roughnecks. The slightest wrongdoing on the part of a Job Corps man is cited as absolute proof that the entire program should be abolished. The tremendous good that the Job Corps has done is often ignored. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the headlines we would see if a Job Corps man was killed at one of the centers in a violent struggle? Well, there have been eight of these young men killed in a violent struggle and I think it is time that the Congress and the people are aware of it. These young men were killed in action in Vietnam. There have been several more wounded. They are among the 346 former Job Corps men who have served their country in that distant land.

The Laredo Times recently carried an article about one of these brave young men, Mr. Donald Morris of Plains, Tex., who was killed in June. Donald Morris had been turned down for military service because he was not qualified. He joined the Job Corps and as a result of the training he received, he was able to enlist in the Armed Forces. More than 6,600 of his colleagues have done the same.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when we are presented with the tragic spectacle of young men burning their draft cards and refusing to fight for their country, the knowledge that there are other young men who are willing to work for the privilege to serve their country fills me with pride. It is time we took note of the many Job Corps men who make good instead of the few that do not. At this point I insert the article in the RECORD:

JOB CORPS DORM NAMED FOR CORPSMAN

HUNTSVILLE.—Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman Friday helped dedicate a new Waverly Job Corps dormitory named for a former corpsman who was killed in action in Vietnam.

The dormitory was named for Donald Morris, who was at the Waverly center from November, 1965, to August, 1966.

He was killed last June in Vietnam while attempting to disarm a faulty hand grenade. He was buried in his hometown of Plains, Tex.

"We are here to do the best we can in our small way to recognize his (Morris') courage, patriotism and unselfish devotion to his country," Freeman said.

Morris was originally turned down for military service, so he joined the Job Corps.

Freeman said after his work with the corps, Morris had no difficulty enlisting in the Army.

Freeman told a group of 200 corpsmen the work the Job Corps is doing is not busy work, "but constructive work which will give future enjoyment to hundreds of thousands of Americans."

UNDERSTANDING OF RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the rent supplement program is unique as it proposes to bind private enterprise and the Federal Government in a dynamic partnership to provide housing for low-income families. Private enterprise has responded with enthusiasm to this partnership. Recently, the life insurance industry committed $1 billion to attack the problems of urban slums, most of which will be used in the rent supplement program. When making this announcement Mr. Gilbert Fitzhugh said:

> Existing programs offer many opportunities for constructive action. For example, the rent supplement program is probably the area into which we will move most rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, too long we have neglected to provide incentives for private enterprise to invest in solving urban problems. The rent supplement program is designed to provide such incentives. It will reduce Government control over housing construction and management. It will stimulate private investment. And, most important, it will greatly increase our supply of decent housing for low-income families.

Despite these benefits, the House of Representatives failed to support rent supplements. Many people have been unable to comprehend this lack of support. For example, a recent editorial in the Coatesville, Pa., Record noted:

> There are times when Congressional economizing leaves us puzzled and disturbed. The action of the House in refusing to approve any funds for the rent supplement program for fiscal year 1968 is a good example. One can only conclude that the legislators didn't understand the program, or that they didn't think through the alternatives to it.

Since I believe that the Coatesville Record editorial clearly and concisely sets forth the benefits of the rent supplement program, I would like to share it with my colleagues by placing it in the RECORD at this point:

COSTLY ECONOMIZING

There are times when Congressional economizing leaves us puzzled and disturbed. The action of the House in refusing to approve any funds for the rent supplement program for fiscal year 1968 is a good example. One can only conclude that the legislators didn't understand the program, or that they didn't think through the alternatives to it.

Decent housing for low-income families is

an urgent need in nearly every city in the nation. If business can't fill that need, then it logically follows that government will do so, sooner or later.

The fact is that the business community—builders, bankers and brokers—support the rent supplement program. So do mayors, city managers, labor, churches and other organizations. The program has this wide-based support because it represents a working partnership between government and private enterprise. The features of the program are:

It is available for new or rehabilitated housing, privately financed, and privately managed. The property stays on the local tax rolls.

Only the really poor are eligible. Income limits are the same as for public housing, but tenants are not required to move if income rises. The supplement is simply reduced or eliminated.

It tends to reduce government control over housing construction and management.

It stimulates private investment. To date some $500 million in private financing has been triggered by the $32 million of federal funds approved for rent supplement payments.

In short, the program joins public and private resources in a common attack on the program of developing the housing which low-income Americans in cities large and small so badly need.

The Senate should approve the proposed $40 million for the rent supplement program in 1968, and thus give the House a chance to reconsider its earlier action.

Both local and federal tax burdens will benefit in the long run.

RED SOX WIN PENNANT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we in this body lead a busy life, caught up with the problems of our country and the world. We do not often take time out to contemplate the truly beautiful and wonderful things in life. I would like now to share with you one of the most delightful things to have happened in many years. It concerns a great American tradition.

The tradition of which I speak is the pennant race, and lest any of the Members of this body were in some isolated area of Antarctica during the past weekend and have not heard the news, let me inform you that the Boston Red Sox won the American League pennant and will play the National League champions in the World Series.

This pennant race was the closest one in the history of the American League. Many of you, especially those who have the honor of representing Detroit, Chicago, and Minnesota, will understand the tension and anxiety that accompanied this close race.

It was so close for so long with only one game in the loss column separating four teams. Three of these teams went to the wire and it was only the last game that decided the whole contest.

And, of course, the reason I am standing here now is that the Boston Red Sox won that game. Now, the competition was fierce this year and all the teams were in fine shape, but I must insist that the best team won.

The last time the Sox had the pennant was in 1946. Last year they finished in ninth place and I am told that the Las Vegas odds were against them 100 to 1. Well, that only served to spur them on to greater heights. In the past two weeks, they vacillated between 1st and 4th place, but they could not be counted out.

But I am not going to go on and tell you things you can read in the sports pages—about 12 and 22 inning games, about 44 home runs or records in RBI's. I would prefer to tell you something about the greater Boston area's reaction to this victory. It was fantastic.

The people in Boston were completely behind this team. They broke the all-time attendance record. There were sell-out crowds with more people than seats and, it seemed, more voices than people.

On Sunday a 12-year-old boy climbed to the top of the time clock. Now those of you who do not know Fenway Park will not understand, but let me assure you, it is incredible—and before Sunday it was impossible. But he did not have a ticket, and like everyone else around, he wanted to see the game.

And what a game to see. It was everybody's hour. Dick Williams did a splendid job, bringing the team from ninth place to the pennant in 1 year. Tom Yawkey—who stood behind the Red Sox through the years—finally had his dreams come true. So did the coaches who put time, energy, lots of hard work and good advice into everything they did. But when you come down to it, there are only nine men out there—and these are the nine best. They put everything they had into it, and they brought home the pennant.

And the people of the Boston area, of all of Massachusetts, were justly appreciative. Fenway Park was covered with people; the team could not get back to the locker room. When I left Boston this morning there was a smile on everyone's face and, more often than not, a piece of Fenway Park in his hand.

There are hundreds of stories about these games and about the men that won yesterday. I will not repeat them. The names of the Red Sox are household words by now—they should be. But this whole season was a team effort: great pitching, great batting, great fielding. The statistics show what a wonderful season it was. There was nothing lacking in this team. They had every component and worked together and worked smoothly.

I am afraid no one less than a poet could describe the beauty of Sunday's game. The score was 5 to 3 and for once in our busy lives there was true beauty and happiness.

But now, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we must get back to work, to serious business, as we all ceaselessly endeavor to get tickets to the Series.

I would like to share one more part of the Red Sox and their wonderful victory with you. The newest of the great stars of baseball, the greatest major leaguer of today is a young man who sounds and looks like a baseball player should. I would like to include in the RECORD the well-written article in today's Boston Globe, by Harold Kaese. It illustrates one of the reasons the Sox won the pennant!

YAZ CLUTCH STREAK HAS NO PARALLEL

(By Harold Kaese)

Like a rocket that starts from a spark, traces a fiery path into the night until it explodes in a shower of light, the Red Sox have dazzled a nation by winning the American League pennant.

Whoever thought that so modest a vehicle as this team guided by Dick Williams would climb into the baseball sky to deliver streamers of excitement and the incandescent confetti of inspired effort?

"I thought we would finish about 10 games over .500 and in fourth or fifth place," said Tom Yawkey seriously, as his players drenched each other with beer after the climatic 5-to-3 victory over the Minnesota Twins.

But Williams, his manager, quipped, "I said all along we'd finish over .500."

And now for the great anti-climax—the World Series.

No known Red Sox hitter ever had a final two weeks to compare with those the Yaz delivered in the hottest stretch of the American League's hottest pennant race.

The Series can do a lot for Boston, for the Red Sox, for still unidentified heroes who may be lurking in the wings, but what can it do for Jim Lonborg, for Carl Yastrzemski?

Tris Speaker may have done it, or Duffy Lewis, Chick Stahl or some other Red Sox giant of long ago, but Ted Williams didn't, nor Jimmy Foxx, nor Vern Stephens.

As the Sox won eight out of the last 12 games for their eighth pennant, Yaz made 23 hits in 44 times at bat for an average of .523, hit safetly in 11 of the games, drove in 16 runs, scored 14 and hit five homers.

In the two all-or-nothing games against the Twins, he made seven hits in eight times up.

If any player in baseball history—Babe Ruth, Rogers Hornsby, Ty Cobb, Lou Gehrig—ever had a two-week clutch production to equal Yastrzemski's, let the historians bring him forth.

Certainly no other Globe writer has done anything comparable on the athletic field, even though Leonard Fowle and John Ahern have won boat races and Bud Collins owns some tennis trophies.

Of Yastrzemski, Dick Williams said, "I never saw a player have a season like it."

And Rico Petrocelli said, "You'll never know how much he meant to us. We just knew he was going to hit."

And Tom Yawkey said, "At no time has this club ever been close to trading Yastrzemski.

In the Red Sox clubhouse, Yastrzemski wept from joy; in the visiting clubhouse, the Twins wept from Yastrzemski.

On Yawkey's 35 Red Sox teams, he has had few inspirational players. Joe Cronin, Ted Williams, Dom DiMaggio. These men wore the capes of baseball greatness—but none approached Yastrzemski for combining the qualities of baseball proficiency and on-the-field leadership. Baseball is a game in which individual players seldom fire up a lot of other players, but Yastrzemski did it this season.

He did it with his arms, legs and sharp eyes, with his desire, with his optimism and determination. And even though a ball rolled through him for an unearned run Sunday, how fitting it was for him to cut down Bob Allison trying to advance the tying run to second on what looked like a double into the left field corner.

The Red Sox put it together this season, which is why they won, but nobody put it together the way Yaz did, and not many in the annals of baseball ever have.

Strategically, the games with the Twins revolved around that fact that the Red Sox pitched around Harmon Killebrew, whereas the Twins did not pitch around Yastrzemski.

Killebrew got three walks and four hits; Yaz got no walks and seven hits. The Red Sox were careful; the Twins took chances. So today the Red Sox are champions of the American League, as they also were in 1903, 1904, 1912, 1915, 1916, 1918 and 1946.

Now they have a chance to even the score with the Cardinals for the only World Series they have ever lost, and while the Cardinals look like the better team on paper, I would no more bet against Yastrzemski, Lonborg and the Red Sox than I would bet against the United States Marines.

BUREAU OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS CLEARS UP OFFICER BORROWING QUESTION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Public Law 90–44, the so-called Officer Borrowing Act, was signed by President Johnson, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions issued two interpretations that have been strongly questioned by a number of credit unions.

The act was designed to ease the restrictions placed on the borrowing powers of directors of the supervisory and credit committees of Federal credit unions. Prior to enactment of this law, these individuals could borrow only up to the amount of their unencumbered shares or shares pledged on their behalf. The new law allows these individuals to borrow up to $5,000 without the necessity of pledging their own shares, provided that the other elements of the law, such as adequate collateral, are met.

The Bureau, in analyzing the law, determined that all loans made by officer-borrowers would have to be approved by the board of directors of the credit union. While it is true that it was the intent of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House that Board approval be obtained on most loans, it was never the intention that loans fully secured by the officer-borrower's shares be subject to Board approval, unless the individual credit union felt such approval was necessary. It was felt that such loans could be approved by the normal approval standards of most credit unions. Under this arrangement, a loan is approved by the credit committee or the credit committee may delegate certain lending authority to a loan officer. Such an arrangement would in no way jeopardize the safeguards contained in the officer borrowing legislation since these loans are fully secured by the shares of the borrower. Thus, they are backed by the best possible collateral, and in the event that the borrower defaults, the shares may be impressed for payment of the loan.

The Bureau also determined that any loan made by an officer-borrower in excess of the $5,000 limitation contained in Public Law 90–44 must be fully secured in its entirety by the shares of the borrower or shares pledged on his behalf. This was not the intent of the Banking and Currency Committee and the report on the legislation correctly reflects this intent. Under present law, any loan in excess of $750 must be fully collateralized. However, the law does not require that collateral be only in the form of pledged shares. It may be in the form of stocks and bonds, a chattel mortgage or other acceptable collateral. It was the intention of the committee that loans in excess of $5,000 made by officer-borrowers be collateralized by pledged shares for that amount in excess of $5,000. Thus, a loan for $5,500 to an officer-borrower could be made on the following basis, provided the credit union agreed to such terms: $750 on an unsecured basis—the amount from $750 to $5,000 fully secured by collateral acceptable to the credit union and approved by law and the $500 in excess of $5,000 secured by the unencumbered shares of the officer-borrower on shares pledged on his behalf.

Thus, the law is intended to require that only the amount above $5,000 be secured by the shares of the officer-borrower.

Because of the problems that the Bureau's interpretations have caused, I consulted with the ranking majority member of the Banking Committee, Mr. MULTER, and the ranking minority member Mr. WIDNALL, and on September 19, 1967, I wrote to Mr. J. Deane Gannon, Director of the Board of Federal Credit Unions asking that he restudy the situation. A copy of that letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1967.

Mr. J. DEANE GANNON,
Director, Board of Federal Credit Unions, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GANNON: It has come to my attention that the Bureau, following enactment of the recent credit union officer borrowing legislation, has issued the following regulations in connection with this new law:

1. Officers, directors and members of the supervisory and credit committees must file detailed financial statements and receive Board approval before obtaining a loan if that loan is secured by the shares of the officer-borrower or unencumbered shares pledged on behalf of the officer-borrower.

2. Loans in excess of $5,000 to officer borrowers must be secured in the entire amount of the loan by unencumbered shares of the officer-borrower or shares pledged in his behalf.

Because of the hardship that these two rules would work on credit union officers, and the fact that officer borrowing legislation was designed to ease borrowing provisions for credit union officers, I have consulted with Mr. Multer, the ranking Majority member of the Banking Committee and Mr. Widnall, the ranking Minority member of the Banking Committee, to ascertain their feelings on the Bureau's rulings as they relate to the law.

Both Mr. Multer and Mr. Widnall, as well as myself, are of the belief that the law as amended by the officer borrowing legislation does not provide a basis for the Bureau's rulings. This position is further backed up on Page 3 of the Banking and Currency Committee's report on H.R. 9682 which reads in part:

("H.R. 9682 would continue the present credit union officer borrowing requirements contained in the Federal Credit Union Act. But in addition, H.R. 9682 would allow Federal credit union directors and members of the supervisory and credit union committees to borrow up to $5,000 without the requirement of pledging shares. The requirement that any loan which exceeds $750 shall be fully secured for that portion of the loan in excess of $750 remains unchanged. Such security might be in the form of pledged shares or in other collateral authorized by the Act and the regulations of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.")

Thus, the Act is intended to liberalize the borrowing provisions for credit union officers and in no way is designed to make the borrowing provisions more restrictive. In addition, the report makes it clear that collateral for officer borrowing loans may be in the form of pledged shares but this is not a mandatory requirement.

Since Mr. Multer offered the amendments to the bill contained in the credit union officer borrowing section, I have withheld writing this letter until I had an opportunity to discuss the matter in depth with him. He confirms the belief of both Mr. Widnall and myself that his amendments, and the resulting legislation, have been misinterpreted by the Bureau in promulgating the regulations for the legislation.

In light of this, it would be appreciated if the Bureau would restudy its regulations so that they may conform to the spirit of the legislation.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

Today I have learned that Mr. Gannon has restudied the Bureau's position and has determined that with regard to officer-borrowing loans that are fully secured by pledged shares, the board of directors of the credit union may, if it desires, delegate the authority to approve such loans to the credit committee of the credit union and the credit union, in turn, may further delegate the authority to approve such loans to a loan officer. It must be remembered that this delegation is only for loans that are fully secured by shares of the officer-borrower or shares pledged on his behalf.

At the same time, Mr. Gannon assures me that he is carefully looking into the other problem, the loans in excess of $5,000. It is my hope that the Bureau will find a solution to this problem in the near future.

I want to commend Mr. Gannon for the expeditious treatment that he gave this important matter, one that affects the officers of every Federal credit union.

WORDS OF PRAISE FOR NORMAN S. PAUL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, from this floor many words of praise have been spoken. The deeds and accomplishments of great men have been recognized, and their names have been called before the Nation for acclaim.

Today, I would add the name of Norman S. Paul, Under Secretary of the Air Force, who soon will be leaving the Defense Department to return to private life.

Mr. Speaker, Norman Paul has spent more than 20 years in the service of his country. As a Navy officer in World War II, he took part in combat operations in the southwest Pacific. In April 1948, only 2 years out of the University of Virginia Law School, he joined the legal staff of the Economic Cooperation Administration. The Marshall plan was then just beginning to get underway.

In the ECA and in its successor agencies he functioned in a number of administrative positions dealing with military and economic assistance matters in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Next in the Foreign Operations Administration from 1953 to 1955, he was first the Regional Director for the Near East, Africa, and South Asia and later Deputy Director for Congressional Relations. It was at this time that many of us here in Congress began to know and appreciate this dedicated and able gentleman. And it was in 1955 that he received the William A. Jump Memorial Award presented annually to an employee of the executive branch, 36 years of age or younger, for "exemplary service in public administration."

Recognized as an outstanding manager he was marked for greater responsibilities. For 5 years, from 1955 to 1960, Norman Paul served the Central Intelligence Agency as Legislative Counsel and in other capacities.

Then in January 1961 Secretary of Defense McNamara appointed him Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. Subsequently, he was appointed by President Kennedy in July 1962 to be Assistant Secretary of Defense—Manpower. That position he held until October 1, 1965, the date he became Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Military men and civilians alike in the Air Force are quick to say that the Air Force was indeed fortunate in 1965 to have a man of Mr. Paul's talents and experience appointed as its No. 2 leader backing up Secretary Harold Brown. The years during which they have teamed together have been years of strengthening and improving the Air Force. I know from personal observation and by confirmation from a large number of people in the Pentagon that the combination of Brown and Paul has been one of the best ever to head the Department of the Air Force. Their individual talents complemented and blended to give the Air Force invaluable leadership.

Norman Paul's wise counsel, his astute judgment, his perceptiveness, objectivity, and understanding will be missed by the Air Force staff and his associates in the Office of the Secretary. Those officers and airmen who felt something deeper and more profound about the Air Force after they had met him in Europe, in the United States, and in Vietnam—all over the world—will miss him too. Surely this is one of the greatest rewards of a true public servant—and Norman S. Paul, a man dedicated to the service of his country and his countrymen—is a great and true public servant.

I take this opportunity to wish him well in his future endeavors. I thank him on behalf of the Congress, the people and the Nation for his contributions to U.S. security.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, representing, as I do, a district which contains a major university, the University of California at Berkeley, I am deeply interested in the problems of education and the role of the university in the community.

Thus, it was with special interest that I read a recent article in the Berkeley Gazette that deals with the contribution a major university can make to its home city. As Dr. Neil Sullivan, the respected Berkeley superintendent of schools points out, university resources are often not fully drawn upon by the local school systems.

We have been fortunate in Berkeley that the University of California has contributed to university demonstration schools and to the school resource volunteer program. These projects serve both the university and the community.

The vast resources, the manpower and facilities of the universities of our country are, in the main, untapped by surrounding communities. We can no longer assume that the university is removed from the problems of its community environment. We have, in fact, received strong indications from the universities themselves that they reject this insular role.

Dr. Sullivan points out that he feels—

No university in the country has fully utilized its potential for aiding surrounding communities and their schools.

I, therefore, wish to insert Dr. Sullivan's article at this point and urge attention to the specific suggestions he makes for involving universities in the community:

THE ROLE OF A UNIVERSITY IN LOCAL SCHOOL PLANS

(By Neil Sullivan)

A major university in a city can be a major benefit to that city's school system. But there are wide variations in the degree to which universities accept their responsibilities and involve themselves in the life of the surrounding community Since its property is tax exempt, Harvard University, for example, takes its responsibility so seriously that it voluntarily makes a contribution to the city treasury of Cambridge, Massachusetts. Another example is a major midwestern university, standing aloof as the school system of the suburban community in which it is located, wrestled with a major problem in human relationships. In most places the helpfulness of the university in the community and its local school system falls somewhere between these extremes. I know of no case, however, where a university and its surrounding public schools are taking advantage of their potential helpfulness to each other.

Here in Berkeley we have been relatively fortunate in the help our school district has received from the University of California. The presence of that institution in our city has been a distinct and valuable asset to our school district's program. Chancellor Heyns has clearly demonstrated his support for public education and his willingness to help us. Other offices and departments as well as individual members of the university community have likewise made palpable contributions to the public schools of this city. These contributions cover a wide range.

The program of three of our elementary schools is greatly enriched by their designation as "University Demonstration Schools." Each year approximately 155 student teachers from the University (in addition to 57 from other teacher training institutions in the area) participate in our schools. Many members of the University faculty live in Berkeley and have given generously of their time on citizens' committees, and in individual consultation. Some have made valuable contributions as members of the Board of Education. Many special projects sponsored by the University are operated within our schools. Various classes and activities at the University are made available to our high school students who can profit from them.

In addition to the help we receive from faculty members of the University, hundreds of U.C. students donate their time each year to our School Resource Volunteer program. Their volunteer services provide a genuine help to our classroom teachers in enriching the educational opportunity of the boys and girls in our schools.

This description of some of the ways in which our local University assists the public schools serves to indicate that my following remarks are not directed specifically at the University of California. However, I feel that no university in the county has fully utilized its potential for aiding surrounding communities and their schools.

Dr. Harold Howe, Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, has taken a strong position in urging universities to become more involved in their surrounding communities. I concur and feel that there are several areas in which this kind of help needs to be expanded.

1. Every major university contains on its staff an unusually high concentration of brains and experience in virtually every field. This brain power should be brought more fully to bear upon the problems faced in local communities. Even in times of no crisis, local community officials can profit by the expertise of the typical university faculty in developing goals and plans for community life.

2. Every major university contains extensive facilities for public meetings. These facilities range from rooms for small, informal discussion groups to space for massive public forums. These facilities, when not being used by University classes, should be made available for conferences and meetings dealing with community problems.

3. The massive research facilities, both human and material, should be used more fully in studying the important questions facing surrounding communities and their schools. In some instances research projects might be carried out by University staff members; in other cases the facilities could be made available to surrounding school districts and other community agencies for use

in research developed by the agency involved.

4. Universities frequently have access to sources of funds that can be used for the benefit of the surrounding communities and schools. This applies both to the research projects and action projects that could be sponsored by the University and operated within the schools. We have several projects of joint sponsorship currently in operation. However, this field should be explored more fully.

5. One of the most vital aids the universities could give to surrounding schools is the training and retraining of teachers. University schools of education regularly turn out teachers who are technically competent in imparting academic subject matter. But much more is required to prepare teachers for their vital role in a racial, intercultural urban center. New teachers need a better understanding of the varied backgrounds of the children they teach.

I wonder how many potentially good teachers have been lost to the profession because their initial baptism into teaching came in an environment for which they were totally unprepared? It is neither fair to the teacher nor to the children to send eager but unsophisticated young teachers into difficult situations before giving them the kind of background necessary to cope with such difficulties. And the problem is not limited to new teachers.

Our profession is so dynamic that methods, skills and attitudes common in one era can be totally inappropriate in another. Even the best of school staffs frequently need retraining.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. CABELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. ECKHARDT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. KUYKENDALL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. PETTIS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. BRASCO), for today, 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:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 45 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY, for 30 minutes, on October 3.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK), for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. UDALL), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POLLOCK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. HUNT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UDALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; and

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 29, 1967, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13026. An act to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 3, 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:

1119. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1120. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of August 1967, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967, and to the Presidential Determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1121. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of opportunities for improvement in administration of the contract for operation of the National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colo., National Science Foundation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1122. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of inventory accounting systems for aeronautical equipment, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1123. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for procedures to preclude more than just compensation in acquiring oil interests, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1124. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the examination function of the small business investment company program, Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1125. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 127 of title 28, United States Code, to define more precisely the territory included in the two judicial districts of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1126. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Richard C. Meckler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1127. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according beneficiaries of petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1128. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, as amended, to extend the period of time within which the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources is to submit its final report and to provide for a fixed expiration date for the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1129. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provision of 6 U.S.C. 14; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1130. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 11, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Pensacola

Bay and Bayou Texar, Pensacola, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950, no authorization by Congress recommended as the desired improvements have been accomplished by other interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

1131. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 21, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Silver Lake Harbor, N.C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 13, 1956, no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been approved for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 306. An act to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education (Rept. No. 725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee of conference. H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 726). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 938. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 853, joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 727.) Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 13249. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. PELLY, Mrs. MAY, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. MEEDS):

H.R. 13250. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 13251. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13252. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13253. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13254. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 13255. A bill to allow a limited credit against Federal income tax for certain deposits in restricted educational accounts and for expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 13256. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and Mr. RHODES of Arizona):

H.R. 13257. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13258. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13259. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 13260. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into and renew reciprocal agreements for police mutual aid on behalf of the District of Columbia with the local governments in the Washington metropolitan area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 13261. A bill to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13262. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13263. A bill to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H.R. 13264. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 861. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 862. Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary neighborhood action crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban slum dwellers in preventing riots; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.J. Res. 863. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H. Con. Res. 516. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 517. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to United States policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 13265. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Orecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 13266. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Z. Assadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13267. A bill for the relief of Agostino Maggiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13268. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Allegra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 13269. A bill for the relief of Byung Il Chang; 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:

165. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Junior Order United American Mechanics, Louisville, Ky., relative to efforts to settle the Vietnamese war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

166. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to distribution of introduced bills; to the Committee on House Administration.

167. Also, petition of the City Council of Orange, Calif., relative to governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

168. Also, petition of the City Council of Whittier, Calif., relative to a Federal tax-sharing program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

169. Also, petition of City Council of Gardena, Calif., relative to governmental tax sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.