Ada B. Williams, Hart Lot, N.Y., in place of L. L. McGinn, retired.
Helen B. Santay, Henrietta, N.Y., in place of H. M. Finegan, retired.
Thomas P. O'Toole, Hensonville, N.Y., in place of J. D. Chatfield, retired.
Merwin W. Jester, Meridale, N.Y., in place of E. B. Bisbee, retired.
James L. Bloomfield, Meridian, N.Y., in place of M. D. Tabor, retired.
Ernest C. Warga, South Salem, N.Y., in place of B. R. Fellows, retired.
Betty J. Kelver, Wales Center, N.Y., in place of E. A. Kelver, retired.
Walter F. Brady, Watertown, N.Y., in place of H. C. Hager, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert E. Sharpe, Greensboro, N.C., in place of J. T. Moore, retired.
Charles C. Brown, Sr., Kittrell, N.C., in place of L. B. Ellis, retired.
Paul D. Johnson, Jr., Siler City, N.C., in place of H. B. Siler, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

George J. Lemieux, Rolla, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Bateson, retired.

OHIO

Joseph L. Clark, Amlin, Ohio, in place of R. M. Patch, retired.
Homer A. Crecelius, Bellevue, Ohio, in place of G. T. Messig, retired.
Darrell E. Fawley, Chillicothe, Ohio, in place of, P. F. Ralston, retired.
Forest A. Baird, Chippewa Lake, Ohio, in place of F. A. Taylor, retired.
Edward J. Hinde III, Huron, Ohio, in place of E. G. Roswurm, retired.
Don M. Davis, Minerva, Ohio, in place of R. J. Davis, retired.
Keith L. Rutledge, Rockford, Ohio, in place of B. V. Tilburg, retired.
Charles F. Smith, Utica, Ohio, in place of G. C. Rine, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Thomas L. Detherage, Fairland, Okla., in place of B. F. Cooksey, retired.
John I. Washecheck, Sr., Piedmont, Okla., in place of I. L. Snyder, retired.
Harry J. Frasco, Savanna, Okla., in place of Bessie Gossett, retired.
Denver L. Turner, Wister, Okla., in place of R. R. McCarver, retired.

OREGON

Jean C. McDougall, Deadwood, Oreg., in place of I. B. Heavrin, retired.
Patricia M. Hescock, Fort Klamath, Oreg., in place of A. G. Brattain, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Florence M. Hannan, Bradfordwoods, Pa., in place of N. D. Mashey, retired.
Raymond C. Hall, Coal Center, Pa., in place of L. M. Cole, retired.
John M. Dranzo, Cokeburg, Pa., in place of E. L. Russell, deceased.
Genaro G. Landi, Cresco, Pa., in place of R. V. Hawk, deceased.
Alvin C. Brady, East McKeesport, Pa., in place of S. H. Ward, retired.
Elzer N. Coates, Jr., High Spire, Pa., in place of D. C. Miller, removed.
Victor E. Blank, Kinzers, Pa., in place of M. A. Trout, transferred.
Rayburn R. Krause, Laurys Station, Pa., in place of H. W. Young, deceased.
Dorothy J. Osterberg, McKean, Pa., in place of M. S. Smith, retired.
John H. Schaffer, Millersburg, Pa., in place of W. L. Rothermel, retired.
James W. Mengel, Mount Pleasant Mills, Pa., in place of R. B. Lesher, retired.
Anson L. Bigham, Normalville, Pa., in place of G. E. Shank, retired.
Harold C. Lorah, Oley, Pa., in place of S. L. Rothenberger, retired.
Myra B. Pifer, Tarrs, Pa., in place of S. M. Gilpin, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

David L. Benson, Fairforest, S.C., in place of R. A. Dobson, retired.
Eugene Craven, Joanna, S.C., in place of D. M. Carr, retired.
Marise B. DeVore, Kinards, S.C., in place of V. C. Oxner, retired.
Donald A. Yongue, Orangeburg, S.C., in place of J. C. Cauthen, retired.
Duncan L. Crawley, Jr., Ruby, S.C., in place of Maynette Streater, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Merlon M. Kotila, Frederick, S. Dak., in place of P. C. Heinzen, deceased.
Raymond F. Cerney, Geddes, S. Dak., in place of O. V. Bruner, retired.
Dale N. Rezac, Highmore, S. Dak., in place of C. V. Hill, retired.
Delmar J. Nelson, Rosholt, S. Dak., in place of A. H. Fogel, retired.
Charles R. Swartz, Wessington, S. Dak., in place of F. D. Fitch, retired.

TENNESSEE

Roe H. Price, Erie, Tenn., in place of R. E. Wicker, retired.

TEXAS

Louise E. Baker, Barnhart, Tex., in place of W. D. Kessler, retired.
Ruby E. Seat, Cayuga, Tex., in place of A. W. Johnson, retired.
Armando E. Gonzalez, Edcouch, Tex., in place of L. B. Doshier, retired.
Jack D. Watson, Fort Worth, Tex., in place of R. T. Cowan, retired.
W. Kenneth Suddeth, Hubbard, Tex., in place of E. H. Brown, retired.
Donovon A. Boyett, Moran, Tex., in place of J. M. Cottle, deceased.
Mark A. Phillips, Jr., Port Lavaca, Tex., in place of H. J. Runk, resigned.
Ross Hodges, Ranger, Tex., in place of C. M. Ohr, retired.
John C. Gregg, Santa Anna, Tex., in place of J. L. Strother, Jr., deceased.
Lloyd E. Million, Jr., Stamford, Tex., in place of E. B. Britton, retired.
Charles E. Baum, Whitesboro, Tex., in place of C. E. McFarland, transferred.

UTAH

Carlene N. Reed, Manila, Utah, in place of J. H. Harper, retired.
Laurella D. Holley, Tropic, Utah, in place of M. L. Cope, retired.

VIRGINIA

Herbert D. Jones, Coeburn, Va., in place of R. G. Boatright, retired.
George A. Johnson, Fort Blackmore, Va., in place of O. A. Quillen, retired.
Leon R. Waters, Luray, Va., in place of H. H. Price, resigned.
Cecil W. Wood, Meadows of Dan, Va., in place of C. A. Reynolds, retired.
Daniel R. Lynn, Randolph, Va., in place of M. J. Vaughan, retired.
Mary E. Moshenek, Ringgold, Va., in place of D. B. Bennett, retired.
Katherleene D. Rountree, Whaleyville, Va., in place of A. R. Knight, retired.

WASHINGTON

Gloria P. Wharton, Carlsborg, Wash., in place of E. M. McNamara, retired.
Billy M. Moyer, Dayton, Wash., in place of C. G. Johnson, retired.
George I. Simmons, Kennewick, Wash., in place of W. A. Woehler, retired.
Louis L. Valentine, Mount Vernon, Wash., in place of C. F. Shrauger, retired.
John W. Hull, Port Orchard, Wash., in place of D. M. Corliss, retired.
Leona M. Wing, Tracyton, Wash., in place of A. H. Grant, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Glenn L. Crane, Capon Bridge, W. Va., in place of Gertrude Ward, retired.
Stephen J. Moore, Leon, W. Va., in place of Lucille Jividen, retired.
James L. Scarberry, Ona, W. Va., in place of Sam Stinson, retired.
Carl W. Lang, Philippi, W. Va., in place of Doyle Phillips, retired.
Earl F. Wellman, Prichard, W. Va., in place of B. F. Adkins, retired.
Johanna M. Gaudino, Triadelphia, W. Va., in place of W. P. Kahl, retired.

WISCONSIN

John W. Wied, Amherst, Wis., in place of V. A. Martin, retired.
William P. Brennan, Barneveld, Wis., in place of A. G. Campbell, deceased.
Robert O. Westman, Bristol, Wis., in place of J. O. Goff, retired.
Richard B. Dougherty, Ellsworth, Wis., in place of C. L. Haessly, retired.
John R. Thompson, Elroy, Wis., in place of J. A. Podruch, deceased.
William E. Leonhard, Greenleaf, Wis., in place of G. B. Meulemans, retired.
Norman L. Myhra, Stevens Point, Wis., in place of H. L. Yulga, resigned.
Gerald J. Lonzo, Suring, Wis., in place of J. W. O'Callaghan, retired.
Frederick A. Mohrmann, Viola, Wis., in place of C. H. Mullendore, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Stanley W. Wagner, rabbi, Baldwin Jewish Center, Baldwin, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty Sovereign of the universe, with the word Thou didst create the world and with the word Thou hast made us preeminent over the beast. Through the faculty of speech Thou hast sanctified man, charging him not to use this divine gift in vain. Yet, with the freedom of will with which Thou hast also endowed him, he has both used and misused the word, at times to foster love and at times to breed hate; in some generations to build civilizations and in others to destroy them; in wisdom to bring mankind closer into a worldwide brotherhood and, in folly, to estrange and alienate brethren.

Dear God, we invoke Thy benign blessings upon all assembled in this great Chamber of words. What a glorious opportunity Thou hast given those gathered here, charged with the awesome responsibility of guiding the destiny of our beloved country to make the attribute of speech into Thy instrumentality of peace, justice, and freedom. Words, articulately expressed within these walls, have been written into laws which have provided equality and dignity for all Americans, Lord, and are helping to banish poverty and illiteracy among Thy children. Words, eloquently delivered by statesmen imbued with Thy spirit, have forged our Nation into a bastion of liberty and a beacon of hope to peoples everywhere. Words, millions and millions of them uttered here, have become as countless emissaries from Thee, inspiring a national commitment to Thine ideals, ideals which promote and advance human welfare and have become the foundation and cornerstone upon which our Great Society is built.

But, Lord, these days are marked by

a "confusion of tongues." In the council of nations pious pronouncements are preludes to ignoble deeds, great resolves are nullified by nefarious acts, professions of sincerity are seasoned with guile. The spoken word has shrunk in value by virtue of the distressing cleavage between the truths which governments affirm and the values they live by. Father in Heaven, implant in the hearts and minds of the patriots and leaders of every land the realization that until genuine communication is restored between the peoples of the world, and speech will be regarded as a God-given attribute not to be profaned, then unfulfilled shall be the vision of Thy prophet that "nation shall not lift sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

On the eve of the birthday of one of the most illustrious figures in our country's history who, by tradition, was the exemplar of truthfulness, and whose words and deeds secured for future generations the glorious heritage of liberty and democracy, we pray Thee to continue to inspire the leaders of our blessed America, the representatives of the people, that the words resounding in this Hall may influence mankind to the end that the millennial hope of universal peace and happiness may be realized in our time. Vouchsafe unto us the wisdom to make "the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts acceptable before Thee," Master of all, so that Thy will shall mold the character of our Nation and of all the nations of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, and other laws relating to housing and urban development, to correct certain obsolete references.

SELECT COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee created pursuant to House Resolution 1 be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

PROF. BERNARD FALL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the shocking and sad news that Prof. Bernard Fall has been killed in Vietnam. To those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him, this is indeed a tragic report.

Bernard Fall was that rare man who dedicated his life to the search for truth and knowledge. Professor Fall was an expert on southeast Asia, and used his encyclopedic knowledge to bring the facts and history of that area to the American people. In an area replete with passion and partisanship Bernard Fall never allowed himself to be used for partisan or biased advantage by any group or individual.

Professor Fall leaves to future generations several outstanding books and innumerable articles on Vietnam. "Two Vietnams" is a classic. He is also the author of "Street Without Joy" and the recently published and very well received "Hell in a Very Small Place." But even more than his invaluable contribution to knowledge, his life stands as a monument to the scholarly search for truth.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of those Members who knew and respected Bernard Fall, I have today obtained a special order for Wednesday, March 1, to pay tribute to him.

HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT OF 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Human Investment Act of 1967.

I consider it a great privilege to join with 128 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and 29 Members of the U.S. Senate in introducing this legislation, whose purpose is to provide an incentive to American business to invest in the improvement of the Nation's human resources by hiring, training, and employing presently unemployed workers lacking needed job skills, and by upgrading the job skills of and providing new job opportunities for workers presently employed.

If we are ever to win the war against poverty or to make substantial progress in that direction, it is absolutely essential that the unemployed be trained so that they may become self-supporting and reach the dignity that comes to man when he is self-supporting, and it is essential that those who are only marginally self-supporting acquire the skills which will allow them to upgrade their economic position in life.

The Human Investment Act of 1967 can become a major weapon in our war against poverty, and I exhort the Congress of the United States and the President to support this legislation.

CASSIUS CLAY EVADES DRAFT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, albeit depressing, to note that the illustrious Cassius Clay has scheduled another alleged bout to milk a few more thousand dollars out of dodging the draft. I cannot understand how patriotic Americans can promote, or pay for, pugilistic exhibitions by an individual who has become the symbol of draft evasion. While thousands of our finest young men are fighting and dying in the jungles of Vietnam, this healthy specimen is profiteering from a series of shabby bouts. Apparently Cassius will fight anyone but the Vietcong.

This case should illustrate to Congress that revisions in our draft laws are needed. It may also call for an investigation of why Clay has not been allowed to serve in Vietnam as a conscientious objector—one of the many ploys he has used, including terming himself a member of the clergy, to avoid helping his country in time of war.

Many conscientious objectors who sincerely refuse to bear arms have served brilliantly as medics and in other capacities, I might add.

Cassius Clay's draft classification has been sustained as 1A but his lawyer brags that he can delay his going for a year by legal hanky-panky. Other boys go when their number is called. Clay should not be the exception. He may look upon himself as "the greatest," but I am sure history will look upon him as "the least" of all the men who have held the once-honorable title of "Heavyweight Champion of the World."

CONDUCT AND ETHICS

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 just came from a meeting of the Rules Committee in which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] was appearing in support of his resolution to set up a Committee on Conduct and Ethics. He excoriated the House Administration Committee, of

which I am a member, because of its failure, he said, to act in this field. He said the reason he did not act last fall after we gave him this committee was the lack of time.

In due course I will appear before the committee, I hope, and ask them to send this matter to the House Administration Committee. But in the meantime I would point out that during that same time Mr. BENNETT claims he did not have, or the amount of time he did not have, the House Administration Subcommittee investigated the Powell situation from beginning to end and brought out all the evidence that the ad hoc committee has subsequently used, and even a little that they did not find out because, they said, according to the press, they did not know who signed the checks.

Well, if you read our hearings, Mrs. Dargans has testified that she did under Mr. POWELL's direction. So it seems to me that if they did not have time last December and we did, maybe Mr. BENNETT would never find time.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDERS SCHEDULED FOR TOMORROW UNTIL THE FOLLOWING DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I note that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] has a special order for 10 minutes tomorrow, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] for 60 minutes tomorrow, which is George Washington's Birthday. I have not been able to contact the gentlemen, but I ask unanimous consent that these special orders go over until the following day when they shall be called before special orders previously granted for that day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 209 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 209

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations in connection with all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, including, but not limited to, the following matters:

(1) Personnel requirements and manpower utilization, the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Federal civil service generally.

(2) The classification of all mail, postal rates, fees, and size and weight of all classes of mail.

(3) Compensation and other emoluments of Federal civil officers and employees.

(4) The administration of the civil service retirement, insurance, and health benefits programs.

(5) The administration, management, and operation of the Post Office Department, mailability of articles and printed matter, including, among other things, the mailing of obscene matter and unsolicited articles.

(6) The purchase, lease, rental, use, and modernization of land, buildings, vehicles, and equipment for the postal field service, including research, development, and engineering programs related thereto.

(7) The activities of the Bureau of the Census, National Archives and Records Service and the collection, reporting and data processing activities of the Government generally.

(8) The classification of Federal civilian positions, including, among others, General Schedule positions subject to chapter 51, of title 5, United States Code, and postal field service positions subject to chapter 45, of title 39, United States Code.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman or, in his absence, the vice chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman or, in his absence, the vice chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman, or vice chairman, or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have a whole series of these routine resolutions giving committees additional power to investigate, and so forth. I know of only one controversy, which I will clearly identify when the resolution is brought up. To the best of my knowledge, all the others are routine. To the best of my knowledge, each resolution, even the controversial one, was reported unanimously by the Commitee on Rules.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time on this resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from Missouri has just said with reference to the noncontroversial character of these standard investigative resolutions. Some questions may arise among some Members concerning the limitations upon unrestricted foreign travel. Only those committees whose duties require almost constant foreign travel are permitted to do so without bringing a separate travel resolution before the Rules Committee.

I would also say at this time—and I ask the attention of the gentleman from Missouri—that a Member on this side has directed my attention to House Resolution 179, the resolution dealing with the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has raised a question as to whether or not certain investigations could be conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs under the language as stated in that resolution, so I merely ask the gentleman, when he calls that resolution to the attention of the House, to give us an opportunity to discuss the question that may arise on that single resolution. Other than that, I know of no objection to any other of the resolutions we will have before us today. The one in question is House Resolution 179, dealing with the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 101 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 101

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors:

(1) The program of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, nursing home care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation); and

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances;

with a view to determining whether or not such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interests of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs.

The committee is also authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people, or segments thereof, in the name of American veterans by appealing to the desire of the American people to assist such veterans and their survivors or dependents;

(2) whether an undue proportion of such charitable contributions is used to meet the expenses of conducting such appeals and for other administrative expenses rather than for providing services for or benefits to veterans;

(3) whether any of such appeals are fraudulent in nature;

(4) whether additional supervision of the fund-raising activities conducted by organizations chartered by Act of Congress in the name of veterans is necessary or desirable; and

(5) the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the Houes is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary, except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leaves to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

SEC. 2. In addition, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to send not more than five members of such committee and not more than two staff assistants to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam for the purpose of conducting a full and complete investigation and study into the disability compensation and pension program, the death compensation and death pension program, the dependency and indemnity compensation program, insurance, education, vocational rehabilitation, hospital and medical care and other subjects properly coming within the jurisdiction of said committee in the Republic of the Philippines and in the case of American veterans and servicemen in South Vietnam the above-mentioned subjects and the servicemens group life insurance program.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, after line 22, insert the following paragraph:

"*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

On page 5, line 22, after the word "Government," insert the words "the cost of such transportation, and".

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 101 is the regular legislation on investigative powers that is necessary for the normal operation of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has made one change which should be called to the attention of the House.

The amendment corrects this resolution relative to the reporting of transportation costs of overseas travel involving the use of counterpart funds in line with the Mutual Security Act, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 1754. It is my understanding that this language should have been in resolutions in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 101 in order that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will have authority to conduct investigations and studies of matters under their jurisdiction, and that funds for this purpose will be available to them.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I would add to what the gentleman from Tennessee has said is that in section 2 there is also the provision that a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, along with two staff assistants, may travel to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam for investigative purposes. It was explained to the satisfaction of the Committee on Rules that this was necessary for the work of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 19 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 19

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including but not limited to the following:

(1) administration and operation of the Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Commission and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American merchant marine;

(2) administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and all laws and problems relating to fisheries and wildlife;

(3) administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws and problems relating to functions thereunder;

(4) administration and operation of the Panama Canal and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(5) the natural resources and environment of the oceans.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For such purposes the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof as authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Com-

mittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, line 9, after the word "Government," insert the words "the cost of such transportation, and".

Mr. BOLLING (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 19 is the regular legislation on investigative powers that is necessary for the normal operation of the committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has made one change in this resolution which should be called to the attention of the House.

This amendment corrects this resolution relative to the reporting of transportation costs of overseas travel involving the use of counterpart funds in line with the Mutual Security Act, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 1754. It is my understanding that this language should have been in past resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 19 in order that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will have authority to conduct investigations and studies of matters under their jurisdiction, and that funds for this purpose will be available to them.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from Tennessee has said and join him in urging the adoption of House Resolution 19.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO MAKE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I am about to call up the controversial resolution, the one on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the disposal of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements upon United States agriculture;

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954;

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained-yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies;

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers;

(5) The formulation and development of improved price-support and regulatory programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection, grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities;

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees;

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended; the development of land use programs pursuant to titles I and IV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962; and the development of the various programs provided for by the Child Nutrition Act of 1966;

(8) All other matters wihin the jurisdiction of the committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at any time during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 12, after the word "places", delete the comma and insert the words "within the United States,".

On page 4, after line 3, add the following paragraph:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and announce at this time that I intend to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 is the regular legislation on investigative powers that is necessary for the normal operation of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has made two changes in this resolution which should be called to the attention of the House.

On page 3, line 12, after the word "places," the words "within the United States," were inserted. This was done as in the past several Congresses the Committee on Agriculture has been authorized to travel within the United States only.

The second amendment on page 4, after line 3, is as follows:

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

Since this resolution does not include overseas travel, counterpart funds are not available. In the past, the Committee on Agriculture has introduced specific resolutions for trips within the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 83 in order that the Committee on Agriculture will have authority to conduct investigations and studies of matters under their jurisdiction, and that funds for this purpose will be made available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 83, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has said in explanation of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, however I do apologize to the Members of the House if I misspoke myself earlier in describing these resolutions as being generally noncontroversial, with the exception of the question raised in House Resolution 179. I, frankly, did not realize that the question with reference to the House Committee on Agriculture in the decision on the matter of foreign travel had been elevated to the status of controversy. But, apparently, there are those who do question that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in opposition to the committee amendments to House Resolution 83. The reason I have done this is because that upon more than one occasion I have stated why I object to these amendments.

No. 1, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that when the representatives of the committee, the Committee on Agriculture, went before the Committee on Rules when this resolution was up for consideration, there was no mention made of any intention to propose to amend this resolution. To conserve time, our presentation, by the chairman of our committee was brief. We did not anticipate any objection to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, further, I believe this amendment that is proposed to be placed into this resolution places the Members of the House Committee on Agriculture on the basis of second-class Members of this House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that the Committee on Rules is in a very good position to set itself up as an authority in an attempt to try to regulate the morals, or the anticipated morals, or the intimation of immoral practices by the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members what this resolution calls for, and directs the Committee on Agriculture to do. It is to make studies and investigations into the following matters, including the restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the disposal of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements upon U.S. agriculture. The House Committee on Agriculture is charged with the administration of programs involving several billions of dollars.

Secondly, it is to investigate all matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Mr. Speaker, if the Committee on Rules did not want us to do this investigating I think they should have amended the resolution to take away the authority. I do not believe they are going to have the nerve to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a reflection on this committee to ask us to assume an obligation here, and then deprive the committee of the opportunity to use funds to make these investigations which should be made on the spot, so to speak, where wasteful practices often occur.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say as a matter of record here today that the Committee on Agriculture, I believe, has come as near as any committee in the House of Representatives of showing good judgment in the conservation of funds—and that includes travel funds.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the present speaker, in cooperation with a Republican member of our committee, made a trip to India a few years ago, and I will challenge any committee in this House to come up with what we did on that particular trip. All of the expenses of that trip with the exception of transportation were paid in Indian rupees. Everybody knows the worth of a rupee. So there was no bill turned in for any expenses for that trip, because they were paid with Indian rupees.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I believe some of the other committees of this House could learn how to use some of these counterpart funds. Although when I came back home and I told them that I did not have any bill to turn in, they said, "How did you do it?"

I said I did it with Indian rupees. They said, "How did you do it?" I tried to explain it to them. They said, "Oh, you are in violation of the law, in spending the rupees in the place of dollars."

Perhaps I violated the law, but I saved the Government of the United States a lot of money when I did it.

Mr. Speaker, another thing is that none of these trips can be made outside the United States without the direction and authority of the chairman of our committee. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I will put the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture up against any Member of this House when it comes to conserving funds and acting economically. I will say that I doubt if there is any other committee in this House, with one exception, and another committee had to do it for them, where their staff was cut this year—and that happened in the Committee on Agriculture, our staff was cut—and the salaries were cut in that committee, and we have otherwise tried to conserve the funds allotted to our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think in view of the record this committee has made, and the fact that this was not called to our attention during the consideration of the rule in the Committee on Rules, I am asking the other Members of this House to vote with me to defeat these two committee amendments.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply briefly to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], that there certainly is no intention on the part of any member of the Committee on Rules to treat the Committee on Agriculture any differently than any other committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I will yield to the gentleman when I finish my statement.

In the last 2 years I believe the Committee on Agriculture has had a resolution which required, as this resolution would, that when they had an investigation abroad they would come back to the Committee on Rules, and having come back to the Committee on Rules, they would get a resolution for travel.

The notion that there was any intimation or any intent to treat the Committee on Agriculture differently, I think is in error.

I think the Committee on Rules carefully weighed its decision and I think its unanimous vote is significant.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in what the gentleman has just said and further point out that I raised the question in the Committee on Rules about members of the Agriculture Committee traveling to investigate the Public Law 480 program. This is a very large, international program. Millions and millions of dollars of surplus agriculture commodities are involved. Supervision and inspection are necessary in order to carry out the congressional mandate. I went along with this resolution only after receiving assurances from the Committee on Rules that requests to investigate the operation of particular programs under Public Law 480 will be given early consideration by the committee and favorably reported as the facts warrant.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman has very clearly stated the matter and it is accurate.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the gentleman, you have made an admission that you are treating the Committee on Agriculture as second-class members. You have admitted that you do not treat this committee as other committees have been treated. You have not denied that you are charging us in a resolution to perform certain duties and now you are asking that we come with hat in hand and say, "Please, Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Rules, please Mr. Member, let us have some money." Why this is all poppycock and you know it.

I say if you are going to give this committee the obligation and the authority to make these investigations, at least be man enough to give us the money and

then if we violate our trust, take it away from us—and you have done that with some other committees. But do not do it this way. This is a terrible way to do it and it is a reflection not only on this committee but on every member of this committee, when you ask us to do things and then refuse to provide any money for us and say that we have to come with hat in hand and beg you to do it.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri), there were—ayes 34, noes 13.

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make the straight point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes the point of order. I want to get a quorum here and then I will have a division.

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

The Chair will state that the vote is automatic at this point.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The vote on the resolution is not automatic. At this point we are only voting on the amendments.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri make the point of order that a quorum is not present and objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present?

Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is whether or not the gentleman from Missouri did object to the vote on the basis that a quorum was not present as was stated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to understand clearly what the gentleman from Missouri is demanding.

Is the gentleman from Missouri demanding a straight quorum call?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was demanding a straight quorum call, and then I am going to ask for a division when we come to adopting the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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. 16]

Abbitt	Bow	Celler
Arends	Bray	Clausen, Don H.
Ashbrook	Brown, Calif.	Cohelan
Ayres	Burton, Calif.	Corbett
Baring	Burton, Utah	Daddario
Barrett	Button	Davis, Ga.
Bates	Byrnes, Wis.	Diggs
Bell	Cahill	Dow
Blatnik	Casey	Dowdy
Eckhardt	Kluczynski	Ronan
Edwards, Calif.	Kornegay	Roudebush
Everett	Laird	Roybal
Farbstein	Landrum	Ruppe
Feighan	Macdonald, Mass.	Sandman
Fino	Mailliard	St Germain
Flynt	Marsh	Saylor
Ford, Gerald R.	Mathias, Calif.	Selden
Ford, William D.	Meskill	Shipley
Fraser	Mize	Sisk
Gathings	Multer	Smith, Calif.
Goodell	Myers	Smith, Iowa
Griffiths	Nix	Snyder
Hagan	O'Konski	Staggers
Haley	Ottinger	Stanton
Hanna	Passman	Stephens
Hansen, Idaho	Patman	Stuckey
Harsha	Pepper	Talcott
Harvey	Philbin	Thompson, N.J.
Hébert	Pike	Tunney
Helstoski	Pirnie	Utt
Irwin	Pollock	Waldie
Jarman	Pool	Whalley
Jones, N.C.	Pucinski	Whitener
Karth	Rarick	Williams, Miss.
Kee	Reinecke	Willis
King, Calif.	Resnick	Wilson, Charles H.
	Rivers	Zion

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 323 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 87, noes 35.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 230, nays 85, not voting 117, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—230

Adams	Collier	Ford, William D.
Addabbo	Conable	Frelinghuysen
Albert	Conte	Friedel
Anderson, Ill.	Conyers	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson, Tenn.	Corman	Fulton, Tenn.
Ashley	Cramer	Gardner
Aspinall	Culver	Giaimo
Bennett	Cunningham	Gibbons
Berry	Curtis	Gilbert
Betts	Daniels	Gonzalez
Biester	Davis, Wis.	Goodling
Bingham	Dawson	Green, Oreg.
Blackburn	Delaney	Green, Pa.
Blanton	Dellenback	Griffiths
Boggs	Denney	Gross
Bolling	Dent	Grover
Bolton	Devine	Gubser
Brademas	Dickinson	Halleck
Brasco	Dingell	Halpern
Brock	Downing	Hamilton
Brooks	Dulski	Hanley
Broomfield	Duncan	Hansen, Wash.
Brotzman	Dwyer	Hardy
Brown, Calif.	Eckhardt	Harrison
Brown, Mich.	Edmondson	Hathaway
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Hawkins
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Calif.	Hays
Broyhill, Va.	Eilberg	Hechler, W. Va.
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Heckler, Mass.
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Hicks
Bush	Eshleman	Holifield
Carey	Evans, Colo.	Holland
Cederberg	Evins, Tenn.	Horton
Chamberlain	Fallon	Hosmer
Clancy	Findley	Howard
Clawson, Del	Fisher	Hunt
Cleveland	Flood	Hutchinson
Jacobs	Morse, Mass.	Scherle
Joelson	Morgan	Scheuer
Johnson, Calif.	Morton	Schneebeli
Johnson, Pa.	Moss	Schweiker
Jonas	Murphy, N.Y.	Schwengel
Jones, Ala.	Natcher	Scott
Karsten	Nedzi	Shriver
Kastenmeier	Nelsen	Skubitz
Kee	O'Hara, Ill.	Slack
Kelly	O'Hara, Mich.	Smith, N.Y.
King, N.Y.	Patten	Springer
Kyl	Pelly	Stafford
Kyros	Perkins	Steed,
Langen	Pettis	Steiger, Wis.
Latta	Poff	Stratton
Lipscomb	Pryor	Taft
Lloyd	Quie	Talcott
Lukens	Quillen	Tenzer
McCarthy	Railsback	Thomson, Wis.
McClory	Rees	Udall
McCulloch	Reid, Ill.	Ullman
McDade	Reid, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
McDonald, Mich.	Reuss	Vander Jagt
McFall	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vanik
MacGregor	Rhodes, Pa.	Watkins
Machen	Riegle	Watson
Madden	Robison	Watts
Martin	Rodino	Whalen
Matsunaga	Rogers, Colo.	Widnall
Meeds	Rooney, N.Y.	Wiggins
Michel	Rooney, Pa.	Williams, Pa.
Miller, Calif.	Rosenthal	Willis
Mills	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Bob
Minish	Roth	Winn
Mink	Roush	Wyatt
Minshall	Rumsfeld	Wylie
Monagan	Ryan	Wyman
Moore	Sandman	Yates
Moorhead	St. Onge	Young
	Schadeberg	Zablocki

NAYS—85

Abernethy	Hammer-schmidt	Price, Ill.
Adair	Henderson	Price, Tex.
Andrews, Ala.	Herlong	Purcell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Hull	Randall
Annunzio	Hungate	Reifel
Belcher	Ichord	Roberts
Bevill	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Brinkley	Kazen	Satterfield
Burke, Fla.	Kleppe	Sikes
Burleson	Leggett	Smith, Okla.
Carter	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Cowger	Long, Md.	Sullivan
de la Garza	McClure	Taylor
Derwinski	McEwen	Teague, Calif.
Dole	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Thompson, Ga.
Edwards, La.	Mathias, Md.	Tuck
Fascell	May	Vigorito
Foley	Miller, Ohio	Waggonner
Fountain	Morris, N. Mex.	Walker
Fuqua	Mosher	Wampler
Galifianakis	Murphy, Ill.	White
Gathings	Nichols	Whitten
Gettys	Olsen	Wolff
Gude	O'Neal, Ga.	Wright
Gurney	Pickle	Wydler
Hall	Poage	Younger
		Zwach

NOT VOTING—117

Abbitt	Dorn	Laird
Arends	Dow	Landrum
Ashbrook	Everett	Macdonald, Mass.
Ashmore	Farbstein	Mahon
Ayres	Feighan	Mailliard
Baring	Fino	Marsh
Barrett	Flynt	Mayne
Bates	Ford, Gerald R.	Meskill
Battin	Fraser	Mize
Bell	Gallagher	Montgomery
Blatnik	Garmatz	Multer
Boland	Goodell	Myers
Bow	Gray	Nix
Bray	Hagan	O'Konski
Burton, Calif.	Haley	O'Neill, Mass.
Burton, Utah	Hanna	Ottinger
Button	Hansen, Idaho	Passman
Byrne, Pa.	Harsha	Patman
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Pepper
Cabell	Hébert	Philbin
Cahill	Helstoski	Pike
Casey	Irwin	Pirnie
Celler	Jarman	Pollock
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, N.C.	Pool
Cohelan	Karth	Pucinski
Colmer	Keith	Rarick
Corbett	King, Calif.	Reinecke
Daddario	Kirwan	Resnick
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Rivers
Diggs	Kornegay	Ronan
Donohue	Kupferman	Roudebush
	Kuykendall	

Roybal	Smith, Iowa	Utt
Ruppe	Snyder	Waldie
St Germain	Staggers	Whalley
Saylor	Stanton	Whitener
Selden	Stephens	Williams, Miss.
Shipley	Stuckey	Wilson,
Sisk	Thompson, N.J.	Charles H.
Smith, Calif.	Tunney	Zion

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. LONG of Maryland changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WIDNALL and Mr. DUNCAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 128, noes 25.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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. The gentleman from Missouri objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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 306, nays 18, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—306

Adair	Conable	Gonzalez
Adams	Conte	Goodell
Addabbo	Cowger	Goodling
Albert	Cramer	Green, Oreg.
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Green, Pa.
Anderson, Tenn.	Cunningham	Griffiths
	Curtis	Gross
Andrews, Ala.	Daniels	Grover
Andrews, N. Dak.	Davis, Wis.	Gubser
	Dawson	Gude
Annunzio	Delaney	Gurney
Ashley	Dellenback	Hall
Ashmore	Denney	Halleck
Aspinall	Devine	Halpern
Battin	Dickinson	Hamilton
Belcher	Dingell	Hammer-schmidt
Bennett	Dole	
Berry	Dorn	Hanley
Betts	Dowdy	Hansen, Wash.
Bevill	Downing	Hardy
Biester	Dulski	Harrison
Bingham	Duncan	Hathaway
Blackburn	Dwyer	Hays
Blanton	Eckhardt	Hechler, W. Va.
Blatnik	Edmondson	Heckler, Mass.
Boland	Edwards, Ala.	Herlong
Bolling	Edwards, La.	Hicks
Bolton	Ellberg	Holifield
Brademas	Erlenborn	Holland
Brasco	Esch	Horton
Brinkley	Eshleman	Hosmer
Brock	Evans, Colo.	Howard
Brooks	Evins, Tenn.	Hull
Broomfield	Fallon	Hungate
Brotzman	Fascell	Hunt
Brown, Calif.	Findley	Hutchinson
Brown, Mich.	Fisher	Ichord
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Jacobs
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford,	Joelson
Broyhill, Va.	William D.	Johnson, Calif.
Buchanan	Fountain	Johnson, Pa.
Burke, Mass.	Fraser	Jonas
Burleson	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Ala.
Bush	Friedel	Karsten
Carey	Fulton, Pa.	Kastenmeier
Carter	Fulton, Tenn.	Kazen
Cederberg	Fuqua	Kee
Chamberlain	Galifianakis	Keith
Clancy	Gallagher	Kelly
Clark	Gardner	King, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Gettys	Kleppe
Cleveland	Giaimo	Kuykendall
Collier	Gibbons	Kyl
Colmer	Gilbert	Kyros
Langen	O'Hara, Mich.	Sikes
Latta	Olsen	Skubitz
Leggett	O'Neill, Mass.	Slack
Lipscomb	Passman	Smith, N.Y.
Lloyd	Patten	Smith, Okla.
Long, La.	Pelly	Springer
Long, Md.	Perkins	Stafford
Lukens	Pettis	Steed
McCarthy	Poage	Steiger, Wis.
McClory	Poff	Stratton
McCulloch	Pool	Stubblefield
McDade	Price, Ill.	Sullivan
McDonald, Mich.	Price, Tex.	Taft
	Pryor	Talcott
McMillan	Quie	Taylor
MacGregor	Quillen	Tenzer
Machen	Railsback	Thompson, Ga.
Madden	Randall	Thomson, Wis.
Mahon	Rees	Tuck
Martin	Reid, Ill.	Udall
Mathias, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.	Ullman
Mathias, Md.	Reifel	Van Deerlin
Matsunaga	Reuss	Vander Jagt
May	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vanik
Mayne	Rhodes, Pa.	Vigorito
Meeds	Riegle	Waggonner
Meskill	Robison	Walker
Michel	Rodino	Wampler
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.	Watkins
Miller, Ohio	Rogers, Fla.	Watson
Mills	Rooney, N.Y.	Watts
Minish	Rooney, Pa.	Whalen
Mink	Rosenthal	White
Minshall	Rostenkowski	Widnall
Monagan	Roth	Wiggins
Moore	Roush	Williams, Pa.
Moorhead	Rumsfeld	Willis
Morgan	Ruppe	Winn
Morris, N. Mex.	Ryan	Wolff
Morse, Mass.	Sandman	Wright
Morton	Satterfield	Wyatt
Mosher	St. Onge	Wydler
Moss	Schadeberg	Wylie
Murphy, Ill.	Scherle	Wyman
Murphy, N.Y.	Scheuer	Yates
Natcher	Schneebeli	Young
Nedzi	Schweiker	Younger
Nelsen	Schwengel	Zablocki
Nichols	Scott	Zwach
O'Hara, Ill.	Shriver	

NAYS—18

Abernethy	Jones, Mo.	Pickle
Burke, Fla.	Lennon	Rarick
de la Garza	McClure	Roberts
Derwinski	McEwen	Teague, Calif.
Gathings	Montgomery	Teague, Tex.
Henderson	O'Neal, Ga.	Whitten

NOT VOTING—108

Abbitt	Flynt	Pepper
Arends	Foley	Philbin
Ashbrook	Ford, Gerald R.	Pike
Ayres	Garmatz	Pirnie
Baring	Gray	Pollock
Barrett	Hagan	Pucinski
Bates	Haley	Purcell
Bell	Hanna	Reinecke
Boggs	Hansen, Idaho	Resnick
Bow	Harsha	Rivers
Bray	Harvey	Ronan
Burton, Calif.	Hawkins	Roudebush
Burton, Utah	Hébert	Roybal
Button	Helstoski	St Germain
Byrne, Pa.	Irwin	Saylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Selden
Cabell	Jones, N.C.	Shipley
Cahill	Karth	Sisk
Casey	King, Calif.	Smith, Calif.
Celler	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Clausen, Don H.	Kluczynski	Snyder
	Kornegay	Staggers
Cohelan	Kupferman	Stanton
Conyers	Laird	Steiger, Ariz.
Corbett	Landrum	Stephens
Corman	McFall	Stuckey
Daddario	Macdonald, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.		Tunney
Dent	Mailliard	Utt
Diggs	Marsh	Waldie
Donohue	Mize	Whalley
Dow	Multer	Whitener
Edwards, Calif.	Myers	Williams, Miss.
Everett	Nix	Wilson, Bob
Farbstein	O'Konski	Wilson,
Feighan	Ottinger	Charles H.
Fino	Patman	Zion

So the resolution as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Myers.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Helstoski.

Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. Koonegay with Mr. Dow.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Hagan.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Corman.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Cabell.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Daddario.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Jarman.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Foley.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Karth.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Mailliard with Mr. King of California.

Mr. Pirnie with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford with Mr. Boggs.

Mr. Laird with Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Corbett with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Bow with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Arends with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Bates with Mr. Pike.

Mr. Cahill with Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Ayres with Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Bray with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Sisk.

Mr. Zion with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Roudebush with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Pirnie with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Pollock with Mr. Stuckey.

Mr. Saylor with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Mize with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Harvey with Mr. St Germain.

Mr. Kupferman with Mr. Roybal.

Mr. Harsha with Mr. Selden.

Mr. Bell with Mr. McFall.

Mr. Burton of Utah with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Fino with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Hansen of Idaho with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Smith of California with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Stanton with Mr. Marsh.

Mr. Utt with Mr. Everett.

Mr. Whalley with Mr. Ronan.

Mr. Reinecke with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin with Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Don Clausen with Mr. Waldie.

Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. Button with Mr. Tunney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the oversea operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of United States programs of assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expand local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, line 6, after the word "Government," insert the words "the cost of such transportation, and".

Mr. BOLLING (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and, pending that, such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy on the resolution, but I do understand there are some questions that should be answered.

I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who has raised the question with respect to this resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the question which I have with reference to this resolution relates to the authority given to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to investigate areas in which there is not a specific piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the language in the resolution leaves some doubt about this, inasmuch as the language which appears on page 2, line 10, uses the word "legislation" rather than the words "all matters" which might have been used.

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that the language of subparagraph 1, page 1, line 5, is broad enough to cover the area involved; specifically, the question which I would like to put to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is this:

Would the language of House Resolution 179 permit the investigation by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of all possible effects upon our foreign policy of a nuclear nonproliferation treaty?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], that he feels the language contained on the first page fully covers any jurisdiction.

I would add, however, for myself that my impression is that the jurisdiction of nonproliferation would probably lie—although I have not had an opportunity to confer with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—but in any event, if this is a treaty, as I understand it to be, I understand that the Constitution of the United States provides to the effect that the responsibility of the House of Representatives is different than that of the other body, and any action taken here on a treaty would have to be taken by the other body and not by the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I might say to the gentleman that I do not myself find myself in disagreement with the reply made by the gentleman from Missouri. However, I would point out that the question which I put to the gentleman from Missouri related to whether or not it would be appropriate for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate the possible effects upon our foreign relations generally, of such a treaty.

I recognize, of course, that this body has no constitutional function in the ratification of a treaty, but the question I put was whether or not we can investigate the area of the possible effect upon our foreign relations generally of a nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, after a brief consultation with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my reply to the gentleman from Ohio would be to the effect that the Committee on Foreign Affairs would have the jurisdiction through its control of, in effect, its legislative oversight of the Arms Control Agency.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman from Missouri say that this would apply equally with reference to the hearing on the Consular Treaty proposal that is now pending before the Congress?

Mr. BOLLING. That is a treaty proposition, and I do not see where we would be involved in that.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean the House of Representatives?

Mr. BOLLING. The House of Representatives would not be involved in that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, of course that treaty, if ratified, would affect every citizen of this country and, certainly, the Members of the House of Representatives ought to be interested in it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is saying that in terms of this resolution the House Committee on Foreign Affairs could not hold hearings in order to inquire into the ratification of the consular treaty proposal; is that right?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further; no, the gentleman is not saying that, because the House Committee on Foreign Affairs could hold hearings upon any matter that comes before the Department of State. But I am saying, as I understand the constitutional provisions, the provisions of the Constitution of the United States say that we are beyond jurisdiction when that type of situation is involved.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would the

gentleman point out what limitation, if any, there is upon the foreign travel of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. BOLLING. The only limitations are contained in the reporting of the expenses.

The Committee on Rules felt, unanimously, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had to engage in foreign travel.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, in other words, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not have to come before the Committee on Rules and have that committee make a judgment as to whether or not the travel which that committee undertakes and carries forward is in the best interest of the Government of the United States?

Mr. BOLLING. If they stay within their jurisdiction.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They have never come to your committee for any permission to travel; is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. No; that is not correct, because that provision is in here.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I mean after this resolution is adopted they will never have to come before your committee again. Is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. If they stay within their jurisdiction and do not find that they need further authority.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Where in the resolution is there anything that would require them to come before the Committee on Rules under any circumstances?

Mr. BOLLING. I trust in the good judgment of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not doubting the good judgment of the chairman of the committee at all. I have the highest regard for him. But I am just asking you if there is any limitation whatsoever requiring the Committee on Foreign Affairs to come before the Committee on Rules at any other time during this session to get any further authority or permission to travel?

Mr. BOLLING. I think that it is important to point out at some place here in this discussion that the Committee on Rules has no power to grant anything to any committee.

There was a rather lengthy—I will not call it a debate, but an exercise—recently over another resolution. During that exercise, as I would call it, the House of Representatives made a decision here on what responsibility on travel a certain committee of the House could have.

The Committee on Rules has no power to do more than to present the resolution, which it is doing now unanimously.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a comment at this time?

Mr. BOLLING. Indeed I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like to say the reference that you made occurred during the debate—if you can call it a debate—on the Agriculture Committee resolution when there were less than 50 people in this House. And when we came back in here did not the person who is handling this resolution deny me any further time to speak on this resolution and to point out to this House what was actually in this resolution?

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to reconstruct the parliamentary situation a little more accurately, if I might.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. BOLLING. When I yielded to the gentleman I announced prior to yielding to him that I would yield him only 5 minutes. The gentleman only took advantage of 5 minutes.

Then somebody misunderstood the parliamentary situation, and allowed the amendments which were objected to to be adopted by a division vote. There then was a vote on the previous question pending after that to be disposed of, and the gentleman felt that the House had had a clear opportunity to decide or work its will, and therefore I did not yield further.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, did I not ask you for time before the rollcall on the previous question was called, and you denied me any time to speak on House Resolution No. 83?

Mr. BOLLING. I denied you time to speak prior to moving the previous question.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is what I am trying to say. In other words, you cut off the debate, and did not give me an opportunity to present the situation to this House, and I still say with all due respect that many of the Members did not know what they were voting for at the time they voted on either the previous question or House Resolution 83.

I do admit we were beaten mighty badly. But I still want to say that I think the House of Representatives should know that they are giving up their rights under the resolution that was passed under House Resolution 83 to the Committee on Rules, which committee will be acting arbitrarily at any time the Committee on Agriculture comes before it.

We are being treated differently than the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We are being treated differently than the Committee on Armed Services. We are being treated differently from the Committee on Appropriations. I think if the House of Representatives itself would recognize all that they are turning over to the Committee on Rules—which has been wrongly quoted here today, I think they perhaps would resent it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point, so that I may go further into this matter without taking any further time of the House.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri as to who was incorrect about what they said as to the action of the Committee on Rules? I would like to make that inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have talked to some members of the Committee on Rules about this. It was said that this was a unanimous-consent thing. But there was an understanding, they said, that if we would come there with the proper kind of request, why then it would be granted. I think that is just a lot of poppycock and a coverup.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. BOLLING. Of course, I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to get into a position here of umpire or referee. I must confess I was detained elsewhere when this debate on the previous resolution took place. But I merely want to make this observation in view of what has been said and what has transpired in the last few minutes between my good friends, the gentlemen from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Committee on Rules as this humble member thereof understood in all of these resolutions, was to treat all committees equally insofar as possible.

Now the question naturally arose in the committee as to which committees should travel abroad and what their duties required them to do. There was some agreement to the effect that there were certain committees—the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services for instance—that required them to do considerable traveling.

Now there has been much abuse—and I say "much abuse" and I think that is an accurate statement—in the past about this travel. The fact of the business is that we cannot pick up a paper nowadays that we do not read something about these alleged abuses of foreign travel.

Mr. Speaker, there is no Member in this House of Representatives for whom I have greater respect than I do for my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]. He has been a watchdog of the Treasury, as it were, in all of these matters, and he would be the first, I would have thought, who would want to curtail unnecessary travel, and therefore reduce the unnecessary burden upon our overburdened taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to publicly here and now and for the record compliment the gentleman upon his very, very fine work in the capacity to which I have just referred in always trying to curtail unnecessary expenses.

So to conclude, Mr. Speaker, it was the view of the committee that there was a difference in the duties of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in dealing with foreign affairs and the Committee on Armed Services dealing with matters scattered all over the world on the one hand, and the duties of other committees, including the committee of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] on the other hand.

I regret that he feels that way about it. I regret that he feels that there was any discrimination. But I want to hasten to assure him that so far as I am concerned, there was certainly no intent to discriminate against his committee but that it was the judgment of the Committee on Rules that his committee fell in a category with other committees than the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker,

will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee—and I ask this very respectfully, sir—Did you read the section of the bill on the first page of the bill, lines 5 to 12 wherein it states that the committee is authorized to make studies and investigations into "the restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the disposal of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements upon United States agriculture."

Furthermore, charging us, authorizing us, and directing us to make studies of "all matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954."

Did the Chairman read that language in the bill?

Mr. COLMER. Yes, I will say to my good friend, I did read that. I think it has already been said to him—if it has not, I want to say it now—that any time that my friend, his chairman, or anyone authorized by the committee wishes to come before the Rules Committee for a specific investigation involving travel abroad, the committee will be glad to hear from them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further? I would like to ask one other question.

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can you tell me the difference between this charge to the Committee on Agriculture in your resolution and some of the duties performed by the Foreign Affairs Committee? I would like to see the distinction—making meat out of one and fowl out of the other—causing us to come with hat in hand each and every time that our committee feels it is necessary to make certain investigations abroad. I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee. I will challenge any Member of Congress to put his record on economy in travel alongside the money I have spent and the money I have saved to the taxpayers of this Nation in making investigations abroad. I resent having to come to some other committee to let them be the ones to determine whether or not, in my judgment, I think that that needs to be done.

Frankly—and I say this with all due respect to the chairman of the committee and the other members of your committee—I do not think you have a member on your committee who has any more sense of responsibility about what ought to be done about these things than I have, and that is why I resent coming to you, and that is why I resent my committee being treated differently from other committees of Congress.

You have admitted that you do treat the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and possibly others in a much different light. That is the thing that I think is a reflection upon my integrity, and I challenge anyone to review anything that I have done that has brought discredit upon this Congress.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I just wish to make this one observation: Of course, I would not want to undertake to go into a delineation of the respective duties of those committees. So far as coming before my committee is concerned, the Committee on Rules did not make this provision. The House made the provision that you should come before the Rules Committee.

I again want to pay my respect and my compliments to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], who is always very watchful and considerate, and I hope on further reflection he might agree that nothing was intended as an aspersion on him or on his great committee.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether I can make a contribution to this discussion except to say that apparently I have missed out on something in the years I have been here. I guess I will have to take a trip abroad to become an expert on this business of junketing.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITH RESPECT TO MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 110 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 110

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations with respect to matters within its jurisdiction, and for the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the present Congress at such times and places either within or without the United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings and take such other actions as are authorized under rule XI(8)(d) of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the Committee on Government Operations.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr BOLLING (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 2, after the word "Government," insert the words "the cost of such transportation, and"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to conduct studies and investigations with respect to matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 40 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 40

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

(1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the resettlement of

refugees, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;

(2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;

(3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;

(4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in territories and possessions;

(5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act; and

(6) involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedures; and

(7) involving the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; and

(8) relating to State taxation of interstate commerce.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designed by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS OF MATTERS COMING WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 218 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 218

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 4, 1967, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation relating to all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

On page 1, after line 5, insert the following paragraph:

"*Provided,* That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

On page 1, line 9, delete the words "or without".

On page 2, delete lines 15 through 25.

Delete page 3.

On page 2, after line 14, add the following paragraph:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Commitee on Education and Labor for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations of matters coming within its jurisdiction."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATION, MANAGEMENT, OPERATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 68 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 68

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following:

(1) the organization, management, operation, and administration of any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia;

(2) the organization, management, operation, and administration of any independent agency or instrumentality of government operating solely in the District of Columbia; and

(3) those operations or activities directly affecting the District of Columbia, of any governmental agency or instrumentality operating on a regional basis entirely within the Washington metropolitan area.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which

is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United Sates Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on the District of Columbia for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

Mr. BOLLING (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 3, insert the following paragraph:

"*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS INTO ANY MATTER WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 34 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 34

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1967, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies as required in connection with bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to it and, more specifically or in addition thereto, in connection with the following matters within its jurisdiction:

(1)(a) The status, progress, and administration of irrigation, reclamation, and other water resources development programs of the Department of the Interior and of other agencies insofar as the latter affect the work of the Department of the Interior with respect to such programs, including (i) policies and procedures relating to such programs, (ii) projects previously authorized, (iii) projects proposed for authorization and construction, and (iv) developments under the Small Reclamation Projects Act and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act; (b) compacts relating to the use and apportionment of interstate waters; (c) the application to Federal agencies and activities of State laws governing the control, appropriation, and distribution of water; (d) the saline water research and development program; (e) the water resources research program; and (f) water resources planning conducted pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act, including the establishment of river basin commissions and financial assistance to the States for water and related land resources planning.

(2)(a) The administration and operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws, including those which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of oil, gas, helium, geothermal steam, and associated resources of the public and other Federal lands; (b) mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including the conditions, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; (c) mineral resources surveys and the exploration, development, production, and conservation of mineral resources; (d) research facilities needed to improve the position of the domestic mining and minerals industries; (e) capability of mining schools to support research facilities and assure domestic industry of a continuing source of technical talent; (f) proposed long-range domestic minerals programs, including availability of domestic minerals to fulfill all domestic requirements; (g) impact upon domestic mining industries caused by the transfer or disposal of excess and surplus Government-owned metals and minerals; and (h) the effects upon domestic mining industries resulting from the world metal situation and the means available to the Government to permit domestic mining industries to compete favorably in domestic and world markets, including cooperation with established international organizations.

(3)(a) The status, progress, and administration of the national park system and its units, including national seashores, national riverways, and national recreation areas, and of other recreational developments on public domain lands or reservations created out of the public domain and on areas under the jurisdiction of or affecting the Department of the Interior; (b) national outdoor recreation plans and the administration of the land and water conservation fund; and (c) national cemeteries.

(4)(a) The administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of public lands administered by the Department of the Interior, of forest reserves created out of the public domain and of areas of the Outer Continental Shelf; (b) administration and operation of the Wilderness Act; and (c) the withdrawal or restriction on use of public domain or Outer Continental Shelf lands, including reservations created out of the public domain, by military and nonmilitary agencies of the Government from normal operation of the public land and mining laws and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(5)(a) The administration of Indian affairs by agencies of the Government participating therein, the programs and policies of those agencies, the adequacy of existing Indian legislation, and the effectiveness with which it is being administered and with which moneys available to carry out its purposes are being used; (b) the release of Indian tribes and bands from Federal supervision, preparation therefor, and the effects thereof; (c) the availability to Indians of health, education, and welfare services and the extent to which they are receiving the full benefit of Federal programs in these areas; (d) the utilization of tribal lands and other resources, with particular attention to the means of developing the skill and aptitudes required for such utilization; and (e) the study and analysis of treaties and other written agreements between recognized Indian tribes, nations, or lands and the United States.

(6) The status, progress, and administration of the territories and insular possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the operation and administration of the Revised Virgin Islands Organic Act of 1954, the Virgin Islands Corporation Act of 1949, and Guam Organic Act of 1950, all as amended; local conditions bearing upon and the provisions to be included in organic acts for American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the extension of various laws of the United States to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the granting of citizenship to residents of American Samoa; operations of the Peace Corps in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and American interests in Antarctica.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of making such investigations and studies, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit, hold hearings, and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States as the nature of the investigation or study requires, and be represented at any meeting called by an established international organization to consider matters that affect the areas of jurisdiction of the committee; may do so not only during the session but also during periods of recess and adjournment; and may require, by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and its members and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. BOLLING (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

On page 5, after line 12, insert the following paragraph:

"*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

On page 7, line 6, after the word "Government," insert the words "the cost of such transportation, and".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to say that even though I have not taken the time of the House this afternoon on each and every occasion to refer to the unanimity within the committee that did exist on these resolutions, such was the fact, and these resolutions were reported unanimously out of the Committee on Rules. We have joined with the majority in presenting these resolutions to the House today for approval.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the many important problems covered in President Johnson's message "to protect the American consumer" is the protection of people against hazards in their homes. A man's home is generally regarded as a haven of peace and security. The hard facts, however, tell a different story. Last year, 28,000 people were killed and 20 million people injured in accidents occurring in and around the home.

What caused this terrible toll of life and limb? Familiar, widely used products that are found in just about any home today—heating devices, stoves, incinerators, hot water heaters, washing machines, power mowers, glass doors, and a variety of electrical appliances.

Who is to blame for this obviously unacceptable situation? Is it misuse by the purchasers? Is it faulty design by manufacturers? Have we simply let our technological ability to invent things overtake our human ability to safely use these products? No one knows the answers to these questions. But there is one question that does have an answer. Can something be done about the problem? And the answer to that question is definitely "Yes."

Specifically, President Johnson recommended establishment of a National Commission on Product Safety, to find the facts, to get the answers, to lay the groundwork for positive, constructive action. I heartily agree with this recommendation, and I have introduced a bill to establish a National Commission on Product Safety. Identical bills have been introduced in the other body by Senator MAGNUSON and Senator COTTON, and in the House by Mr. JOHN MOSS, my highly respected colleague on the committee.

The Commission would consist of seven members, appointed by the President on the basis of their training and experience in these problems. The mandate of the Commission would include a study of the protection consumers presently have against the hazards of household products, and a report of their findings to the President and the Congress within 18 months, together with any appropriate recommendations.

There are a few points which should be stressed at the outset. First, no proprietary information on products would be disclosed. Second, products which have come under recent congressional scrutiny would be exempt from the Commission's study. Finally, it should be understood that this is not a proconsumer or an antibusiness proposal. Consumers, of course, would benefit from increased safety in the use of household products. However, manufacturers would also benefit by being protected from a possible rash of conflicting State and local laws aimed at one product or another. In our mass markets of today, based upon mass production efficiency and savings, no manufacturer could function in a chaotic mesh of State and local regulation.

This bill is not a bill introduced on the heels of a nationwide scare due to some specific product safety problem. It is a bill introduced in the calm and thoughtful recognition of the fact that we do face a problem in household safety. Instead of emotional arguments, we need rational discussion. Instead of hysterical outcries, we need facts and figures. It is in this spirit that I have introduced the bill to establish a National Commission on Product Safety. In that same spirit, I commend it to your thoughtful consideration.

THE HONORABLE FRED L. WHAM

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following February 16 St. Louis Post-Dispatch article reviewing the distinguished career of the recently deceased U.S. District Judge Fred L. Wham of Centralia, Ill.

It was my distinct privilege to know Judge Wham, a jurist whose approach to the exercise of judicial power made a lasting impact on southern Illinois. His career earned him the deep respect and admiration few men achieve. Judge Wham's personal integrity and honesty were above reproach, and his conduct as a public official should inspire all who are charged with the responsibility of public office.

The article is written by Carl R. Baldwin, distinguished writer for the Post-Dispatch, who was acquainted with Judge Wham through years of close contact with him.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include the article:

(By Carl R. Baldwin)

United States District Judge Fred L. Wham presented two faces to the world, and both wore well. Off the bench he was quiet and unassuming. His manner bordered on the timid. On the bench he was a stern defender of federal laws. For the occasional sinner he always was ready with the lecture and the light sentence. A professional criminal could expect to have the book thrown at him.

Judge Wham's death Feb. 2 at the age of 82 brought many memories to those who had followed his career. The scene that most frequently comes to mind dates from the bootlegging era. The dignified judge, sitting tall in his high-backed chair, listening intently to the evidence as defendants were brought before him.

The old courtroom, in the Federal Building at Seventh street and Missouri avenue, East St. Louis, would be crowded. Some would have to stand and others would be waiting in the hall. For Judge Wham, immaculately and conservatively dressed, his shock of dark hair carefully combed, would be prepared to take the cases one by one, disposing of 30, 40, or even 50 who might plead guilty.

Judge Wham was neither a lawyer's lawyer nor a judge's judge. His trial experience was limited when he first took the job. He had to feel his way. However, he brought to the office unimpeachable integrity and a strong belief in the old-fashioned concept that laws are made to be obeyed and that those who violate the laws should be punished.

He was no legal hair-splitter. Some of his critics thought that he had little regard for individual rights. Defense lawyers, for instance, had to prove that any errors made in the issuance of search warrants were really flagrant errors. Minor legal faults did not count with Judge Wham, whose main concern was whether the raid had resulted in finding evidence of a law violation.

There was an embarrassing void on the East St. Louis bench when Judge Wham came to fill it. His predecessor, United States District Judge George W. English, had resigned rather than face an impeachment trial on evidence of wrongdoing disclosed in a large degree by a Post-Dispatch investigation. President Calvin Coolidge passed over three favored candidates, each with powerful political backing, to appoint the little known Wham, a Centralia, Ill., lawyer.

Respect for law was at a low point throughout the United States, but nowhere was it lower than in Southern Illinois. Gangsters were fighting over quick profits being made in a bootlegging industry that was operating without any serious restraint. Federal enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment was bringing only moderate fines, which bootleggers considered part of the payoff.

This all changed in 1927, the year Judge Wham took his oath of office. The late Harold G. Baker, young and vigorous, had been named United States Attorney the year before and the names of Wham and Baker became dreaded words to bootleggers, and to all others who violated federal laws. The late United States District Judge Walter C. Lindley, sitting at Danville, held up his end of the sprawling Eastern District of Illinois.

Before the team of Wham, Lindley and Baker went into action only about 20 per cent of the bootleggers brought into court went to jail. The new regime quickly turned things around. Eighty per cent of the defendants began going to jail and the terms were much more severe than they had been. In the late 1920s the Eastern District of

Illinois had more jury trials of bootleggers than any other district in the United States.

Judge Wham was not a fanatical prohibitionist although he was a teetotaler and a prominent layman in the Presbyterian Church. It was only that the law was on the books and therefore had to be enforced. That was that.

"The only way to stop crime is by punishing it," Judge Wham said in 1932 when pronouncing sentence on four defendants charged with stealing from interstate freight shipments. His sermons from the bench usually were direct and simple.

Several firsts occurred in Judge Wham's court, including the first sentencing of a bootlegger under the tough Jones "5 and 10" law, which carried a maximum penalty of five years in prison and a $10,000 fine.

Max Sonzinsky, a notorious East St. Louis fence, provided the court with another first. He was the first man to be convicted under the National Firearms Act, which had been passed to curb the sale of automatic weapons to gangsters. It bars the sale of sawed-off shotguns, machine guns and silencers. Judge Wham sentenced Sonzinsky to 18 months in prison and an appeal brought a Supreme Court ruling that the act was constitutional.

The high-ceilinged East St. Louis courtroom, in a building erected in the administration of President William Howard Taft, was not the best place to conduct a trial. It was not airconditioned in Judge Wham's time. In the hot summer, when open windows brought the clatter of Missouri avenue traffic into the room, it became almost impossible to hear testimony.

Judge Wham never eased his rules of formality, however, and anyone entering the courtroom in shirtsleeves was ejected. The rule applied to defendants as well as spectators, officers of the court and newspapermen. The United States Marshall was called on to provide coats for defendants who showed up without them.

Once, in Judge Wham's first year, a juror reported for duty in a hazy state of intoxication. The judge, calling it "a most unfortunate incident," referred to the sinning juror in talks to subsequent jury panels. "This must not happen again in this court," he would say. "I demand that you refrain from drinking while serving here."

Judge Wham heard odd stories from some defendants. A bootlegger who had been operating on a small scale in one of the German communities of outer St. Clair county claimed as late as 1929 that he had never heard of the Eighteenth Amendment. Four defendants from Birksville, in Monroe county, said that same year that they "had not been educated that the prohibition law was made to be observed."

From time to time Judge Wham criticized law enforcement officials and citizens of Monroe and Massac counties, where there seemed to be an utter disregard of the Volstead Act. He frequently censured East St. Louis for allowing bootleggers, prostitutes and other appendages of organized crime to operate openly throughout the 1920s and '30s. He lived to see all this eliminated. Even the gamblers closed their doors.

Of all the liquor conspiracy trials before Judge Wham probably the most interesting and most controversial was that of a sheriff, a chief deputy and 14 other residents of Massac county. Thirty-six defendants had been named in the indictment. Nine had pleaded guilty and others had been freed or granted severances.

Friends and neighbors from Massac county jammed the courtroom to hear Government witnesses tell about liquor seized in raids being channeled to prisoners in the jail or to consumers on the outside. After a week of testimony, at which court sessions extended into the night, the jury found all defendants not guilty.

Usually, after an acquittal of this nature, the defendants advance to the jury box and shake hands with the jurors. Here the jurors, almost in a body, rushed to the counsel table to congratulate the sheriff.

Later, friends of the sheriff visited the homes of Government witnesses in Massac county. They gathered in groups outside and serenaded the witnesses by singing "How Dry I Am."

Probably the most spectacular of all trials in Judge Wham's court was that of the eight "tumbling Womacks," an East St. Louis family which for more than 12 years pursued an astonishing career of collecting insurance money for fake accident claims. The family consisted of the father, mother, three daughters and three sons-in-law. Two of the sons-in-law made excellent "tumblers." They were professional wrestlers. There was a ninth defendant, a woman friend of the family.

The Government proved that the Womacks had stumbled over objects, out of taxi-cabs and against busses to lay the groundwork for the insurance claims. The evidence accounted for 59 "falls." A jury found each defendant guilty of conspiracy to use the mails to defraud after a trial lasting two weeks in early 1938.

All were given prison sentences, the terms ranging from two to four years. Judge Wham, on hearing the violent sobs of the mother of the Womack clan, eyed her sternly and said: "There is no excuse for a grown woman being involved in such operations."

An observer could take a good sampling of organized crime in Southern Illinois by watching Judge Wham's court. Connie Ritter, the smiling, sardonic lieutenant of gang boss Charlie Birger, appeared before the judge in 1930 to receive a two-year sentence for liquor conspiracy after having already been sentenced to life imprisonment for the murder of former Mayor Joe Adams of West City, Ill.

In 1938, Joseph Shelby Teague, biggest operator in The Valley, East St. Louis's segregated vice district, was sentenced by Judge Wham to three years in prison for bringing women to The Valley from Hot Springs, Ark., for prostitution. Teague had been traveling in high society and was a nationally known skeet shooter. He and his wife owned a modern brick bungalow designed especially as a house of prostitution.

Judge Wham often displayed compassion when dealing with small bootleggers, freeing them on probation if they were heads of large families or were hard up. In 1935, he reprimanded the son of a Civil War veteran who had been Judge Wham's boyhood hero. After the severe words he placed the bootlegger on probation on his promise to straighten up. The man had been operating an illicit still.

Railroad operators added to the burden of the already overloaded court in the Depression era by prosecuting out-of-work people for stealing coal from freight cars to provide heat for their homes. The charge was theft from interstate shipments and the penalty usually was a fine or a short jail sentence. For a while the federal court took on the appearance of a justice of the peace court. Judges Wham and Lindley quickly rebelled against this imposition, however, and the railroads were told to take their cases to lesser courts.

Echoes of the violence of the extended war between the Progressive Miners of America and the United Mine Workers were heard in the East St. Louis court from time to time. Finally, in January 1938, Judge Wham issued a precedent-setting decision by making the Progressive Miners and 55 individuals liable for $117,000 damages growing out of a conspiracy to commit illegal acts in a strike against United Electric Coal Co.

World War II brought a different type of defendant to the court. Jehovah's Witnesses and other persons opposed to war appeared before Judge Wham and were sentenced to prison terms for violating the Selective Service Act.

One of the last big trials over which Judge Wham presided was that of Evan R. Dale, labor boss and politician, and James Bateman, a labor boss, who were found guilty of labor racketeering by a jury. Calling Dale, downstate Republican leader, "a menace to the union movement," the judge imposed a 15-year prison sentence and a $10,000 fine. Bateman was fined $2,000, avoiding prison.

It was an explosive trial. Judge Wham's reputation for patience was sorely tried by Defense Attorney John J. Hoban, who later was to become State's Attorney of St. Clair county. Hoban, seeking cause for a new trial, announced in court that he had found evidence that six of the women jurors were "semi-hysterical with fear" at the trial because of "armed hoodlums" in court.

The allegation never was proved. Judge Wham was furious at the apparent attempt to interrogate the jurors, and threatened contempt action.

"The inviolability of the jury room from outside influence is a prime necessity in the administration of justice," he said. "Jurors must not be harassed in any manner. He who makes a studied inquiry as to what occurred in the jury room acts at his peril. A searching examination of jurors by a party to a trial is emphatically to be condemned."

Nothing came of the Wham-Hoban exchange and Dale served his prison term.

Judge Wham was graduated from the old Southern Illinois Normal University in 1904 and obtained his law degree at the University of Illinois in 1909. The big, raw-boned farm boy not only worked his way through school, but also became an all-star tackle on the Illini football team.

He first practiced law in Fort Smith and Fayetteville, Ark., and worked in the solicitor's office of the United States Department of Agriculture from 1915 to 1917. He returned to Centralia to set up law practice with his brother, Charles, but was better known for his interest in education at the time of his appointment to the bench. He served on the Centralia Board of Education and was a trustee of the University of Illinois.

He was active in Boy Scout work, was a Sunday school teacher in his church and was a thirty-third degree Mason. He held many lay positions in the Presbyterian Church.

Judge Wham retired as a judge of the Eastern District in March 1956 but he did not become inactive. It wasn't long before he became a senior district judge on special assignment throughout the United States. He was active until a few weeks before his death.

Newspaper reporters were present at Judge Wham's last day on the East St. Louis bench early in 1956. When the last case was called they presumed that the judge would end his career on a lenient note.

Judge Wham heard the evidence against a bookie who had failed to pay the federal wagering tax. The man was a repeater and obviously was a dedicated handbook operator. Judge Wham gave him the works.

PURPOSEFUL SCHOOL SEGREGATION IS VIOLATIVE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HAWKINS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights should be commended for its forthright stand on pointing the way for us to obey the many warnings of the Supreme Court that "purposeful school segregation" is violative of the Constitution; and that it has occurred in northern cities as well as in the South.

Critics of the Commission have, as usual, seized on the more controversial and emotional aspect, the issue of "busing" to mount their attack. With equal vigor, they have ignored a variety of techniques to integrate our schools and improve the quality of education for all our children.

Acknowledging that achieving equal opportunity in education is not always an easy task, the Commission did assert what should be incontrovertible criteria for judging the "will to comply," namely:

A prompt start must be made toward finding solutions, progress must be continuous and substantive, and there must be some assurance that the job will be completed as quickly as possible.

Judged by this simple and flexible standard, the critics who use the argument of busing as their weapon to fight equality of education have little evidence to show they intend even to make a start in doing anything to desegregate whether it's busing or otherwise.

On the contrary, they seek delay and outright reversal of the Supreme Court 1954 decision for they are willing to continue inferior education because they believe in separate schools—by law in the South and by subtle techniques such as the so-called neighborhood school in the North.

Use of the neighborhood school concept as a gimmick to impose racial segregation in the North is relatively recent. Like residential segregation it is deliberate. It is the northern practice of doing what the South does by intimidation, violence, and unconstitutional means.

Mr. Speaker, in February 1967 issue of the Progressive magazine appeared an article which summarized the long fight for compliance with law in our Southern States. In asking that this material be included in my remarks, I wish to state that many northern cities have records just as reprehensible. We can only hope that in this period when crime and law and order are issues in the forefront, those school officials and other elected officers in government sworn to support the Constitution will set higher standards of observing the law themselves, as well as spreading more equally the benefits of a high quality education.

The article follows:

LAST TICK FOR TOKENISM

Throughout 1966 the Deep South fought against integration of its school systems with every possible weapon—with subterfuge and the law's delays, with political pressure at the national, state, and local levels, and with economic intimidation and sometimes violence directed against Negroes who sought to enroll their children in white public schools. Southern racists in Congress, unopposed by Northern colleagues apprehensive of the white backlash in their home districts, launched a series of vitriolic attacks against guidelines established by the U.S. Office of Education to advance school desegregation under the enforcement powers of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

White supremacists exercised so much control over the pace of school desegregation in the Deep South that overall progress in such states as Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana was barely visible, with integration increasing only five percent in the case of the best performer, Georgia, in a year. Even such "progress," according to figures of the Office of Education, raised the percentage of Negroes in school with whites during 1966 to only 2.4 in Alabama, 3.2 in Mississippi, 6.6 in Georgia, 4.9 in South Carolina, and 3.6 in Louisiana.

The Southern Regional Council, a highly-regarded private research agency, in a year-end report that was justifiably caustic about the glacial pace of school integration in the Deep South, cited the supporting figures and declared: "This poor performance of the South in the second year of enforcement of Title VI for school desegregation remains the strongest rebuttal of the Southern complaint that the Office of Education has been over zealous in the matter. A more proper question might be whether it has been diligent enough."

In spite of the Supreme Court's 1954 decision holding that race discrimination in public schools is unconstitutional, "The record of many Southern school and public officials and the publics they serve has been one of avoiding and evading this clear-cut dictum of the basic law of the nation," the Council said. "Such mistreatment of the legal system by these 'best' people has been far more a national disgrace and scandal than the notorious lawlessness of violent racist gangs comprised of the 'worst' people of the area."

The Council's indictment of this flouting of the law of the land might stir the conscience of other citizens, but of itself could not shake the resistance of the segregationists. What did jar them to the eyeteeth was the recent decision of the Fifth (Federal) Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans. Judge Minor Wisdom, with Judge Homer Thornberry assenting, and the notoriously racist Judge Harold Cox dissenting, ordered seven Louisiana and Alabama school systems to desegregate classrooms, facilities, faculties, and staffs by the 1967–68 school year.

Judge Wisdom upheld the Office of Education's guidelines in this crucial test case brought by the Department of Justice. He issued a stern warning to the Southern resistance: "Now after twelve years of snail's pace progress toward school desegregation, the courts are entering a new era. The court has ticked the last tick for tokenism and delay in the name of 'deliberate speed'. . . . We shall not permit the courts [under local court plans] to destroy or dilute the effectiveness of the Congressional policy in Title VI. There is no bonus for foot dragging."

As we have said before in these columns, it has been the Federal judiciary rather than Congress which has been the prime mover in the advancement of civil rights. If Congress is too timid to defend the guidelines designed to open the door of the white schoolhouse wider so that every Negro child can have equality of educational opportunity, then the Federal Courts, as the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court now has demonstrated, will.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in President Johnson's message, to protect the American consumer, he cited a gap in existing legislation which is so glaring that action should not be delayed. The President was referring to the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953. That act did a great deal to keep certain highly flammable items such as the well-known "torch sweaters" out of the Nation's stores.

Unfortunately, however, the standard of flammability which was created under that act is not adequate today. It applied only to certain types of wearing apparel. There are many articles of clothing on the market today which present an unreasonable danger to people's safety. Furthermore, the act does not even cover things like carpets, upholstery, rugs, draperies, and other items commonly found in the home.

The need for further protection is amply demonstrated by the fact that it is estimated that about one-quarter million injuries each year are caused by clothing fires alone. If other highly flammable household materials were included, the total would be even higher.

The 1953 act proved that a problem like this can be solved, where there is a willingness to act and a spirit of cooperation among all parties. In my judgment it is clearly in the public interest to amend the act of 1953 to provide the protection needed by the conditions that exist in 1967. Accordingly, I have introduced a bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953.

The amendments would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to revise the existing flammability standards for wearing apparel as appropriate in order to help reduce the national loss of life and the number of injuries. The Secretary would also be authorized to issue standards for interior furnishings, if he determines after proper notice and an opportunity for public comment that flammability standards are needed for a particular kind of furnishing. Acting in concert with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Commerce would also conduct a factfinding study of the causes of deaths, injuries, and property losses resulting from accidental burning of furnishings, and wearing apparel. Finally, the amendments would authorize laboratory research on the flammability of furnishings, fabrics, and materials.

It may not be possible to eliminate completely all of the human and material losses incurred by fires of the type type I have described. There will always be some element of human frailty which rules out a complete solution. However, to the extent that people of good will, acting in good faith, can devise steps to help alleviate this serious national problem, then I believe we must forthrightly meet our responsibilities. The bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953 presents us with exactly that choice. I strongly urge your thoughtful consideration and enactment of this bill.

AGRICULTURAL MEETING

Mr. POAGE. 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. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we witnessed an historic meeting of agricultural people here in the Nation's Capital. Representatives of agriculture—and I mean the men and women who are actually feeding and clothing the Nation—were invited to Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture. They engaged in a full day's discussion of the problems confronting agriculture. At noon the President sent word that he wanted these farm people to have lunch with him at the White House. Those who were privileged to attend will always recall that President Johnson exhibited a most intense interest in farming and ranching.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the President and the Secretary of Agriculture for this recognition of the importance of agriculture in the United States. I believe that too often we hear of various groups meeting in Washington without any representation from our rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to report that President Johnson has announced that he is going to make this at least an annual event, and that agriculture is going to be welcomed to this Capital, and to the White House. I think that this spirit can only improve the understanding and cooperation so essential to the production of food and fiber for our own people as well as for our foreign friends.

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

Mr. POAGE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I should also like to mention, because he is too modest to do so, that he has had considerable to do with arranging this meeting. We are indebted to him.

REALISTIC APPROACH TO THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, two southwest Missouri farmers were privileged to attend the National Farm Policy Conference, which was held here in Washington, D.C. The two gentlemen were Mr. John Fawcett, of Fair Grove, Mo., and Mr. E. M. Poirot, of Golden City, Mo. Both men are extremely knowledgeable in agricultural affairs and in addition Mr. "Gene" Poirot is the author of the book "Margin of Life," from which was taken the concept of a cropland restoration bill which I submitted as H.R. 7164 in the 89th Congress and which I intend to submit again this year.

Attached is a copy of Mr. "Gene" Poirot's explanation of this concept which was made available to the delegations attending the National Farm Policy Conference. I believe these comments from a true man of the soil deserves serious consideration. The explanation follows:

AN ORIGINAL REALISTIC APPROACH TO SOLVING FARM PROBLEMS BASED UPON RESTORING AND EXPANDING OUR FOOD PRODUCTION POTENTIAL

(For the consideration of delegates attending the National Farm Policy Conference in Washington, D.C., February 20, 1967)

My name is E. M. Poirot, farmer (2000 acres) near Dudenville, Missouri.

My address is Route #2, Golden City, Missouri.

I am one of more than 2 million farmers.

Our final product is human bodies!

From the soil, we produce the food necessary to nourish and grow them from the moment of conception to death. From the same soils we grow much of the fibers necessary to keep them warm.

We believe that this is an important service, and that we should be paid a fair wage for doing it . . . an income high enough so that we could buy the products of one hour of the work of others with one hour of our work. It is essential to recognize the problem of recruiting and training our replacements!

The problem, however, is more than simple economics, because human bodies not crops are the final products of farming.

Those bodies are made of well refined clay put together by nature in combination with water, air and sunshine.

Farmers encourage this process. All of them know it cannot begin without water and soil containing the suitable plant food minerals necessary for making bones, flesh and brains. Poor soils contain less of these minerals, good soils more of them. Poor soils produce less food or fibre per acre, at a higher cost per unit, while at the same time they supply the needs of *fewer* people at a *higher* cost of them. Good soil is our very Margin of Life!

We have neglected this soil phase of the farm problem in past and present farm programs. Doing so has left us with the same basic trouble we began with over 30 years ago. They are:

1. Poor soils, appearing on almost every farm and against which most farmers and consumers cannot defend themselves.

2. Low market prices against which the farmer cannot defend himself.

3. Increasing production costs against which the farmer cannot defend himself.

More specifically, 32% of our good land is lost beyond recovery. From what is left we now take three times as much plant food as we return in fertilizers. Seventy percent of our farmers have an average annual net income of only $1,351. The next 15% have less than $6,000 per year. The top 15% only have an average income of $13,500, about what a good insurance salesman would make with a pencil and pad of paper.

Our costs of production are now about 12 times what they were in the early 30's, when farm programs began. If farm products had moved up the same proportion, wheat would now bring $3.60 per bu. in place of $1.50. Hogs: $36.00 per hundredweight in place of $21.00. Steers: $60.00 in place in $26.00 per cwt.

What is a simple attainable solution poor soils, low market prices, and high costs?

1. Restore the potential to produce (at a profit) in our poor soils. Protect the potential in our richer soils so that we may provide good food in abundance at a reasonable cost to the consumer of this and coming generations.

2. Pay a minimum wage equivalent, or a fair price for restoring the potential thus protecting the farmer against the equally urgent need to produce products for the consumer at a lower level.

3. Restore the soil potential at a fair price level by providing the farmer with a free market offering to buy tons of a suitable crop which, by its weight, measures the degree of soil restoration accomplished, and the amount due him. This free market offering to buy tons of a suitable crop proving soil restoration on one or all of his acres in any given year, gives him a chance to defend himself against low market prices and high local costs, by "shifting" low producing acres to the soil restoration market while at the same time he defends the consumer and the nation against soil depletion and destruction.

The price to be paid for tons of a suitable crop would be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, and would be determined by the amount of fertility returned to the soil as against that which is lost each year through crop production.

The second (alternate) market is the key to solving other problems of concern to the the farmer for impounding extra rainfall on farmer, consumer and government. It offers a means of buying Flood Control at a profit to the government by offering payment to his private property to be used later for irrigation, resulting in cheaper food for the consumer and more profit to the farmer.

In addition to these values, the second market can also buy erosion control, stream siltation control, water conservation, wildlife habitat restoration, (and perhaps later even insect control through creating an environment favoring their natural enemies) and other values to the final consumer.

Through this second market we can open the door for the science of agriculture to reach the farmer in a direct way without taking the time needed for special training. It is acceptable to him as illustrated by the response I have had from farmers at meetings and discussions in several States. The second market also give us the opportunity to expand our agricultural production at once in case of national or international emergency.

Is this approach too costly? Not when you consider the savings that would be affected through the elimination of present costs that do not protect or restore our potential to produce food and fibre at a time when the population explosion threatens to outdistance farm production.

The cost allowed for depleting a resource as figured for income tax purposes is from 5% to 27% on gross profits. Those who mine the plant foods farmers need are allowed a 15% of gross profits deduction as a cost item for depleting a natural resource. If this is a fair figure, there should be no objection to providing a sum for the purpose of restoring our food producing resource of soil fertility, for which at present there is no substitute. It is a program that can work because every farmer understands the need for increasing the fertility of his land, and thereby its per acre yields so as to reduce his *per unit costs.*

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a private bill for the relief of Mr. Pedro Irizarry Guido.

For a period of over 13 years Mr. Irizarry has been trying in every possible way to obtain redress for a serious injustice to him while he was a Federal employee in Puerto Rico. He has exhausted all possible administrative remedies and has come to me to try to obtain relief from this honorable Congress, which is his court of last resort.

I believe that Mr. Irizarry's claim is highly meritorious and urge that my bill be quickly reported and passed. For the information of my esteemed colleagues I include at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the favorable report of the Committee on the Judiciary which was submitted last year:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to pay Pedro Irizarry Guido of San Juan, P.R., $3,581.05 in full settlement of his claims for additional compensation for overtime and nightwork from July 10, 1946 to March 24, 1952.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Army in its report to the committee on the bill outlined the facts of the case as disclosed by its investigation, and stated that it deferred to the views of Congress as to whether relief should be extended to the individual in this case. The Comptroller General did not recommend favorable action. This bill was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on March 31, 1966. At that time, the sponsor of the bill, the Honorable Santiago Polanco-Abreu, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, appeared before the committee to testify in support of the bill. At the same hearing, Thomas G. Watkins, representing the American Federation of Government Employees, also appeared to testify in support of the bill.

The information submitted to the committee established that Mr. Pedro Irizarry Guido has been employed as a civilian employee by the Department of the Army since February 1946, at Fort Buchanan, P.R. In the period from July 10, 1946, through March 24, 1952, which is the time relevant to the claim embodied in this bill, he was employed by the Quartermaster Supply Office of that installation and was specifically assigned the duty of "night duty checker" or "clerk on night duty." This position required Mr. Guido to serve as a "watchman-caretaker" for the protection of the quartermaster property and performance of other miscellaneous duties of approximately the same level of difficulty. These included receiving emergency shipments after regular office hours, answering the telephone, and taking care of all routine actions. He performed these duties between 4 p.m. and midnight daily except Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. His position also required him to remain on the installation available for duty until 7:30 a.m. and to accompany an engineer refrigeration checker to unlock two cold storage warehouses at 3 a.m. and 6 a.m. daily. Sleeping quarters were provided for him at the installation and provision was made for eating and sleeping during the tour. Mr. Guido's specific duties and the nature of his position as night checker remained constant from the time he accepted the job to March 24, 1952.

Mr. Guido first filed a claim for his nightwork on July 4, 1955. On February 18, 1957, the Comptroller General disallowed the claim on the grounds that available records do not substantiate the overtime and nightwork claimed. The committee feels that the fact that the claim was filed within the time required for payment shows that Mr. Guido was diligent in his attempts to exhaust administrative remedies available to him, and further that he acted promptly to protect his rights in this case.

Army records show that from July 10, 1946, to March 24, 1952, Mr. Guido received a fixed annual salary for the job of night checker. These records also show that for administrative purposes his salary was for a 5-day, 40-hour workweek plus overtime, if any. In addition he received a night differential allowance for his regularly assigned night duty hours. Mr. Guido's individual earnings records during the 5 years in question disclose that occasionally he performed overtime services, other than his duties in unlocking the warehouse doors, and that he received payment for these services in small and varying amounts. As pertinent time and attendance records have been destroyed according to routine records management procedures, it is impossible to identify what specific hours of overtime were reported as worked or the nature of the work performed.

The situation as reflected both in the Department of the Army report and the Comptroller General report is that the exact records concerning Mr. Guido's extra duties are not available. The Army does observe that this duty entailed approximately 1½ hours every night and that further the performance of these duties occurred at times which prevented uninterrupted sleep. The Army stated that Mr. Guido performed all duties in this period in a knowledgeable, faithful, and commendable manner. Further, the committee observes that the Army report states that available records suggest that Mr. Guido was paid no compensation for this particular duty. Based upon the number of workdays in each pay period less an estimated period of leave, the Army determined that an award of $3,581.05 would be an appropriate amount to compensate Mr. Guido for the time spent in performing his additional duties. This amount would represent overtime and night differential pay for the time estimated by the Army that Mr. Guido would have performed these duties.

A consideration of all the facts and circumstances of this case has led the committee to conclude that this claim should be favorably considered and the bill amended to provide for a payment of $3,581.05. The formula followed by the Army in arriving at this amount appears to be the best solution of the matter which can be obtained in the light of all the circumstances. Accordingly, it is recommended that the bill, as amended, be considered favorably.

UNIVERSITY OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution to provide for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas. My bill is similar to that introduced earlier in this session by the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, and that introduced by the Honorable JAMES O'HARA, the distinguished Member from Illinois. I urge all of my colleagues in this Chamber to study this bill and to introduce similar measures.

We are all aware of the increasing involvement of the United States with the affairs of the countries of Latin America. On the economic and cultural fronts, primarily, there has been a tremendous amount of mutual cooperation and assistance. In many universities, both here and in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, special centers and divisions have been established in the field of Latin American studies. As one example, the Inter-American University located in San Germán, Puerto Rico, is making admirable progress in the development of programs to foster a greater understanding among students and educators of the mutual problems arising from the relations between the United States and the sister Republics of Latin America.

The activities of the universities in this regard are highly commendable and their officials should be congratulated for their appreciation of the great need for expertise and understanding in the field of inter-American relations. Nevertheless, when we consider the tremendous diversity throughout the Western Hemisphere in every aspect of life—vast differences in cultures, economies, politics—and also the magnitude of the lack of mutual understanding which still exists among the citizenry of the American Republics, we can only conclude that many more measures must be taken.

My bill provides for the establishment of a commission on the University of the Americas which is directed to consider all possible factors bearing upon the desirability of establishing a university, staffed by educators from all of the American Republics and available to students from all over the Western Hemisphere. I am confident that the final conclusion of this commission would be that there exists a great need for a University of the Americas and I am hopeful that my colleagues in this Chamber will see fit to authorize the establishment of such a commission.

PROTESTS PROPOSED DONATION OF 6 ACRES PRIVATELY HELD LAND DOWNTOWN WASHINGTON TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. 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 Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest the offer by the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, to donate 6 acres of land currently in private hands in downtown Washington to the Organization of American States, said land to serve as headquarters for the New Permanent Council and General Secretariat of that Organization.

This offer was reported in the Evening Star of Saturday, February 18, 1967, under dateline Buenos Aires. I shall include the entire article at the end of my remarks if there is no objection.

During the District of Columbia subcommittee hearings on the chancery legislation currently pending before the committee, we heard testimony from Ambassador James W. Symington, Chief of Protocol of the Department of State. In that testimony, the Ambassador stated that all lands in question would be

leased or sold to the interested foreign powers. Yet, in the Evening Star story, we are informed that Secretary Rusk has offered to donate 6 acres of land to the OAS. I am told, and if the information is inaccurate it should be denied at once, that an offer has been made equaling $100 a square foot on the 6 acres involved.

Mr. Speaker, this is $4,300,000 plus dollars an acre, tax dollars taken from the general fund, and the result of the purchase is to further weaken the economy of the District of Columbia by removing the property from the District tax rolls. In addition to the economic inequity being perpetrated by the Secretary, there seems to be a real constitutional question involved. It might be responsibly doubted if the Federal Government can take land for foreign governments and international organizations. *Kohl* v. *United States*, 91 U.S. 367, states that:

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

The donation of land proposed by the Secretary of State will establish a precedent, and in my view a most unfortunate one. It is clear that at the very least the Secretary is extremely premature in offering the OAS any land not currently controlled by the State Department. At the worst, he could be guilty of establishing a new role for the Federal Government, that of acquiring privately held land for the purpose of redistributing it as a gift to foreign agencies.

The article referred to follows:

OAS Offered 6 Acres Here for Headquarters

(By Jeremiah O'Leary, Latin American writer of the Star)

Buenos Aires.—The United States has offered to donate six acres of land in downtown Washington to the Organization of American States to serve as headquarters for the New Permanent Council and General Secretariat that will emerge from the reforms being made here in the hemispheric body, it was learned today.

Informed sources said the offer was made at a closed session of the foreign ministers conference this week by the U.S. delegation, headed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Location of the proposed site was not disclosed. However, it was revealed that a bill already has been drawn up for submission to Congress in anticipation that the third special Inter-American Conference will accept the offer.

SEALTEST SITE MENTIONED

In testimony Thursday before the House District Committee, James W. Symington, State Department chief of protocol, said the OAS is interested in the 4-acre Sealtest site on Pennsylvania Avenue just west of Washington Circle.

Symington said the OAS could buy the site without congressional approval of a multi-acre chancery enclave plan proposed by the State Department and being aired by the House District Committee.

It is no secret that many hemispheric nations have been as dissatisfied in recent years with the physical setup of office space and meeting chambers available to the OAS as they have been with the performance of the Pan American Union and the personnel making up the existing secretariat.

The Pan American Union at 17th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, long ago had to expand into an annex two blocks away and other functions of the secretariat are performed in other parts of Washington.

The reorganization of the OAS machinery being carried out here will create three separate organizations: The political arm or General Assembly which will meet once a year on a rotating basis in hemispheric capitals: The Economic and Social Council, which will function on an equal basis with the permanent council and also meet in various locales several times a year and the Educational, Technical and Cultural Council, which may be located in permanent status in some other capital than Washington.

Mexico is considered the likeliest site for the Cultural Council headquarters.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SELECTION SEEMS SURE

Under the reorganization of the OAS being completed here, it appears certain that Washington will be headquarters for the Permanent Council, the IAE-CESOC and the secretariat. Council meetings would continue to be held in Washington about once a month while the General Assembly would meet once a year instead of every five years as is now the case with the ministerial level meetings.

The foreign ministers remained in session until after 8 o'clock last night and will have a full schedule today. The foreign ministers are continuing to wrestle in closed sessions with the agenda for the summit, which now appears set for Uruguay beginning April 12 or 14. Other delegates of lower rank are completing the language of the OAS reforms, with some delay being caused by difference in terminology.

The only stumbling block to the summit agreement appears to be differences between the U.S. and Colombia over the precise language of the summit agenda. Both Colombian and U.S. sources said last night this does not constitute an impasse and that there is complete cordiality and understanding.

GODLESSNESS AND CRIME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the members of the Katzenbach Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Miss Genevieve Blatt, annexed additional views to the Commission's report which merit more currency than they are likely to receive as a small chapter of that great volume.

In her poignant prose, Miss Blatt identifies what I call "the cause of all of the causes of crime." Under leave of the House, I quote herewith Miss Blatt's additional views in full:

> Thorough as the Commission's studies have been and comprehensive as its valuable recommendations are, its report seems deficient to me in that it neglects to recognize godlessness as a basic cause of crime and religion as a basic cure.
>
> The report acknowledges the necessity for activating religious institutions in the war on crime, and it mentions some of the excellent work religious groups have done in youth work and along similar lines.
>
> But nowhere does the report mention the Ten Commandments which underlie our Judaeo-Christian culture. Nor does it mention the God who created all of us, who gave us the Ten Commandments, who enforces a law higher than ours and who administers the ultimate justice.
>
> Admittedly, it would not be within the province of the Commission to recommend how to combat the godlessness so prevalent today and so basically at the root of so much of our crime problem. Nor could the Commission properly outline how religion, as a moral force distinct from an institutional group, could help control crime.
>
> But just as the report recognizes the obvious relationship of poverty and ignorance and discrimination to an increasing crime rate, it should recognize that man's alienation from his God has also been a crime-inducing factor.
>
> It is true that all too frequent unwillingness of many religious groups and of many presumably religious individuals to live by and not just to profess the moral precepts common to all religions has all too frequently blunted the effectiveness of religion in preventing crime. Nevertheless, properly used, religion is a real weapon. In my personal opinion, it is the best weapon. And it should be used.
>
> My feeling is that we unquestionably should, as the Commission suggests, improve family life and the school system and every other human institution. In so doing we will undoubtedly help prevent crime.
>
> To do these things, however, without renewing and revitalizing religious life, won't be enough.
>
> Somehow or other we must restore to every citizen's everyday living that same belief in God's love and justice which was characteristic of our countrymen in an earlier and less crime-ridden period of our history.
>
> We were a God-fearing people at one time, and proud of it. We must be that again if we expect to see the crime rate substantially reduced.

LEGISLATION TO MAKE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT MORE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE AND DEVOID OF POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which is the second of two bills designed to take the Post Office Department completely out of politics. Identical measures have been introduced by my colleagues the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. KYL, Mr. MAYNE, and Mr. SCHERLE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

These same gentlemen, with the exception of Mr. DERWINSKI, joined with me on February 9 in sponsoring the first proposal—to prohibit political influence in connection with appointments and promotions in the lower echelons of the Post Office Department.

The bills we have introduced today deal with the top positions in the Post Office Department whose incumbents are appointed by the President.

The bills provide that the Postmaster General shall not perform any duties except those relating to the administration of the postal service and his office is to be disassociated from the President's Cabinet.

Through the years we have witnessed

a situation develop whereby the Postmaster General devotes altogether too much of his time and attention to matters unrelated to the postal service. It is impossible for the Postmaster General to administer the affairs of a department the size and magnitude of the Post Office Departments without devoting full time to his official duties.

Our bills further provide that the Postmaster General shall be appointed by the President for a term of 12 years and that he may not be removed during his term of office except for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance of office.

During the past 6 years, three persons have occupied the position of Postmaster General, each of whom had different concepts and sometimes contradictory policies with respect to the administration of the postal service. Each time there was a change in the Office of the Postmaster General, the direction of the Post Office Department was altered. This lack of continuity in office has tended to create a chaotic condition which finally manifested itself in the recent breakdown of the postal service with the suggested solution offered by one Assistant Postmaster General "to burn the mail."

It is important to the American people that the postal service be administered with the greatest possible degree of continuity and purpose. Vacillating and indecisive policies must be eliminated so that the general public and business mailers will be the recipients of a better postal service which is predicated on a constant purpose of improvement and a sense of dedication to the needs of the mailing public.

Our bills further provide that the Deputy Postmaster General, to be appointed by the President, must be selected from among the career employees of the postal service and his term of office shall be for 6 years. This provision carries out a recommendation of the former Hoover Commission which stated that the immediate subordinate of the Postmaster General should be a career postal employee who is knowledgeable, possessing background experience related to the day-by-day operations of the postal service.

The other provisions of the bill relate to the establishment of rotating terms of appointments of 6 years for the six Assistant Postmasters General and the General Counsel of the Post Office Department. As in the case of the Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General, occupants of these positions are to be appointed by the President and removed only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. This section provides that not more than three of the six Assistant Postmasters General shall be members of the same political party, thus creating a bipartisan group to advise the Postmaster General.

The general purpose of this legislation is to create a climate and attitude of independence from political influence among the top echelons of the Post Office Department. In this manner, occupants of these positions will be free from political interference and pressures which far too often shape the policies of the Post Office Department.

For example, political pressures or influence should no longer dictate the establishment and location of new post offices and postal facilities, or determine the banks in which postal receipts are to be deposited, or dictate the appointments and promotions of postal employees, or determine from whom the Post Office Department should purchase equipment and supplies, or dictate who should receive contracts to be awarded by the Post Office Department.

Under our bills the Postmaster General and his immediate subordinates will be in a position to conduct the affairs of the Department with greater efficiency on a businesslike basis with consideration only for the needs of the American people.

A Government activity as large and as complex as the Post Office Department, with more than 700,000 employees and with $6.8 billion in annual appropriations, certainly is not the kind of Government establishment which will survive efficiently and effectively without complete divorcement from political influences, pressures, and demands.

Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1967, the distinguished House minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], said:

> We believe the Post Office Department should be taken out of politics from top to bottom.

The Republican Members of this body from Iowa wholeheartedly support that statement and the proposals we have offered—the first on February 9 and the second today—will in fact take the Department completely out of politics.

We welcome the support of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

TO MAKE THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT MORE EFFECTIVE AND DEVOID OF POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues, the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. GROSS, Mr. KYL, Mr. MAYNE, and Mr. SCHERLE] in the introduction of legislation which would complete the task of taking the Post Office Department out of politics.

On February 9 legislation was introduced to eliminate political considerations in the appointment of postmasters and rural mail carriers as well as from promotions within the Postal Field Service.

The legislation being introduced today takes the next step needed to free the Post Office Department from political influence. It provides that the Postmaster General be appointed for a 12-year term, removes the office from the President's Cabinet, and prohibits the occupant of the office from engaging in any duties other than those directly connected to the administration of the postal service.

Mr. Speaker, if other congressional offices are anything like mine, they have received numerous complaints about the postal service. Something must be done and soon. The lack of continuity in the office of the Postmaster General has contributed to the inefficiency in the Department.

We need to insulate the Postmaster General from political pressures so that he will be able to conduct his Department in a businesslike manner. We need to strengthen his authority to deal forthrightly with the problems of the postal service. As long as Presidential or congressional politics determine policy, personnel, and facility decisions at the Post Office Department, we will continue to have second-class postal service.

I hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give prompt consideration to the two bills which have been introduced.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill, in conjunction with our earlier proposals to eliminate political influence in the appointment and promotion of postmasters, rural carriers, and field service employees, would greatly increase the efficiency and quality of the operation of the Post Office Department. We are constantly faced with the prospects of ever-increasing deficits in the Post Office operation and increases in the postal rates.

Postal patrons feel that it is about time for Congress to implement legislation that will place the Post Office under the management of people who are principally concerned with its effective operation, and people who, in turn, will staff the postal service on the basis of quality alone.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any other Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN RESOLUTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1967, the American Lithuanians of Newark, N.J., and vicinity gathered in a meeting at St. George's Lithuanian Hall to commemorate the 49th anniversary of the February 16, 1918, Declaration of Independence.

A resolution was unanimously adopted at the meeting and I hereby submit it for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the hope that Members of Congress will not forget that Lithuania and several other countries subjugated by the Soviet Union, still yearn for independ-

ence and freedom. I know that someday Lithuania and other nations captured by the Soviet Union will regain their independence and freedom. How soon will depend to a great extent on what the United States says and does to help.

The following resolution will help:

We, American Lithuanians of Newark, New Jersey and vicinity, gathered in a meeting on February 12, 1967, at St. George's Lithuanian Hall, to commemorate the 49th Anniversary of the February 16, 1918 Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, did unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty, and

"Whereas the Soviet Union has by force of arms suppressed the freedom of the people of Lithuania and has continued to deny these people the right of self determination. Now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Soviets show their sincerity by liberating the Baltic Countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and be it further

"*Resolved*, To urge the President of the United States to instruct the United States Mission to the United Nations to request that the abolishment of the Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Soviet consular treaty must be unconditionally rejected and any endorsement of it is an endorsement of a Soviet aggression, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we send this Resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, all Senators and Representatives from the State of New Jersey, the Governor of New Jersey, and the press."

Done at Newark, N.J., this 12th day of February 1967.

VALENTINAS MELINIS,
President.
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS,
Secretary.

EUGENE C. PULLIAM RECEIVES TORCH OF TRUTH AWARD

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Eugene C. Pulliam, distinguished publisher of the Indianapolis Star and the Indianapolis News, was recently awarded the Indianapolis Advertising Club's eighth annual Torch of Truth Award. This award is given to recognition of promotion of integrity and public service in advertising.

Mr. Pulliam's acceptance remarks pointed out that:

Today the power of government over the lives and fortunes of the people is greater than at any time in our history.

The following story from the Indianapolis Star of February 17, 1967, carries pertinent excerpts from Mr. Pulliam's speech to the club:

FREE PRESS GUARANTEE TO FAIR TRIAL: PULLIAM

Without the constitutional guarantee of a free press, the constitutional guarantee of a fair trial would become a mockery of justice, Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of The Indianapolis Star and The Indianapolis News, declared in a speech yesterday before the Advertising Club of Indianapolis.

Pulliam termed "it very obvious that if the legal profession succeeds in shutting off the flow of pre-trial news on the pretext of assuring an impartial trial, other professions, armed with equally convincing-sounding arguments, will agitate to reduce the newspaper profession to rewriting handouts and routine releases."

The job of newspapers is to protect the public by making sure that the public is informed about what goes on, and this cannot be done if the legal profession is going to continually harass them with new regulations and new proceedings which give judges almost a mandate to muzzle the press, the published asserted.

Pulliam was presented the advertising club's eighth annual Torch of Truth Award at the luncheon meeting at Monte's Restaurant in Riley Center.

The award is presented in recognition of promotion of integrity and public service in advertising, Ted I. Nicholas, club president, said. The award was presented by Sam J. Freeman, chairman of the board of L. Strauss and Company, and 1964 Torch of Truth recipient.

Pulliam accused the Federal government of deceiving the public and trying to control the press, and warned that "a free press in America is the last great bastion of the people against complete domination by the government."

"I believe, and I have faith in the belief, that as partners in freedom—business, labor, the professions, and the press joined together in a partnership rooted in confidence and understanding, can save freedom for America," Pulliam said.

Through regulations the government exercises the power to destroy—the very power of life or death—over all transportation enterprises, power companies, telephone companies, and radio and television companies, the speaker said.

"I would call your attention to the fact that during the last few months we have seen the glaring example of Federal officials literally blackmailing American business and American labor into doing the bidding of the Washington bureaucrats," Pulliam said.

He warned that "freedom of the press and speech in the United States are in greater danger today than at any time in our history for today the power of government over the lives and fortunes of the people is greater than at any time in our history, and that power is being used to subvert and destroy the freedom of the people to examine the acts of their government."

Pulliam blamed "publicity-seeking lawyers" for the clash over the First and Sixth amendments, which guarantee free expression and a fair trial, respectively.

"Each time a newspaper writes '30' to its existence, one more community watchdog disappears . . . with taxation and other forms of government intervention, weak newspapers have found it impossible to survive. Washington bureaucracy apparently wants to see to it that all cities of America become one-newspaper towns," Pulliam said.

END THE WAR

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to end the war in Vietnam and as the following editorial from the February 19, 1967, Indianapolis Star so well states:

The best way to end this long and ugly war is for the United States to win it.

The article follows:

YES, END THE WAR

What is cruel about ending a war fast? The greatest fighting generals of all times and all nations have agreed in essence with Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman's simple, plain statement: "War is hell."

The Vietnam War is no exception. It is as ugly as war can be. Innocents as well as fighting men, are killed and maimed—women, children, the elderly, noncombatants—on both sides.

The longer a war lasts, the more is the death, injury and destruction.

The people of the United States bear no malice against the people of Vietnam, north or south. The United States government is continuing the war to honor a commitment to the government of South Vietnam and to keep a dictatorial Communist government, whose tyranny would be permanent, from seizing this Asian nation of more than 15 million persons.

The United States has stopped the Red push. There can be no doubt that this has given heart to other Asian countries striving for representative, elective self-government. The Red tide was turned in Indonesia, an archipelago nation of moe than 100 million. It was turned in Malaysia, a nation of more than 11 million. The Communists were making heavy pushes in both nations. Now, in both, the Red dragon has been defanged.

Nations hanging in the balance look toward the winner in a world power struggle, of which the Vietnam War is part. And Freedom-minded nations hope for a winner that will not in turn devour them.

The turmoil in Red China may well be a direct consequence of our stand in Vietnam.

So may be the other numerous strains in the fabric of world Communism, which appears to be sleazier and less uniform in weave, quality and purpose than it was before the tide turned in Vietnam.

These are gains for freedom, and freedom is something for which millions have sacrificed their lives and fortunes since the great ideal raised men's eyes to goals above the mere level of survival and subsistence. This struggle of centuries, by brave men and women, is sometimes easy to forget in a land of abundance where most of the goals for which those fighters fought are everyday realities.

After the war ends and the people of South Vietnam are truly free to decide their own destinies, they will have the same chance to reach for freedom, and if they are successful to enjoy it.

They will never have that chance if Communism moves in with its force, murder and fakery.

There is one way to stop the Communist power drive in Vietnam. That is to turn up the heat, increase the intensity of the war, multiply the bombing raids.

The Reds of North Vietnam are hypocrites when they say they are ready to negotiate. The blunt condition—the only condition—they put down as a prerequisite for negotiation is U.S. withdrawal. In other words, a demand for Red victory.

They understand one language and one only—force.

Then we must apply it to break down the Communist military machine. The Reds used the latest truce to build up their battle strength. The truce, from a logical, political and military standpoint, was idiocy on our part. We will lose far more than we would

have lost had we kept on fighting—in lives as well as strategic gains.

As Representative L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina said: "We should now have learned our last bitter lesson—no more truces, no more letdowns. We should not only resume the bombings, but triple them."

He is right. The best way to end this long and ugly war is for the United States to win it—to smash the Communist power that has enslaved the people of North Vietnam and wants to enslave those of South Vietnam.

The strong medicine of hard battle is the cure for this disease of ugly, endless warfare. It would be more humanitarian in the long run than another five years or another decade of slow, dehumanizing half-war.

And the people of North Vietnam as well as those of South Vietnam, and of America and all other nations, would be the real victors.

RESOLUTION TO ELIMINATE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined 24 other distinguished Members in support of a resolution which would transfer any function the present House Committee on Un-American Activities might possess vital to U.S. internal security to the Judiciary Committee.

I have been keenly aware of the House Committee on Un-American Activities so-called investigations that often result in exposure to the merciless glare of publicity of innocent individuals. The House Committee on Un-American Activities work with regard to U.S. internal security could be carried out with greater effectiveness and appropriateness by the Judiciary Committee, which traditionally works with a proper regard for the rights of individuals and for other safeguards of the American system of justice and civil liberties.

There is presently before the Federal courts a case, the Stamler case, that gives promise of silencing the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the grounds of unconstitutionality. Just recently, the U.S. court of appeals, sitting en banc, rejected by a 6-to-2 margin a petition by a U.S. attorney in the Stamler case. The Government attorney sought to have the entire eight-man appeals court sit for a rehearing of a decision by a three-judge panel of its members last November. That decision last November set aside a U.S. district court judge's dismissal of suits challenging the constitutionality of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Rejection of the U.S. attorney's petition now sets the stage for either a further petition to the Supreme Court—within the next 90 days—by the Government on the appeals court decision, or a hearing by the three-judge panel of the suits by Stamler and others on the first amendment and bill of attainder aspects of the case. However, it would seem to me there is enough clear evidence for the House of Representatives to take care of its own housecleaning, especially in light of the recent revelations about the House Committee on Un-American Activities using paid witnesses.

In order for the House to act, I believe the Rules Committee should hold hearings on this matter. I respectfully urge my colleagues to address a request to the chairman of the Rules Committee calling for public hearings on this pending resolution.

At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues a number of editorials and newspaper articles that are of significant related interest. I therefore insert this material in the RECORD herewith:

A STATEMENT OF CONCERN BY 120 CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND NUNS IN THE GREATER BOSTON AREA, JANUARY, 1967

As we start the new year 1967, we recognize that we enter a period that may be of great importance for the liberties we cherish. Because of the difficult questions which now divide many Americans, we are concerned about the pressures tending to stifle free expression and creative thinking among American citizens.

One institution, of which too little is known among the general public, concerns us in particular: the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (HUAC).

On June 11, Father Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., eminent Catholic sociologist and Professor of Roman Catholic Studies at the Harvard Divinity School, discussed in *The Pilot* some of the serious charges against HUAC, and he requested that the House of Representatives debate these charges. Father Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Dean of the Boston College Law School, also made this request in an article entitled "The Case Against HUAC" (*Boston Globe*, August 28).

Since these two articles were written, HUAC has announced that it is launching an investigation, under the joint supervision of two segregationists, Rep. William M. Tuck (D-Va.) and Rep. John H. Buchanan, Jr. (R-Ala.), into disturbances in Negro urban areas to determine if "a group of Communists doing the work of Moscow or Peking, as the case may be, and attempting to mask their subversion under the guise of civil rights" is responsible.

Moreover, it has been disclosed by a longtime supporter of the Committee, Rep. Wayne Hays (D-Ohio), that HUAC has been paying its "friendly witnesses" for testimony (after the Committee members had denied having done so) and that HUAC keeps dossiers of "un-American activities" *even on other congressmen* (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 20, p. 27510).

In an editorial decrying HUAC, Father John B. Sheerin, C.S.P. stated:

"In reading the newspaper accounts of the (HUAC) hearings almost inevitably we thought of the Star Chamber proceedings in old England but I wonder how many Catholics realized that it was their forebears who were the main victims of these miscarriages of justice. In many instances, their rights of free speech and fair trial as well as their religious liberty were at stake." (*The Catholic World*, October, 1966.)

We, as Catholic priests and nuns, are aware of the dangers of restricting freedom of speech and the political and religious liberties guaranteed in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. As Richard Cardinal Cushing stated in his recent pastorial letter (December 10), "Critical thinkers and thinking critics constitute the life-blood of any society."

We endorse the calls of Father Fichter and Father Drinan for "a full and open debate in the Congress about the continued existence of HUAC," and we urge Speaker of the House John McCormack to provide for the discussion in the House of Representatives this issue merits.

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Aug. 28, 1966]

(By Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Dean, Boston College Law School)

On the first day of the reconvening of Congress in January 1945, a strange unprecedented and tragic event occurred. On that day the first and only permanent investigating committee was authorized by the House of Representatives.

Led by Mississippi's segregationist Cong. John Rankin, a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans made the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) a permanent standing committee—over the dissenting votes of Cong. John McCormack and, in 1946, of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

From that day in early January, 1945, until last week HUAC has been engaged in some of the most unproductive and disorderly inquiries ever conducted by Congress.

The recent tumultuous hearings of HUAC on the activities of the "Vietniks" prompted even Sen. Everett Dirksen, in an unprecedented rebuke to a committee of the House, to state his firm disapproval of HUAC's tactics and his opposition to the legislation to be proposed by HUAC.

The injunctive relief given by Federal Judge Corcoran to the two individuals subpoenaed by HUAC was a last, desperate attempt to prevent the public harassment of American citizens because of their views on American foreign policy.

The reversal of Judge Corcoran's decision may have been erroneous; it certainly did nothing to resolve the grave question which Judge Corcoran faced: how can a citizen protect himself ahead of time from the devastating and irremediable harm to his reputation which will almost inevitably result from a session before the inquisitors of HUAC?

Despite the huge staff of HUAC and the protestations of its members and friends its achievements during the 21 years of its existence have been meager:

1—Only three pieces of legislation enacted in the last 20 years can be traced directly to HUAC.

2—The hundreds of pamphlets issued by HUAC have been consistently criticized by scholars and experts as misleading. The pamphlets have literally "fed" right-wing extremist groups.

3—In the last 15 years HUAC has asked and received House endorsement for its citations of contempt for 129 individuals but only nine of these citations have resulted in final conviction. The U.S. Supreme Court has reversed five convictions since 1961.

4—HUAC's abortive hearings on the Ku Klux Klan have led neither to new legislation nor effective prosecution of the Klan.

The reasoning which keeps HUAC in business comes to this: Communism is so terrible an enemy that any method of exposure is justified and should be retained.

It is this simplistic and indeed pernicious logic which prompts right-wing extremists and many others to brand anyone critical of HUAC as either subversive or "duped."

The fear of subversion and Communists appears to be so profound and even pathological among countless Americans that it submerges their beliefs in the right to a fair trial and the necessity of the separation of powers among the three branches of government.

It is, of course, these two key elements of American democracy which HUAC threatens to undermine.

The basic arguments against the continued existence of HUAC could be stated as follows:

1—If a person is to be accused of "un-American activities" (not merely opinions) he should be tried before a court of law and not before a congressional committee.

2—If Congress desires information about "un-American activities" (a term which Congress has never defined) it can acquire such information through its own committee on the judiciary and does not need a special roving group to inquire into "espionage," a subject which is already within the specific mandate of the House's Judiciary Committee.

Many well-informed Americans have long since concluded that the time has come for HUAC to be abolished. But political realities must be faced; on Jan. 27, 1966, HUAC received its requested appropriation of $425,000 from the House by a vote of 299 to 24.

In 1965 it received an appropriation of $370,000 by a vote of 358 to 29.

Congressmen think—perhaps erroneously—that voters back home would not approve of a vote to withhold funds from a House committee investigating "un-American" activities.

Indeed, it is humiliating to have to note that in both 1965 and 1966 not a single congressman from New England voted to diminish or eliminate the appropriation sought by HUAC!

Under the aegis of the long standing National Committee to Abolish HUAC a Massachusetts group has been reactivated in the recent past. Under chairmanship of Prof. Vern Countryman of the Harvard Law School the Massachusetts Committee to Abolish HUAC, based at 144A Mt. Auburn st. in Cambridge, is fighting an uphill struggle.

That struggle may possibly become a bit less difficult now that there is at least a discussion going as to the availability of an injunction by a Federal court against HUAC. But the widespread, emotion-laden and mountainous support in America for anything anti-Communist may well prevent the phasing-out of HUAC in the foreseeable future.

The least that the people of America can expect, however, is what Fr. Joseph Fichter, S.J., called for in the Boston Pilot on June 11, 1966—"a full and open debate in the Congress about the continued existence of HUAC."

After the unbelievable debacle staged by HUAC earlier this month the citizens of America are entitled to have at least an orderly inquiry by Congress into one of its committees, the very existence of which was described recently in a statement by 100 of the nation's leading constitutional lawyers as "unnecessary and unconstitutional."

[From the New World, Jan. 27, 1967]

IS HUAC NECESSARY?—MANY SAY NO

(By George G. Higgins[1])

A group of 120 Roman Catholic priests and nuns in the greater Boston area has endorsed a "Statement of Concern" on the right of dissent, with particular reference to the House Un-American Activities committee (HUAC).

The priests and nuns noted that both the Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of the Boston college law school, and the Rev. Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., professor of Roman Catholic Studies at the Harvard divinity school, earlier had raised "serious charges against HUAC" and had called for "a full and open debate in the Congress about the continued existence of HUAC."

The statement called attention to an editorial by the Rev. John B. Sheerin, C.S.P., in the Catholic World which compared HUAC's hearings in Washington, D.C., this past August to "'the Star Chamber proceedings in Old England'" where the "'rights of free speech and fair trial'" of Catholics "'as well as their religious liberty'" were jeopardized.

"We, as Catholic priests and nuns, are aware of the dangers of restricting freedom of speech and the political and religious liberties guaranteed in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution," the statement said.

The signers of the statement endorsed the calls for a debate on HUAC and urged Speaker of the House McCormack "to provide for the discussion in the House of Representatives this issue merits."

The Boston committee could have cited a number of other Catholics who have called for the abolition of HUAC, including Msgr. Charles Owen Rice, a pioneer in the field of Catholic social action in the Pittsburgh area, and the Rev. Edward Flannery, former editor of the Providence Visitor and an acknowledged expert in the field of Christian Jewish relations. Monsignor Rice has publicly stated that HUAC itself is "an ignoble experiment in un-Americanism."

Father Flannery, in an editorial entitled "HUAC Is Not Necessary," agrees with Father Fichter that no group of legislators should have the power to decide what is or is not an "un-American activity" and adds, in his own name, that "it may be the judgment of history that HUAC itself most perfectly exemplifies what is meant by this ill-defined term."

Why all this criticism of HUAC? Basically there are three principal objections to the committee:

1) The existence of a congressional committee whose jurisdiction is limited to inquiring into ideas, opinions, speech, and other forms of expression is irreconcilable with a system of free expression in this country.

2) The committee's methods of operation have tended to curtail discussion of controversial issues and to hinder the development of new ideas and new approaches to the complex issues which face our country in a rapidly changing world.

3) The committee serves no useful purpose. It considers only a few bills each year, and all of these fall within the jurisdiction of some other congressional committee. Moreover we already have adequate laws, regulations, specialized personnel and procedures for safeguarding internal security.

HUAC's decision of last October to investigate Negro rioting in the major U.S. cities is an added cause of alarm and an added reason for hoping that the Congress will abolish the committee. When HUAC's chairman announced a staff inquiry into Negro rioting, preliminary to a full-scale committee investigation, there were 60 anti-rioting bills pending before the House Judiciary Committee, the appropriate body to consider such legislation.

Moreover a special Judiciary subcommittee had been authorized to make a comprehensive review of the civil rights problem. As the Washington Post pointed out, this subcommittee "needs the interference of HUAC about as urgently as a brain surgeon in the midst of a delicate operation needs the intrusion of a circus clown."

This is admittedly very strong language, but no stronger than the situation calls for. The editors of the Post and many other thoughtful and well informed observers—including the majority of civil rights leaders in the United States—fear that HUAC, under the guise of determining whether or not the Negro rioting of last summer was, in part, planned and instigated by subversive elements, will engage in a witch hunt against the civil rights movement as such. Given the committee's past record, I should say that this fear is well founded.

It should be noted, in passing, the HUAC's critics readily admit that the Congress needs some sort of machinery to investigate those matters pertaining to internal security or to the administration of existing laws.

They are convinced, however, that adequate authority for these purposes is already vested in other House committees, particularly in the Committee on the Judiciary, which has traditionally dealt with the problem of internal security. If the authority of the latter committee needs to be classified, its rules can easily be amended by the Congress to this end.

But no congressional committee should ever be authorized—under the guise of ferreting out subversive elements in our society—to investigate "propaganda" or other forms of free expression guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. To permit any agency of government to censor controversial ideas or to determine what is or is not an "un-American" activity would clearly violate the true meaning of patriotism.

Patriotism is a virtue, yes; but as Cardinal Cushing of Boston pointed out in his recent pastoral letter, "The Servant Church," there is "a distressing and too prevalent notion that patriotism must be a cloak for the blanket and blind acceptance of all decisions made by the United States. This is not patriotism—it can be instead the road to national disintegration.

"All of us must admit, and true patriots will agree, that critical thinkers and thinking critics constitute the life-blood of any society. True love of country demands that we commit ourselves unequivocally to the ideals on the basis of which America was founded—that we pursue these ideals with integrity, honesty, and fidelity, not merely in pursuit of domestic tranquility, but in our relations with other peoples in the family of nations.

"Patriotism, true and proper, demands much more than the choral chanting of 'God Bless America.' It demands a responsible, persistent, honest endeavor by citizens to insure, at home and abroad, the extension of freedom, the establishment of responsible governments and the preservation of human dignity.

"Such a commitment makes our love of country a more vital and dynamic force than any instinctive pieties of blood and soil."

[From the Pittsburgh Catholic]

REFLECTIONS

August and HUAC—The month of August—often called the "dog days" by sweltering commuters, or the "last lap" by harassed mothers of school children—has another name in newspaper circles: the "silly season."

So-called "hard news" being on vacation, the August newspaper is full of features on whiskey-drinking octogenarians, pictures of dogs diving into swimming pools . . . and coverage of House Un-American Activities Committee hearings.

Certainly the happenings during recent hearings—lawyers being carried out feet-first; supporters dressed in Revolutionary War costume—lend themselves perfectly to "silly season" journalism.

But leaving aside the circus antics of both Left and Right, and concentrating on the purposes of HUAC at the hearings, we find the legislation under discussion pragmatically unsound, politically unwise and, to borrow Msgr. Charles Owen Rice's phrase, "intellectually unspeakable."

The proposal making it criminal to "aid" in any way anyone in "hostile opposition" to one's armed forces is a piece of "my-country-right-or-wrong" hip-shooting that could riccochet disastrously all over the landscape. Making it a crime to "aid" a starving or bleeding man outrages Christian teaching. Sealing off from compassion those in "hostile

---

[1] Msgr. Higgins is the Director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

opposition" to armed forces which may have only tenuous sanction of the citizens' representative assembly (as in a certain war we have in mind) is walking on thin constitutional ice. So we think, at any rate.

As for the elephant gun legislation aimed at the ant-like efforts of some to "interfere with the movement" of military materiel—well, it's possible that HUAC has a "silly season," too.

Surely if enough citizens are sufficiently opposed to the action of their armed forces to interfere seriously with the movement of war materiel, then it is time, in a democracy at least, to question and examine the actions of the armed forces. If the protest is not seriously interfering, but is rather token dissent offered publicly and passively in the effort to change men's minds, then one is witnessing not a crime, but more a display of contending viewpoints on which a democracy should grow strong.

The distinction between treason and dissent has been carefully guarded throughout our history. It is such a vital distinction, one so fundamental to the maintenance of the American character of the government, that it deserves and demands all the reverent and stubborn support of which the virtue of patriotism is productive.

We have legislation against treason; it should be used when treason has been committed. We have no legislation against dissent and we need none. Nor do we need harassment of dissenters by HUAC. Come to think of it, we don't need HUAC.

[From Christianity and Crisis, Jan. 9, 1967]

HUAC AGAIN

(By Henry B. Clark [1])

The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) has long been a bone in the throat, and opposition to it has become a standard index of approved liberalism. But opposition to HUAC is one of those good causes one easily tires of pursuing. Its vicious tactics have been exposed so often, its ineffectualness has been so thoroughly documented, and its victims have so often escaped with "mere" harassment that one is inclined to be familiarly contemptuous of the whole sorry matter.

Most important, perhaps, is the role played by HUAC in the creation of a climate of national opinion that tolerates right-wing extremism and is always ready to believe the worst about progressive causes and individuals. Though condemned by experts as misleading, the committee's myriad pamphlets feed groups on the extreme right.

HUAC's latest maneuver is particularly ominous. On October 3 Chairman Edwin E. Willis of Louisiana announced a "preliminary inquiry" into recent Negro ghetto uprisings. The true aim of this undertaking can be clearly read between the lines of Willis' statement:

"We have no intention of investigating the civil rights movement. . . . If we should learn in the course of our investigation that a certain organization which claims to be a civil rights group is actually controlled and dominated by Communists, . . . we would not hesitate to investigate their operations. If that should develop, however, we will be investigating not a civil rights group but the activities of a group of Communists doing the work of Moscow or Peking, as the case may be, and attempting to mask their subversion under the guise of civil rights."

Fortunately, there is a possibility that HUAC may not live long enough to carry out this ominous inquiry, for both a judicial and a legislative strategy of attack are nearing culmination. The judicial strategy is based on a recent decision in the Stemler case by the Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago. This promises a full-fledged test of the constitutionability of HUAC before the Supreme Court. It derives encouragement from the fact that the Court has given evidence of second thoughts about the Frankfurter "balancing" doctrine, which argues that First Amendment guarantees have to be balanced against the needs of national security. This doctrine has never been accepted by Justices Warren, Brennan, Black and Douglas; and the famous dissenting opinions by Black and Douglas offer eloquent warnings against the danger that if First Amendment rights are abridged, we may become a nation of men and not of laws.

In *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister* (April 26, 1965), the rights of officials of the Southern Conference Education Fund were vindicated against the Louisiana counterpart of HUAC. The Stemler attorneys are hopeful that a similar ruling in their case will knock the constitutional props out from under HUAC once and for all.

This fight is especially important now because HUAC is a symbol of the resistance to social change that has manifested itself so sharply in the past few months. Not many people subscribe fully or consciously to the no-holds-barred tactics of the Committee; not many people would agree with what Father Drinan has called "the reasoning which keeps HUAC in business," i.e., the belief that "Communism is so terrible an enemy that any method of exposure is justified and should be retained."

But the vague fears of dissent and disorder that float around in the minds of most Americans are cleverly exploited by HUAC. They are reinforced, magnified and transmuted into the indecision and lukewarmness that cut the nerve of effective action against the real evils that beset us. As long as this behemoth exists, the politics of anti-Communism will more readily flourish at the expense of intelligent noncommunist democracy.

[1] Henry B. Clark is a consultant on urban studies for the Division of Christian Life and Mission of the National Council of Churches.

WASHINGTON STAR HAILS NEW YORK LOTTERY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 10, 1967, Washington Star.

I think that the Star is quite correct in predicting that the New York lottery will work well and prompt Congress to consider a national lottery. As a longtime proponent of a national lottery, I certainly hope so.

I include the Star editorial herewith:

LOTTERY IN NEW YORK

The state lottery about to go into effect in New York will constitute a decent test of a conceivable alternative to the ever-growing burden of taxation as a source of funds for the ever-growing flow of services the citizen expects from government at all levels.

In New Hampshire the lottery for education hasn't set any record for money-raising, but the New York experiment has many things in its favor missing from New Hampshire. Of these the chief is volume. It must be noted, too, that Federal laws obstructed the New Hampshire lottery. They will not be quite as oppressively operative in the Empire State.

There is a neo-Puritan cast of mind that looks with horror at such experiments, holding that they show civic irresponsibility, that the citizen ought to pay for what he wants or for what others want in sufficient numbers to make their wants law. Not so at all. State and nation both raise substantial sums from taxes on liquor and the neo-Puritans make no protest.

The fact is that people do gamble, in great numbers and, in aggregate, great amounts. Why not harness this private propensity to the public good? The further fact is that gambling now provides the base for gangster and hoodlum operations in many parts of the nation. Why not bring at least part of the field under state supervision and control? The hope would be in part to dry up the sources for the numbers racketeers and their fellows.

If the New York experiment works out as is hoped for it, the question should surely be reopened of having a national lottery as a source for national income.

FINO INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ALLOW U.S. OVERSEA BANK BRANCHES TO UNDERWRITE SECURITIES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to allow foreign branches of U.S. banks to underwrite, sell, and distribute securities outside the United States.

Since 1933, U.S. banks have not been permitted to underwrite, sell, or distribute securities. I do not intend to breach this general rule.

However, since 1916, U.S. banks have been empowered to invest in "agreement" or "Edge Act" corporations, which corporations may invest in foreign banks—which may underwrite securities—or foreign investment houses. Last year, U.S. banks were empowered to invest directly in foreign banks, including those underwriting, distributing, and selling securities.

It seems to me that the next logical step is to allow the oversea branches of U.S. banks to underwrite, sell, and distribute securities abroad, but not in the United States. This would put the oversea U.S. bank branches on a more equal footing with foreign banks in countries where banks can underwrite and sell securities.

I do not see how any conflict-of-interest problem is going to be any more severe where a bank has oversea branches doing underwriting than where it has a controlled foreign subsidiary doing it. Still, I feel that a branch's foreign securities underwriting and holdings should be limited by careful Federal Reserve Board regulation.

As U.S. interest rates go down, I expect that the burgeoning U.S. bank branches overseas are going to do less and less business in Eurodollar deposits. I am sure they would find it helpful in

taking up the slack if they were allowed to move into the securities underwriting business like their foreign banking competitors.

I was delighted to see the President take U.S. foreign bank branch dollar loans to foreign borrowers out from under the interest equalization tax. This will be good for the banks, U.S. firms abroad, and for our balance of payments.

FINO ANALYZES HOW CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION SCHOOL INTEGRATION SCHEMES CAN BE IMPLEMENTED UNDER EXISTING LEGISLATION, CITES BOSTON AND CHICAGO

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in line with my continuing opposition to programs like rent subsidies, demonstration cities, metropolitan planning, and the so-called Equal Educational Opportunity Act, I would like to point out to this House that the radical recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission that we legislate racial balance are not innovative: Congress has already given the backroom social planners of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Office of Education radical civil rights programs like rent subsidies, demonstration cities, metropolitan planning, and carte blanche aid for educational experiments to "induce" and all but force racial integration in white residential neighborhoods of the cities and suburbs.

I hope that the Members of this House will read the following analysis of the way existing programs can be used to implement the philosophy of the Civil Service Commission Report.

While Congress would have to pass new legislation to legally require school systems to see that no public school is more than 50 percent Negro or to make Federal aid to local education legally contingent on such racial balance, the Johnson administration is quietly moving to force racial balance in local communities and school systems under the language of existing programs. The radical philosophy of the Commission is already being implemented.

On November 30, 1966, a HUD aid named John Clinton told a group of educators in New York—men who were assembled pursuant to a joint HUD-Office of Education planning program approved in May 1966, to study the problem of urban education planning—that no city which did not propose busing, pupil exchange, or other schemes to achieve school racial balance in its demonstration cities application would even have its application considered by HUD. United Press International carried the text of Mr. Clinton's statement and amplification on November 30. In short, the demonstration cities program is to be used to force cities to plan their school systems in accordance with the Civil Rights Commission-Harold Howe philosophy of forced integration.

HUD plans to force cities to plan busing and school rezoning by administrative and economic pressure. Congress amendment to the demonstration cities bill to prevent actual requirement of such schemes is to be ignored. When the amendment was offered last year, I was the only Member of Congress to oppose it as a farce. HUD has confirmed my suspicions by admitting that the demonstration cities program will be used to require school systems in our would-be demonstration cities to plan busing and school rezoning as a condition of Federal aid in urban renewal, mass transit, and other programs.

Does Boston want to be a demonstration city? Does Chicago? You can be sure that HUD Secretary Weaver will require these two cities to restructure their school systems before they are given demonstration cities status. HUD has all but said so. If Mayor Collins and Mayor Daley want urban renewal money, and other demonstration-connected Federal grants-in-aid, Secretary Weaver has the authority to make them toe the line on school planning. The reason? Demonstration cities cannot get on the demonstration gravy train until they have submitted acceptable plans showing how the city will provide educational services for the disadvantaged. This is in the bill—section 103(2). Assistant HUD Secretary Taylor, in charge of city demonstrations, is quoted in the December 15 Education U.S.A. as saying:

> This kind of approach calls for a major attack on the deficiencies in the schools and school programs in disadvantaged areas.

Mr. Taylor went on to say:

> From the beginning of the Model Cities idea, we in HUD have always assumed that the schools would be an integral part of any proposed program for a model development neighborhood.

Under the demonstration cities program—section 103(4)—HUD has power to require a city to show that "substantive laws, regulations, and other requirements are, or can be expected to be, consistent with the objectives of the program." Clearly Secretary Weaver can force the mayors of Boston and Chicago to tinker with the local school boards. The big question is whether Boston can be a demonstration city so long as it is cut off from Massachusetts school aid because of de facto segregation. Will HUD force Boston to curb the school board's Louise Day Hicks?

HUD can require would-be demonstration cities to do anything under the loosely drawn language of the demonstration cities program. HUD can even require cities to be part of a metropolitan planning program—section 103(4). But can HUD force the suburbs of big cities to be part of a metropolitan planning scheme?

The answer is clearly "Yes." Under title II of the omnibus cities bill of 1966—the metrotitle—all applications for Federal aid under 10 programs, ranging from sewers to libraries to airports, must soon be submitted to a metropolitanwide planning body—metrogovernment—for recommendation before they are forwarded to Washington. The metrogovernment to which the applications must be submitted must be a joint planning body for the central city and suburbs. Federal grant-in-aid applications are to be judged on how they tie in with the metropolitanwide planning program. Ostensibly, metropolitanwide public facilities programing is to be a condition only of bonus grants, but who doubts that communities will soon have to plan on a metrowide basis to get any Federal grants-in-aid? Otherwise, why do all Federal aid applications under 10 programs have to be submitted to a metrogovernment as of the beginning of the 1968 fiscal year—section 204(a)?

Obviously, HUD intends to require federally subsidized metro governments to plan schools and housing on a metropolitanwide basis. Communities which do not go along with these plans will be thrown off the Federal-aid bandwagon. No antibusing amendment to metro can stop this. HUD is empowered to insist on community acceptance of metropolitanwide planning standards, and there is no amendment prohibiting HUD from pressuring the metro-governments which are to be HUD-subsidized.

Thus the Federal Government already has the power to force communities to set up multijurisdictional school programs in order to achieve integration or racial balance in the schools. Title II of the 1966 cities bill requires metrogovernments which can impose these criteria on communities as the price of aid under 10 Federal programs. Under Secretary Wood made this statement to a delegation from New York State's State Education Department racial balance section on September 9, 1966, a meeting which Harold Howe also attended. The administration is planning to use title II of the omnibus cities law to force school racial balance schemes of unwilling suburbs.

Two weeks after Under Secretary Wood and Commissioner Howe planned the way metrogovernment multidistrict—and even multi-State—jurisdiction could facilitate movement of pupils between slums and suburbs, Harold Howe told the House Rules Committee he did not know a thing about it. That was on September 29. On September 14, I exposed a copy of the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967, which included Federal subsidies for school racial balance schemes as well as new proposals to require education aid programs to be part of the metro package. Harold Howe had already given his OK to this legislation. The Office of Education clearly intends to use all the money at its command to force local communities to pursue the type of racial balance schemes cited in the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967 and the Civil Rights Commission report.

The administration has never disavowed any intention of submitting the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967 to Congress. A December 17 Saturday Review article on integration in education said that the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967 was "still in the

discussion stage." Perhaps Lyndon Johnson intends to submit the Equal Educational Opportunity Act to Congress this year in partial fulfillment of the radical scheming of the Civil Rights Commission.

Harold Howe already has authority under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to fund all kinds of busing and racial balance schemes providing the localities request them. The Commissioner has admitted that he would like to do a lot of suggesting.

In short, there is very little in the Commission's report which the Federal Government has not been trying to do for some time, albeit clandestinely. The 1966 omnibus cities bill, as I charged on the floor of the House, was the most far-reaching civil rights bill ever sent to Congress.

It should be noted in passing that the Commission also refers to the rent subsidy program, saying that it ought to be used to break up de facto segregation in the suburbs, but that it cannot because of the local veto provision tacked on by the Appropriations Committee. The Commission recommends getting rid of the veto. Under the language of the metro title of the 1966 omnibus cities bill, metrogovernments can plan housing and relocation—Dr. Weaver said so, on February 28, 1966. Presumably communities can be forced to accept rent subsidy housing as part of a metropolitanwide plan required by the metrogovernment as a condition of Federal grants-in-aid.

Beginning in 1965, I have been telling the House that rent subsidies, demonstration cities, and metropolitan planning are disguised, far-reaching civil rights proposals. If anybody still doubts it, the report of the Civil Rights Commission proves it. There is no doubt as to what the planners want to do. Congress has already given them the tools, if not the appropriations.

NEW BRITAIN HERALD SCORES PENTAGON "CREDIBILITY GAP"

Mr. PETTIS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and influential newspapers in my district, the New Britain Herald, recently published an editorial expressing the concern, shared by many Americans, over what has come to be known as the "credibility gap." The editorial stems from the discrepancy turned up between the actual total of airplane losses we have suffered in Vietnam and the figures issued earlier by the Pentagon, which were much lower and which did not take into account losses sustained in other than actual combat missions.

The other day, former White House Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers downplayed the issue of the credibility gap. He ascribed it solely to the fact that administration spokesmen did not always say what some people wanted them to or thought they ought to say. But this case does not concern any matters of interpretation or speculation. The only hope involved in the case is the plain, uncomplicated, and just hope that the Government will tell the truth.

The editorial which follows is offered in the hope that, by its appearance in the RECORD, it will contribute to restoring the "missing element" referred to in the editorial; namely, "confidence by the American people in the world of their Government":

[From the New Britain Herald, Feb. 8, 1967]

OUR PLANE LOSSES

At a recent White House gathering, President Johnson joked about the so-called "credibility gap." But it is no joke. Not when we are suddenly told that the number of American aircraft losses in Vietnam is closer to 1,800 than the previously announced 877.

Nor is the semantic explanation that the big difference between the two figures is accounted for by adding to combat losses those planes lost in training accidents or while idly parked on airfields, or over Laos or Cambodia or Thailand.

Why did they have to "explain?" Why didn't the Pentagon from the beginning simply give a running account of what the war was costing us in lost planes, including ground losses and training accident losses and losses other than over Vietnam?

Some might ask what difference it makes? The answer, quite simply, is that if you can't believe your government in a matter as significant as this, then what else are we being told that can't be believed.

There are strong statements from the Pentagon that this was not a "coverup" of losses, but that previously announced losses were geared to persistent press inquiries about combat losses. Further, says the Pentagon, the announcement of total losses might provide valuable information as well as aid and comfort to the enemy. Nevertheless, fuller reporting by the Pentagon would have added one element missing from this picture—confidence by the American people in the word of their government.

FLAG CEREMONY AT THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT

Mr. PETTIS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument. Its purpose is a simple one: to give the American flag full respect and reverence at one of our national shrines.

The Washington Monument has, since 1885, been a memorial to the Father of Our Country and a Washington landmark; it is often the first glimpse of the Nation's Capital seen by the millions of tourists who visit here each year.

My resolution would make raising and lowering the 50 American flags surrounding the Washington Monument a ceremony of dignity and honor befitting our country's banner, instead of the hurried hoisting and dropping of the flag which occurs under the present system.

The specific wording of my resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall arrange for appropriate ceremonies to be conducted in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia.

This stirring display of our flag would be a great and memorable event for those visiting the Monument were it handled as a ceremony, instead of being delegated to a maintenance crew which hastily runs the flags up their staffs with more emphasis on getting through with the chore than on showing proper respect for the flag. Since February 23, 1959, display of the flags has become a daily occurrence instead of just a display on national holidays. Last year millions of Americans visited the Washington Monument. I know their visit to this unique landmark would be more memorable if they could witness a real ceremony when the flags are raised and lowered.

These flags now are wadded into huge baskets after being lowered each evening and remain that way until they are raised the next morning. This is not the proper respect for a flag that thousands of Americans have given their lives to defend.

The Defense Department in the past has opposed this resolution on the basis that a flag ceremony at the monument would require between 100 and 200 military personnel. Nevertheless, the House has refused to accept this argument and has passed this resolution twice. The Senate, however, has yet to act on this measure, but I am hopeful that this year that august body will join us in support of this resolution.

The resolution merely directs the Secretary of Defense to arrange for appropriate ceremonies to be conducted in connection with the raising and lowering of flags at the monument. Some military personnel would be needed, but I am sure it would be fewer than the 100 men envisioned by the Defense Department. Undoubtedly, there are many Reserve units in and around the Washington area who would welcome the opportunity to participate in such a ceremony. In addition, I am sure veterans' organizations, and perhaps State societies, would be happy to take part as well. Indeed, there are numerous ways that an appropriate ceremony could be conducted once a week, twice a week, twice a month, or even daily, without utilization of large numbers of service personnel.

There is an element today in America that belittles what it calls nationalism. It regards the flag as an anachronism representing another age; its long-haired, shaggy-bearded adherents consider patriotism definitely "square." I believe it is time we in America reemphasized our flag. We should study its stripes and stars. We should have it on

display so that in these decisive times, when tensions are all about us, we can refresh ourselves with the true meaning of the words, "the United States of America."

I respectfully request that my colleagues act favorably on this resolution to give new glory to "Old Glory."

NEED TO REEVALUATE PROPOSALS TO EXPAND TRADE AND ASSISTANCE TO RUSSIA AND COMMUNIST EAST EUROPE

Mr. PETTIS. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, each day the war in Vietnam becomes more costly, in terms of money and equipment and, more importantly, in terms of the young men who are giving their lives to halt the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. Each day we are also overwhelmed by the published statistics of the tremendous amount of military materiel that is being supplied to the Vietcong by the Soviet Union and its Eastern European allies. In view of this, I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that we need to reevaluate the President's newest proposals to expand trade and assistance to Russia and Communist East Europe.

I am certain all peace-loving Americans would desire nothing more than an end to the cold war which has plagued us for the past two decades. However, are we not merely kidding ourselves, at this juncture, when we say that the cold war is a thing of the past and that the nature of world communism, per se, has drastically changed? Those favoring this expanded trade say that we are taking a monolithic approach to the situation—that Russia and Eastern Europe are quite different from the Communist forces in Asia. If this administration's assertion that European communism is "thawing" is true, I would appreciate some explaining to me why the overwhelming majority of the Mig fighters, technical advice, guns, and ammunition being used by the Vietcong for the slaughter of our sons are being poured into Hanoi by our "post-cold war" Communist nations in Europe.

We would certainly all like to see an end to the cold war, but it is time to awaken from our pleasant dream world of foreign relations and to survey the situation realistically. For this reason, I have today introduced this resolution, the text of which is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 229

Whereas it is the policy of the Congress and the desire of the people of the United States that an honorable peace be secured in Vietnam; and

Whereas the Soviet Union supported by its East European satellites holds the ultimate key to such a peace as the principal supporter of the Communist war effort now providing more than 80 per centum of the strategic war materials furnished to North Vietnam; and

Whereas the Soviet Union and its satellites are making positive overtures to governmental and private leaders of the United States to effect a further increase in trade and an expansion of credit between the respective countries; and

Whereas the Soviet Union and its satellites support the regime of North Vietnam at relatively low cost to themselves, particularly when compared to the mental and moral anguish and physical and economic cost which the people of the United States are forced to bear in support of a free and independent South Vietnam; and

Whereas of all the military strategy approaches available to the United States for bringing about an honorable and successful conclusion to the war in Vietnam, only two have been utilized thus far: ineffective bombing of various installations in North Vietnam, and a steady and massive escalation of American troops in South Vietnam; and

Whereas trade and cultural and educational exchanges are powerful tools not only for promoting international peace and good will but also as recognized weapons for preventing or prosecuting war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation.

BOOK DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a column which appeared in the February 20, 1967, Washington Evening Star.

The column, by Clayton Fritchey, relates to the U.S. Information Agency book development program. It reports that a portion of that program under which funds are spent to have books written will be ceased by the Agency.

Mr. Marks, in my opinion, is doing a good job as head of the U.S. Information Agency and if this report relating to the book development program is accurate I commend him on the action taken. In my view it is highly inadvisable to have books circulated in the United States which were actually developed by tax money unless the reader is advised of this fact.

The article follows:

USIA QUIETLY BURIES "INSPIRED" BOOK PROGRAM

(By Clayton Fritchey)

The controversial part of the book development program of the U.S. Information Agency, which has aroused so much suspicion in the American press, has just been quietly interred by Leonard Marks, director of the agency.

Actually, Marks had in practice already shut down some of the operation, but his decision to scratch it formally was made without fanfare for fear the termination might seem to reflect on the judgment of previous directors who supported the project for the last 10 years.

Marks is the third director to head the agency since the Democrats returned to power in 1961. The late Edward R. Murrow served until Jan. 20, 1964, and he was followed by Carl T. Rowan, a former ambassador to Finland, who resigned in the summer of 1965.

Marks still believes the project, which involved commissioning and subsidizing (more or less sub rosa) certain books for U.S. propaganda purposes, was legitimately conceived and executed. He concedes, however, that it raised inevitable doubts, and that, theoretically at least, it could be abused.

On balance, he has decided, it was doing the USIA more harm than good. There is no question but that recent adverse publicity and editorial criticism, justified or not, was not improving the agency's standing.

Much of this concern was prompted by congressional testimony revealing that the USIA spent $90,258 in fiscal 1965 on the so-called book development program.

Most of this went for (1) the abridgement and adaptation of existing books into simplified English for persons who read it as a second language, and (2) for supporting the publication of certain books commissioned by private publishers.

Some of the funds, however, were used to contract directly with authors to write new books. The USIA then arranged for their publication under the imprint of private publishers. Also, the agency provided subsidies to publishers in the form of prepublication commitments to buy a specified number of copies. In the latter cases, the authors were approached by the publisher rather than USIA, and did not necessarily know of the underlying arrangement.

As one critical newspaper observed, the most "offensive aspect" of this is the direct commissioning of authors to write books which "are not identified for either American or foreign readers as USIA-sponsored."

But indirect publisher subsidies, the editorial complained, "are also dangerous instruments of government influence in a free society." Since the books in question are read at home as well as abroad, the taxpayer may, in effect, find himself "unwittingly subject to propaganda which he himself has helped finance."

Nobody objects to the USIA buying already published books in bulk for its far-flung libraries, or to underwrite their low-cost reproductions to reach mass audiences abroad. But it is another matter to order up certain kinds of books, so to speak, and then pass them off as disinterested efforts.

The tip-off on what the present USIA director personally thinks about this part of the project is that one of his first orders after taking office Aug. 31, 1965 placed a ban on all further commissioning of new books without his specific approval. A check shows that in the ensuing 18 months he has yet to approve one.

His new decision to formally dissolve the operation is a wise one, for this should eliminate any further public doubt about it. The reputation of the agency, both here and abroad, should have priority over any benefit, small at best, that might be expected from "inspired" books.

In traveling through Africa and Asia in recent months, I made a point of visiting USIA libraries in more than 20 countries, and they are usually so crowded that there is a standard, friendly joke to explain it—air conditioning.

Actually, they are extremely popular with foreigners because they fill a legitimate need in a legitimate, intelligent way that helps the beneficiary country—and the U.S.A. as well. The operation is open and aboveboard, just as it should be.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS: EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE POOR

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, during the debate last year on the Economic Opportunity Act, I was successful in deleting a reference to the use of Federal credit unions, in conjunction with a new small loan program, after noting the potential difficulties this legislative suggestion might have created for the present Federal credit union system. I also noted at that time, however, that Federal credit unions were already serving our low- and moderate-income citizens. The key role the Federal credit union can play has again been called to my attention in the past few weeks.

On January 8, Columnist William Raspberry of the Washington Post detailed the success of the credit union approach in Washington, D.C., among the urban poor. The column, brought to my attention by George D. McCarthy, Acting Assistant Director for Congressional Relations, Office of Economic Opportunity, relates how the low-income citizen has been counseled in family budgeting, encouraged to save, and provided with low cost loan assistance when needed. The dividend and loan repayment record are certainly commendable.

So is the expressed goal of developing the credit unions involved in serving the poor to the point where they can be self-sustaining. This is in keeping with the self-help characteristic of credit union membership.

Nationally, of the 11,975 Federal credit unions operating in 1966, approximately 600 serve primarily low-income groups, according to information supplied by J. Deane Gannon, Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Department of HEW. Of the 400 increase experienced last year overall, 100 of those chartered are primarily created to serve the poor. Of these newly chartered credit unions, 61 are operating in conjunction with community action programs, and the rest are serving religious, associational, occupational and residential groups having predominantly low-income membership.

In his letter to me of January 31, Mr. Gannon also took note of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1967, dealing with the low-income home ownership proposals of the junior Senator from Illinois, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY. As part of the Percy approach credit unions would be encouraged in the social development of low-income neighborhoods. The experience of the Federal credit unions seems to bear out the validity of this component of the Percy proposal, as Mr. Gannon points out.

Legislation dealing with Federal credit unions passes through the Banking and Currency Committee. As ranking minority member on that committee, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the efforts being made by the Federal credit union system to reach and assist our low-income citizens.

At this point, I would like to include the column by William Raspberry in the Washington Post of January 8, 1967, the letter to me from J. Deane Gannon, Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, dated January 31, 1967, and several pertinent pages from the January 1967 issue of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions Bulletin:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 8, 1967]

UPO'S CREDIT UNIONS ARE APPARENTLY SUCCESSFUL

(By William Raspberry)

Maybe the most amazing thing about the United Planning Organization's program of setting up Credit Unions in low-income neighborhoods here is that it seems to be working.

There was serious doubt that it would. It was feared that weeding out the bad credit risks, as lending institutions must, would render the program meaningless to the people it was designed to serve. To lend money to very many of these poor risks would bankrupt the program, doubters observed. The program as they saw it was either worthless or fiscally unsound.

It hasn't turned out that way.

Six of the nine Credit Unions in the two-year-old program will be paying a dividend for 1966 ranging from 3.4 per cent to more than four per cent. Losses—debts charged off as uncollectible—total less than $3000, more than half of it incurred by Credit Unions that were in existence as long as four years before UPO got into the act.

Most of the remainder was incurred during the first year of UPO funding.

According to James Williams, UPO's Credit Union coordinator, the $3000 total represents fewer than 50 loans over a six-year period, only seven-tenths of one per cent of the total money loaned during that time.

On the plus side, the Credit Unions' 5615 low-income members have saved $227,000 in monthly deposits ranging from 50 cents to $100. By the end of November, loans outstanding totaled $165,000.

Williams acknowledged that losses are higher than the national average for in-house Credit Unions, many of which collect by payroll deduction, but low enough that the insurance rates for the low-income and in-house Unions are exactly the same.

Beyond the fact that the program is surviving financially, Williams is pleased with the amount of service it is able to render.

He notes that most Credit Unions are located in Government agencies or private firms and are inaccessible to low-income groups.

Because one of the earmarks of the poverty-stricken family is its inability to manage its money, officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity sought some means to teach budgeting skills and promote savings among the poor. The Credit Union concept was the upshot. UPO entered the program some 21 months ago.

It has not been an easy program to sell, Williams admits. As with in-house Credit Unions, most members of the low-income Unions came to borrow and stayed to save. Staff members insist that each borrower include in his monthly or weekly repayment at least a small amount for savings.

Membership in the low-income Credit Unions is tied in with consumer education, and members are continuously begged, embarrassed, cajoled and brain-washed into saving, Williams said.

In addition, they are encouraged to separate their money shopping from their shopping for goods. If a member finds a good buy on, say, a television set, he is encouraged to borrow the money for the purchase from the Credit Union, not from a commercial loan firm. In that way, he not only gets the money at a lower interest rate, but builds up a savings account while he is repaying the loan.

Carrie Brown, Williams's assistant, pointed out that area small-loan companies are advertising $300 loans to be repaid at the rate of $20 a month for 20 months. (The borrower actually gets $300 less insurance and service costs which are deducted from the principal.)

If he had borrowed the same amount of money from a Credit Union and repaid at the same rate, he would have the use of the full $300 and by the time the loan was repaid he would have accumulated $70 in savings.

In addition to specials—some private businesses have been persuaded to make payroll deductions for Credit Union savings—Williams has had to institute some special safeguards.

For example, if a member wants to borrow money to pay a furniture bill, the check is made payable jointly to the borrower and the furniture company. That way the Union can be assured that the money is used for legitimate purposes.

Williams's goal now is to increase total deposits of the nine Unions to $1 million, at which point he believes the program could pay its own way. As it is, each Union is subsidized with $25,000 a year for operating expenses and salaries.

If any reasonable percentage of the eligible people joined, the million-dollar goal should be easily attainable, Williams said.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS,

January 31, 1967.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: I noted with interest your comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with the low-income housing proposals of Senator Percy, and I was particularly pleased that the Percy plan envisions the organization of credit unions as part of the social development needed in urban ghettos. The results we have obtained during 1966 in conducting the Federal Credit Union Program would seem to bear out the validity of the credit union component of the Percy plan.

Credit unions are beginning to penetrate urban ghettos and rural areas whose residents up to now have had little access to thrift facilities and virtually no chance to borrow money at reasonable interest rates. There are now approximately 600 Federal credit unions serving primarily low-income groups in the United States, 100 of which were chartered in 1966.

One of the primary factors in the success of these credit unions is the training of officials. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, under a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, in 1966 conducted Project Moneywise, a four-week program in credit unions and consumer action, for actual and potential officials of low-income credit unions. This course teaches participants to wring the most from their limited incomes and to plan soundly for future needs.

Significantly, the cost of credit union development among the poor is minimal.

Credit unions are self-help financial institutions which derive their capital from the savings of members. Their successful operation, therefore, depends on the volunteer efforts of officials.

Enclosed is a copy of the January issue of the BFCU *Bulletin* which contains more detailed information on our activities. A complete report of 1966 operations will be available later this year.

Sincerely yours,

J. DEANE GANNON,
Director.

U.S. CREDIT UNIONS ATTAIN NEW HIGHS; ESTIMATED ASSETS NOW TOP $11 BILLION

U.S. credit unions reached new highs in membership, assets, savings and loans in 1966, according to preliminary data compiled by BFCU's Division of Statistical Research and Analysis. The number of operating credit unions—22,610—also set a record.

According to BFCU estimates, U.S. credit unions in operation on Dec. 31 had almost 18 million members and held assets of approximately $11.6 billion. Loans outstanding were approximately $9.1 billion; members' savings totaled over $10 billion.

Federal credit union assets reached a new high of $5.7 billion on Dec. 31. On that date, there were an estimated 11,975 Federal credit unions in operation, an increase of 400 for the year. The number of members in these Federal credit unions were estimated at 9.3 million at yearend.

For the second consecutive year, loan growth at Federal credit unions exceeded half a billion dollars. The $520 million expansion for 1966 was about the same as in 1965, but represented a somewhat smaller percentage increase—13.5 percent compared with 15.4 percent in 1965.

Members' shares, on the other hand, increased by an estimated $400 million during 1966, considerably less than the $521 million added during the preceding year. This represents an increase of only 9 percent, compared with a 13 percent gain in 1965.

Although the rate of growth in shares at Federal credit unions in 1966 was much slower than in 1965, it was typical of the general slow-down in the rate at which consumers added to their savings accounts during the year and compared favorably with growth in such accounts held by other financial institutions. During 1966, it is estimated that the rate of growth in shares at Federal credit unions ranked second only to the increase in consumer savings at commercial banks, and was substantially larger than the rate of growth in savings at savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks.

Table 1 lists the number of operating credit unions and the number of members, broken down according to type of charter. Table 2 gives data on assets, loans outstanding, and members' savings, according to type of charter on an adjusted and unadjusted basis.

TABLE 1.—*Number of credit unions and membership, by month, December 1964–December 1966* [1]

End of month	Number of credit unions			Members (thousands)		
	Total	Federal [2]	State	Total	Federal	State
1964—December	21,730	11,278	10,452	15,622	8,092	7,530
1965—January	21,741	11,286	10,455	15,720	8,132	7,588
February	21,755	11,295	10,460	15,819	8,173	7,646
March	21,793	11,328	10,465	15,871	8,189	7,682
April	21,818	11,348	10,470	15,980	8,246	7,734
May	21,858	11,383	10,475	16,073	8,295	7,778
June	21,898	11,418	10,480	16,174	8,336	7,838
July	21,924	11,439	10,485	16,245	8,386	7,859
August	21,943	11,453	10,490	16,338	8,435	7,903
September	21,977	11,477	10,500	16,431	8,475	7,956
October	22,013	11,508	10,505	16,550	8,533	8,017
November	22,040	11,530	10,510	16,661	8,591	8,070
December	22,060	11,543	10,517	16,757	8,641	8,116
1966—January	22,104	11,579	10,525	16,815	8,650	8,165
February	22,162	11,627	10,535	16,899	8,685	8,214
March	22,225	11,680	10,545	16,993	8,746	8,247
April	22,271	11,716	10,555	17,086	8,798	8,288
May	22,331	11,766	10,565	17,187	8,833	8,354
June	22,372	11,797	10,575	17,308	8,912	8,396
July	22,410	11,825	10,585	17,403	8,948	8,455
August	22,449	11,854	10,595	17,526	9,029	8,497
September	22,498	11,893	10,605	17,632	9,101	8,531
October	22,551	11,936	10,615	17,730	9,156	8,574
November	22,592	11,967	10,625	17,845	9,211	8,634
December	22,610	[3] 11,975	10,635	17,925	9,250	8,675

[1] Data (except number of Federal credit unions) projected from yearend benchmarks.
[2] Actual data.
[3] Estimated.

Source: January 1967, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions Bulletin.

TABLE 2.—*Selected data on credit union operations, by month, December 1964–December 1966* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

End of month	Total assets			Loans outstanding			Members' savings		
	Total	Federal	State	Total	Federal	State	Total	Federal	State [2]
	Seasonally adjusted								
1964—December	9,242	4,461	4,781	6,997	3,313	3,684	8,153	3,958	4,195
1965—January	9,321	4,502	4,819	7,075	3,351	3,724	8,219	3,996	4,223
February	9,428	4,551	4,877	7,165	3,395	3,770	8,303	4,038	4,265
March	9,537	4,607	4,930	7,264	3,447	3,817	8,385	4,081	4,304
April	9,635	4,656	4,979	7,386	3,507	3,879	8,467	4,120	4,347
May	9,718	4,695	5,023	7,486	3,554	3,932	8,540	4,159	4,381
June	9,824	4,750	5,074	7,566	3,594	3,972	8,628	4,207	4,421
July	9,924	4,805	5,119	7,647	3,637	4,010	8,710	4,247	4,463
August	10,025	4,855	5,170	7,726	3,675	4,051	8,783	4,289	4,494
September	10,128	4,912	5,216	7,801	3,711	4,090	8,869	4,329	4,540
October	10,216	4,958	5,258	7,868	3,743	4,125	8,966	4,383	4,583
November	10,321	5,016	5,305	7,962	3,790	4,172	9,053	4,429	4,624
December	10,414	5,050	5,364	8,038	3,823	4,215	9,139	4,467	4,672
1966—January	10,499	5,093	5,406	8,119	3,865	4,254	9,217	4,494	4,723
February	10,588	5,139	5,449	8,196	3,912	4,284	9,289	4,529	4,760
March	10,678	5,185	5,493	8,285	3,958	4,327	9,373	4,571	4,802
April	10,758	5,221	5,537	8,351	3,985	4,366	9,448	4,607	4,841
May	10,859	5,273	5,586	8,428	4,028	4,400	9,518	4,644	4,874
June	10,955	5,319	5,636	8,506	4,072	4,434	9,595	4,681	4,914
July	11,017	5,341	5,676	8,570	4,104	4,466	9,652	4,704	4,948
August	11,065	5,367	5,698	8,681	4,162	4,519	9,705	4,728	4,977
September	11,164	5,420	5,744	8,767	4,212	4,555	9,773	4,756	5,017
October	11,226	5,453	5,773	8,841	4,246	4,595	9,814	4,784	5,030
November	11,304	5,491	5,813	8,939	4,297	4,642	9,882	4,818	5,064
December	11,385	5,530	5,855	9,020	4,340	4,680	9,950	4,850	5,100
	Not seasonally adjusted								
1964—December	9,359	4,559	4,800	7,049	3,349	3,699	8,225	4,017	4,208
1965—January	9,237	4,466	4,771	6,984	3,301	3,683	8,276	4,028	4,248
February	9,333	4,505	4,828	7,026	3,320	3,706	8,332	4,046	4,286
March	9,475	4,575	4,900	7,141	3,385	3,756	8,398	4,077	4,321
April	9,578	4,619	4,959	7,316	3,475	3,841	8,450	4,099	4,351
May	9,709	4,686	5,023	7,447	3,543	3,904	8,541	4,147	4,394
June	9,877	4,788	5,089	7,623	3,643	3,980	8,645	4,215	4,430
July	9,890	4,781	5,109	7,711	3,673	4,038	8,680	4,230	4,450
August	10,011	4,836	5,175	7,835	3,723	4,112	8,713	4,250	4,463
September	10,149	4,907	5,242	7,899	3,748	4,151	8,798	4,299	4,499
October	10,278	4,978	5,300	7,939	3,769	4,170	8,948	4,379	4,569
November	10,429	5,071	5,358	8,010	3,809	4,201	9,076	4,447	4,629
December	10,551	5,166	5,385	8,097	3,865	4,232	9,224	4,538	4,686
1966 [3]—January	10,404	5,052	5,352	8,006	3,799	4,207	9,276	4,525	4,751
February	10,477	5,082	5,395	8,033	3,822	4,211	9,322	4,538	4,784
March	10,609	5,149	5,460	8,149	3,887	4,262	9,387	4,566	4,821
April	10,694	5,179	5,515	8,258	3,949	4,309	9,430	4,584	4,846
May	10,848	5,262	5,586	8,381	4,016	4,365	9,514	4,630	4,884
June	11,015	5,362	5,653	8,560	4,117	4,443	9,614	4,690	4,924
July	10,974	5,309	5,665	8,638	4,141	4,497	9,618	4,685	4,933
August	11,050	5,346	5,704	8,803	4,216	4,587	9,627	4,685	4,942
September	11,188	5,415	5,773	8,877	4,254	4,623	9,699	4,727	4,972
October	11,294	5,475	5,819	8,930	4,284	4,646	9,799	4,779	5,020
November	11,422	5,551	5,871	9,005	4,331	4,614	9,906	4,837	5,069
December	11,560	5,665	5,895	9,090	4,390	4,700	10,050	4,935	5,115

[1] Data projected from yearend benchmarks.
[2] Includes deposits.
[3] Preliminary.

In addition to the data shown in the tables, BFCU has begun compiling data on the performance of Federal credit unions serving limited-income memberships. More than 100 have recently been chartered to serve this field, 94 of these in calendar 1966.

Approximately 61 of these newly-chartered credit unions are operating in conjunction with community action programs. The remaining number were chartered to serve religious, associational, occupational, and residential groups having predominantly low-income memberships.

Community action agencies are providing management assistance and paying administrative costs of a number of the CAP credit unions. Data on the number of credit unions receiving such assistance, and the amount of funds received, is being released by BFCU as it is compiled.

Average savings in the funded Federal credit unions grew from $1,232 in the first quarter of operation to $30,138 in the seventh quarter. In non-funded Federal credit

unions serving CAP-sponsored groups, savings averaged $799 in the first quarter of operation and reached $8,624 at the end of a full year of operation.

The average number of accounts in the funded credit unions rose from 89 in the first quarter of operation to 709 for those in their seventh quarter of operation. The number of accounts in non-funded credit unions varied from 70 in the newest to 271 in the oldest.

Loans in the funded Federal credit unions ranged from $804 outstanding in the first quarter of operation to $30,883 in the seventh quarter. Non-funded credit unions had outstanding loans averaging from $271 in the first quarter to $5,426 in the fourth quarter.

CONGRESSMEN SHOULD REMEMBER

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during my recent courthouse visits to all eight counties in the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, probably the most frequently asked question was, "What will Congress do about ADAM CLAYTON POWELL?"

Often the people who came to talk with me came for some other reason: Either to discuss a problem with medicare, or social security, or military service, or another topic, but they would ask this question almost invariably.

I should like to have included in the RECORD a letter which I received the other day from a sixth-grade teacher from Ashland, Ohio, Mrs. John Fluke, which ties in directly with this concern, but this time on the younger level. Mrs. Fluke's class was discussing the behavior of Congressmen and came up with a six-point, "code of behavior for Congressmen," that goes a long way toward pointing out the impact congressional misbehavior has on young Americans.

Point VI is especially interesting:

Congressmen should remember the children of the United States are watching them, and should act accordingly.

Representatives to Congress, as well as government officials of Federal, State, and local levels should find this letter and code a poignant reminder that the children of this year are the leaders who will fill our shoes in later years and that they are watching our example now.

The material referred to follows:

ASHLAND, OHIO,
February 18, 1967.

HON. JOHN ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thought you might be interested in what took place in my sixth grade classroom one day last week.

Our weekly magazine, Jr. Scholastic, carried an article about Adam Clayton Powell. During our discussion of the article, it was obvious that quite a few of the children were following newspaper and TV accounts of the affairs of Mr. Powell, and were quite incensed that a Congressman would so involve himself. Before the discussion was over, these children compiled a "Code of Behavior for Congressmen"—a copy of which is enclosed. I am also sending one to Mr. Stephen Young, one of our Senators.

Respectfully,

MRS. JOHN FLUKE.

A CODE OF BEHAVIOR FOR CONGRESSMEN

(By a sixth-grade class, Ashland, Ohio)

I. Congressmen should not convert tax money to their personal use.

II. Congressmen should attend at least 80% of the sessions of Congress.

III. Congressmen should not use racism as an issue in considering actions of other members of Congress.

IV. Congressmen should keep records of tax money spent by them, and their books should be examined regularly.

V. Congressmen should not have any more special privileges than the people they represent.

VI. Congressmen should remember the children of the United States are watching them, and should act accordingly.

THE APPEASEMENT OF TYRANTS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that almost 4 years ago the U.S. Senate held its first secret session in 20 years to debate the need for emergency action to increase the defenses of the Nation against the danger of nuclear missile attack. It is now known, with technical details still classified, that Senator STROM THURMOND revealed that the Soviet Union had deployed an antimissile complex at Leningrad, leaving the United States behind in the antimissile field. Senator THURMOND pleaded for an additional appropriation for $196 million to accomplish preproduction engineering on an antimissile system. History now relates that the Senate voted 58 to 16 against THURMOND'S proposal.

Today, almost 4 years later, the Defense Department is still debating the pros and cons of the antimissile issue, but a new development has been added. It seems that now we are going to prevail upon the Soviets not to accelerate the antimissile race because of the cost to both nations and in view of the fact that modern technology cannot produce a system which would be adequate enough to prevent the loss of many, many lives, anyway. It is argued that we should persuade the Soviets to relinquish the idea of a massive antimissile defense in keeping with the policy of friendly relations with the Communist countries. If the following article from the Chicago Tribune for today, February 21, 1967, is any indication, the policy of killing the enemy with kindness has been a dangerous waste of time. The subheading of the article states that the Soviet Union is "Not Interested in Pact With U.S."

It well behooves the American public to begin thinking seriously of their personal security in the light of these developments. It is not too early for them to begin asking questions concerning national security with a view to casting an informed and intelligent vote in the 1968 elections.

I include the article, "All of Soviet Missile Proof, Moscow Says," from the Chicago Tribune of February 21 in the RECORD at this point:

ALL OF SOVIET MISSILE PROOF, MOSCOW SAYS—NOT INTERESTED IN PACT WITH UNITED STATES

Moscow, February 20.—Military leaders today boasted that the Soviet Union has developed an anti-ballistic missile system that will protect it from enemy attacks.

The boasts were accompanied by further indications that the Kremlin has no interest in President Johnson's proposed United States-soviet agreement to stop development of anti-ballistic missile systems.

Gen. Pavel F. Batitsky, a deputy defense minister, said the anti-aircraft troops he commands "can reliably protect the country territory from an enemy attack by air."

NEVER REACH TARGETS

Gen. Pavel G. Kurochkin, head of the Frunze military academy, said that missiles fired at the Soviet Union would never reach their targets.

"Detecting missiles in time and destroying them in flight is no problem," Kurochkin said in answering questions about the soviet ABM system.

His remarks at a press conference and Batitsky's interview with the official soviet news agency, Tass, were in anticipation of Thursday's celebration of the 49th anniversary of the soviet army and navy.

They represented an apparent new confidence about the capacity of Russia to defend itself against missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

WASTE OF BILLIONS

The argument used by Washington has been that the systems would mean wasting billions of dollars on both sides, since despite them intercontinental ballistic missiles could still cause catastrophic destruction.

Premier Alexei N. Kosygin 10 days ago told a London press conference that the soviet ABM system is "designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives . . . I believe that defense systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people."

Kosygin did not explicitly reject the Johnson proposal.

The claim by the generals that enemy missiles would not reach their targets was not limited in any way.

NEED TO EXCLUDE FROM INCOME REIMBURSED MOVING EXPENSES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kanses [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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to liberalize Federal income tax treatment of reimbursements for moving expenses and to provide a more realistic definition of "moving expenses."

For too long employers and employees have been confused and distressed over the treatment of reimbursed expenses.

There is evidence that the Internal Revenue Service has defined "moving expenses" far too narrowly.

It is obvious the real price of moving a family from one city to another to accept employment opportunity includes not just the direct costs of transporting people and goods, but also the expenses of house-hunting trips, temporary living quarters in the new town, commissions to realtors to sell an old home or payments to settle a lease, and many other out-of-pocket expenses.

This legislation provides for the exclusion from gross income of a taxpayer any amounts paid by his employer to cover expenses of moving, and it carefully defines moving expenses to include a realistic coverage of the many costs connected with moving a family from one city to another.

Last year similar legislation was introduced by me and others in the House of Representatives. It met with enthusiastic response from those in management and labor. Following are excerpts of some of the favorable comments which I received from organizations and private citizens concerning this legislation:

"Because of the extreme mobility required by many engineers in industry as well as government service in today's fast moving economy we, as engineers in industry, are vitally interested in the above legislation."

"As one who has moved five times for my company in the past twenty years, I have a personal interest in this bill and know first hand how expensive such moves are in terms of other costs beyond the 'bare bones' cost."

"I have just recently been transferred by my employer and it was quite a shock when I found out that about 95% of the expenses I incurred in relocating are taxable as personal income. I am referring to all the expenses my employer reimburses me for, none of which are costs I would have encountered had I not relocated."

"We understand that you have been one of the sponsors of Moving Expense Legislation which will lessen the burden on a transferred employee. At the present time tight money and qualified labor supply seem to be the leading limitations to industrial growth which is badly needed in Kansas."

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to end the confusion for those citizens whose jobs require frequent moves and for those who may have to move in order to secure employment. This legislation is needed. I urge that early consideration and hearings be scheduled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to create a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. This joint resolution is identical to the one I first introduced in 1964 with two exceptions. The original resolution called for membership to be made up of seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate without regard to their membership on other committees. This resolution calls for nine Members from each body, to be selected from the respective Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs Committees. This change is designed to secure the necessary coordination between the national security, foreign policy, and financial aspects of our national intelligence policy.

The second change is in the mandate of the joint committee set out in section 2(a) of the original resolution which required the joint committee to make studies of:

First, the activities of each information and intelligence agency of the United States;

Second, the problems relating to the foreign information and intelligence programs; and

Third, the problems relating to the gathering of information and intelligence affecting the national security, and its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States.

I have added a fourth item for the joint committee in this resolution—"the extent to which each information and intelligence agency of the United States is providing financial and/or technical support for nongovernmental institutions, organizations, and individuals for the conduct of activities within the United States and abroad, and the propriety of such support."

The need for charging the joint committee with this additional area of study has been made obvious by the events of the past week. The need for the creation of such a joint committee has been apparent for some time.

The disclosure last year that Michigan State University was operating a police training program for the Diem government in Vietnam with close CIA involvement; the use as a legal defense against slander by a CIA employee the fact of national security considerations; the sponsorship by the CIA of an institute of foreign policy studies at a distinguished university; and now the disclosure that CIA funds were channeled through front foundations to academic, business, and labor institutions have all raised questions about the wisdom of our intelligence policies and operations. It can be argued persuasively that they reflect adversely on the creditibility of all U.S. organizations conducting programs abroad, and weaken the confidence of the American people in their universities, their business associations, their labor unions, and their foundations.

It is particularly serious that our universities and colleges and those who study and teach in them have been compromised in the eyes of our own people and in the eyes of the world. We must be sure that we have not reached the unfortunate state of which former University of Chicago President Dr. Robert Hutchins spoke when he said:

What the country needs most of the university, and what only the university can supply, is intellectual leadership. The university could fashion the mind of the age. Now it is the other way around, the demands of the age are fashioning the mind . . . of the university.

I do not think it is appropriate to talk in terms of CIA infiltration of these organizations and institutions. As some of my colleagues have already pointed out, perhaps we have been deficient here in the Congress in failing to provide ample funds for appropriate U.S. representation at international meetings through open channels. Perhaps we have failed to realize that the activities of many of the organizations which have been named in the past several days are sufficiently worthwhile to stand on their own merits, without the taint of secret support.

Nor is it sufficient to talk only in terms of control of intelligence activities. As the excellent series of the New York Times on the CIA pointed out last spring, whatever the institutional forms of control, it is the substance of those controls that is most important. Review of activities without the ability to correct and contribute is meaningless and does not fulfill our responsibilities as a coequal branch of Government.

I am convinced that the Congress must have a continuing and contributory role in the conduct of our intelligence policies. No responsible person would suggest that we can be without intelligence agencies, but they must be an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, not a burden on it.

Many of the specific questions that have been raised not only in the past week, but in the past several years will be put to CIA Director Helms when he appears before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this afternoon. These briefings are worthwhile, but they will not substitute for a joint committee permanently charged with the responsibility to oversee and advise the intelligence community. To those who argue that the Congress is not sufficiently responsible or trustworthy to handle this assignment, I would suggest that many of the errors in judgment that have taken place might have been avoided if the Congress had been consulted.

In my judgment the mandate of the Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence which I propose today is sufficiently broad to deal not only with the present disclosures but with the long term dilemmas of intelligence policy.

Some of the questions we must consider are:

What is the necessary role of secret intelligence gathering agencies in a free and open society?

To what extent should intelligence gathering agencies also engage in operational activities?

Are there limits beyond which a nation's intelligence community should not go regardless of the forms of institutional control?

To what extent should nonintelligence activities of non-governmental organizations, institutions, and individuals be used, wittingly or unwittingly, as tools of the intelligence community?

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to

deal, as a legislative body, with these problems not just for this crisis but for the long term. I urge early adoption of this resolution and the creation of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence.

FDA APPROVAL OF FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration recently granted approval for the manufacture of a fish protein concentrate which, hopefully, as it is made available to undernourished people in underdeveloped countries, will play an important part in our efforts to help the people in India, in Africa and, in fact, throughout the world.

I am inserting in the RECORD today an article published Sunday, February 5, outlining much of the historical background of this additive which has occasionally been referred to as "a miracle food." It was written for the Boston Herald by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, HASTINGS KEITH who, of course, represents the renowned fishing port of New Bedford.

My current interest in fish protein concentrate is prompted by my membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for I realize the extraordinary assistance it could give us in improving our "image" in world affairs. But, Mr. Speaker, my interest antedates my membership on that committee and in fact my membership in the Congress of the United States.

I first heard about this extraordinary product during my service as administrative assistant to Senator Saltonstall. Dr. Ezra Levin had written to the Senator protesting FDA's handling of the fish flour petition submitted by his company, the VioBin Corp. VioBin makes other health products besides fish flour and he was afraid to rock the boat too much, fearing petty reprisals in the form of FDA rejection of his other petitions.

Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, Dr. Levin's home State, and Senator Saltonstall engaged in the FPC fight with great determination. Neither of them could tolerate unfairness—especially of powerful government agencies to the "little guy." To persuade FDA that the fish protein concentrate was not objectionable—that, in fact, it was less objectionable than some foods currently on the market, Senator Douglas offered snacks on the Senate floor of fried grasshoppers, chocolate-covered ants, and so forth. Shortly after Saltonstall and Douglas became involved our colleagues HASTINGS KEITH and BILL BATES joined in.

KEITH's interest dates back to about 1960 when Charles Lewin, a civic-minded former editor of the New Bedford Standard-Times brought to his attention the New Bedford plant of VioBin. Charlie Lewin did much to publicize this dramatic example of bureaucratic bungling.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD articles from the New Bedford Standard-Times, the Boston Globe, the Quincy Patriot Ledger, the Brockton Enterprise and the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Advertiser on FDA approval of FPC as well as Congressman KEITH's Herald article:

[From the Boston Herald, Feb. 5, 1967]

FISH-PROTEIN CONCENTRATE: THE BATTLE FOR APPROVAL

(By Rep. Hastings Keith)

(After six years, the Federal Food and Drug Administration last week finally lifted its ban on the sale of fish-protein concentrate (fish flour), a food supplement made by grinding up the whole fish. Here is the story of the battle against the ban, as seen by a congressman who was closely involved in it.)

Of the many cases of bureaucratic bungling, the case of fish protein concentrate is outstanding. Again it involved Food and Drug Administration the same people who might have ruined the cranberry industry a few years ago.

Two petitions to produce fish protein concentrate, a food supplement that offers hope for millions of undernourished people in underdeveloped countries, have finally been approved by FDA. This approval took almost a year.

The strange history of acceptance of the high protein supplement goes back almost ten years.

Why was there ever any question? The powdered extract of fish has proven beneficial as a food supplement in the diets of undernourished children. FDA claimed however, that FPC was unfit for human consumption because the dry powdered concentrate is made from whole fish. Ignoring the American housewife's familiarity with sardines and clams, the Food and Drug Administration concluded that she should be protected from this "adulterated" protein.

It has been a long battle to get FDA approval, the first step in making the concentrate available. Dr. James L. Goddard, the present Commissioner of FDA deserves strong praise for his efforts in getting acceptance for the two FPC petitions, one from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the other from VioBin.

It was in 1960 that I first became vitally interested in FPC, or fish flour as it was called then. The VioBin Corp., a fish meal and health foods company, had a plant in New Bedford that was producing FPC for underdeveloped countries. The president of VioBin, Dr. Ezra Levin, was in fact the pioneer in the development of the powdered extract of fish.

In 1962 I visited Peru and Mexico and saw striking evidence of the beneficial effects of FPC, added in small quantities, to the diet of malnourished children. Children with large, sad eyes and distended stomachs suffering from a disease known as "kwashiokor" were fed supplements of FPC. The change can only be described as miraculous. This visit to South and Central America encouraged me to push legislation to make FPC available.

Ten years ago, Levin developed his process for making the clean, buff-colored powder from whole fish. His company has long supplied the high protein supplement sold by health food stores and used by Olympic athletes in training and by elderly people who need high protein supplements. But his fish protein was made from filleted fish—an expensive process in which most of the high protein material in the fish was discarded. The new process, using the entire fish, viscera and all, made it possible to produce an end product costing only pennies a pound (compared to the $5 a pound charged by health food stores for the FPC made from fillets.) However when Dr. Levin, a biochemist by training, tried to get FDA approval for his product in 1963, he met incredible bureaucratic footdragging.

FDA refused to grant approval to Dr. Levin on grounds that FPC contained "filth"—that is, it was made from the entire fish.

No amount of reasoning would change the attitude of FDA—which seemed absurd to me since I never knew anyone who bothered to clean a clam or a sardine. In 1961 I said, "Rejecting fish flour on the grounds that it might be esthetically objectionable to someone would be as ridiculous and as tragic as banning penicillin from use by the medical world because it is derived from mold.

"It's the whole concept that's objectionable," insisted FDA.

After Levin's first petition was turned down, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries requested and got a small appropriation to study methods of making what FDA would consider a "clean" fish protein concentrate.

Misunderstandings and misinterpretations held up FPC approval. Wheat and milling interests fought vigorously against "fish flour," fearing it might crowd out wheat flour in the market. The name was changed from fish flour to fish protein concentrate.

FPC has none of the properties of flour—it cannot be used as a basic ingredient in baked foods. But it can be added to flour or cereal products such as rice or corn for the most effective diets, since it contains elements not found in cereal grains. One of the ways to use the additive is to sprinkle it in tortilla dough, for example.

When Levin protested the expenditure of government funds to produce virtually the same product he had already tested exhaustively, he was told (again by an FDA spokesman) that the development of fish protein concentrate was "too big for one man."

In February 1966 after spending $1.4 million to produce FPC using a not-too-different method from Levin's (but using hake only—this, FDA felt, was a "cleaner" fish than some) the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries petitioned FDA for approval of their product, and, at the same time, Levin petitioned for the approval of the VioBin FPC.

The National Academy of Sciences cleared the "clean, wholesome product" developed by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

FDA said it would probably be no more than a month before they could answer the petition.

Hopeful of early approval, a bill to authorize the construction of pilot plants for the production of FPC was proposed. Time dragged on, there was no word from the FDA.

FDA found a trace of fluoride in the protein concentrate—more work was indicated, they said.

I had a discussion with one FDA spokesman, and it went something like this:

Keith: "If 1000 children were fed FPC and one of those children got discolored teeth as a result of the fluoride and the other 999 developed stronger teeth and bones, would you feel you should refuse FPC approval?"

FDA: "I certainly would."

By removing part of the bone during processing, fluoride levels were reduced to a "safe" level.

A former FDA commissioner was so contrary-minded that when he was invited to partake of food with added FPC—hors d'oeuvres, pastries and so forth prepared in the Senate Restaurant he declined.

When Commissioner Goddard took over last spring, things started to move over in FDA, including the fish protein concentrate petitions.

What does approval of FPC mean? It

means that we can finally include FPC in a Food for Peace program. It means an end to Soviet insinuations that the United States is willing to send abroad food supplements it considers not fit for the American consumer. It means a boost to the sagging fishing industry when a boost is badly needed. And for millions of starving people, FPC means hope. The miracle powder can be stored indefinitely, only a teaspoonful a day added to the ordinary diet of the undernourished is enough for the protein needs of a human being—enough to restore mental alertness, physical strength, enough to turn a lack-luster individual into a productive member of society.

But this is only a first step. We have a tremendous amount of work to do, and while we linger, thousands are dying of starvation. We've got to get plants into operation—quickly. We must sell people on the idea—there are too many misconceptions about FPC. It is not fishy, it is not objectionable. I have eaten food with added FPC many times. Members of my staff have even made candy with added FPC, and it was most enjoyable. The powder has a slightly gritty feel. It is a neutral color, something between tan and gray. It dissolves in water, and can be used in combination with milk or juice.

Don't feel that FPC is restricted to the underdeveloped countries. It could even be added to the snacks teenagers eat instead of proper meals—potato chips, pretzels, cookies!

This miracle additive, now that it has been given the needed stamp of government approval, can, and hopefully, will go a long way toward saving the world's hungry millions.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Feb. 2, 1967]

KEITH PLANS LEGISLATION TO AID FISHING INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Hastings Keith, R-Mass., outlined today proposals to assist the fishing and maritime industries, which he said he will submit to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The lawmaker from Massachusett's 12th Congressional District said his proposals would place curbs on methods of oil exploration in fishing grounds, promote fisheries research and development, provide funds for vessel replacement, and allow greater flexibility for conversion of commercial vessels for defense purposes.

"This week, I intend to introduce before Congress a coordinated program of legislation designed to protect and develop our vital fishing and maritime industries in Massachusetts." Rep. Keith said.

"I will submit six major bills and several related proposals affecting both our fishing industry and our seriously outdated merchant marine.

"PROTECT FISH RESOURCES

"Our fish resources must first of all be protected from the careless methods of oil exploration which caused the massive fish kill near Georges Bank last September. I am presently drafting legislation to require new and stricter guidelines for exploration firms. No mining or exploration will be permitted without prior consultation with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and unless the Bureau determines that no significant damage will occur to marine resources.

"Research and development by our commercial fisheries must be promoted by making more funds available to the states for this purpose. I am proposing that a new fund be established from the customs receipts our government receives from imported fish products. Grants could be made to the states from this fund with out requiring any new Federal appropriations."

Rep. Keith said America's fishing and merchant fleets are becoming critically outdated and are increasingly unable to meet aggressive foreign competition.

"In order to build modern fishing vessels which can compete with the Soviet fleets off our shores, I am proposing a new vessel replacement reserve fund," Rep. Keith said. This fund will enable merchant and fishing vessel operators to establish with the Secretary of the Interior a tax-free fund which can be drawn on to finance new or modernized vessels.

RELATED PROPOSALS

Rep. Keith said he will file several related proposals to further benefit the U.S. fleets, both for national defense and for commercial purposes. An amendment to the Vessel Exchange Act will allow greater flexibility in the conversion of reserve fleet vessels for national defense purposes.

Another will further encourage American operators to have repairs done in our U.S. shipyards, rather than abroad. A third will authorize the Coast Guard to develop an electronic guidance system for vessels moving in crowded ports and through canals. "This would greatly benefit the passage of ship traffic through the Cape Cod Canal," he said.

"If approved, this program of legislation will significantly upgrade the fishing and merchant marine industries among our national priorities. At a time when the problems of the fishing and merchant marine industries are getting larger and larger, the allocation of our national resources to maritime affairs is getting smaller."

TAX CREDIT

In addition to these bills, Rep. Keith said he is introducing legislation this week that would provide a tax credit to parents and students for the costs of higher education and vocational training; a tax credit to industry for construction of air and water pollution control facilities; exclude from taxable income certain reimbursed moving expenses; and extend preferential postage rates to museums for the mailing of educational materials and loan exhibits.

Rep. Keith will re-introduce his bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch to review all federal operations and recommend comprehensive management reform.

He also will file legislation to establish a Commission on Public Management to explore the potential application of systems analysis and management techniques to the solution and administration of public policy problems.

He also plans to introduce a resolution to create a Joint Committee on Congressional Ethics, which will be empowered to draw up rules of conduct for all congressmen and a resolution to create a delegation of eminent citizens to a convention of North Atlantic Nations.

Rep. Keith also plans to submit a bill to establish a national memorial at Plymouth Rock.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Feb. 1, 1967]

APPROVAL OF FISH FLOUR BY FDA HAILED HERE

(By Charles Buffum)

The wheels of government grind exceedingly slow.

But the long-delayed formal approval of fish protein concentrate or "fish flour" by the Food and Drug Administration last night was to Carl Larsen, exceedingly fine.

Mr. Larsen is manager of New Bedford Fish Products, which he claims is the only plant in the country that can turn out fish protein concentrate in commercial quantities.

He is the man who has spent 16 years in New Bedford making plans, perfecting techniques, laying groundwork for last night's FDA ruling.

TWO PROCESSES APPROVED

New Bedford Fish Products is a subsidiary of VioBin Corp. of Monticello, Ill. The FDA has approved VioBin's process and a formula perfected by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

But unlike VioBin, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries doesn't even have a plant yet.

Fish protein concentrate is a low-cost protein-packed food supplement made from whole fish. It is expected eventually to be turned out in huge quantities for shipment to undernourished people in all corners of the earth.

Because it is in the form of a flour, and can be stored without refrigeration, it can be adapted to the varied diets of every nation. It can be bread or noodles, soup or milk shakes, waffles or gravy.

Carl Larsen and his boss, Ezra Levin, VioBin president, tried to get FDA approval in 1961, but it was rejected on aesthetic grounds. The FDA didn't like the idea of grinding fish heads, tails and viscera into food for human consumption.

Last night the government accepted the principle, according to Levin, of "the acceptance by the United States of a protein concentrate made from whole fish. This is the crux of the decision by the FDA."

NO CONVERSION PROBLEM

"We can convert our plant material any time," Larsen said today. New Bedford Fish Products has been turning out fish meal for animal feed.

"There's no problem," Larsen added. "We need another two or three days to know what the standards are going to be," he said.

Levin and Larsen are interested in whether the FDA will broaden its stand and allow fish other than "hake and hake-like species" to be used.

Employment will climb at the New Bedford plant, the manager said. "I couldn't say how many we will employ; I say the sky's the limit," he said.

The plant now employs about two dozen people.

Larsen is sure the BCF will locate a plant in New Bedford "to be close to the only fish flour plant knowledge in the world." The BCF will build a government-owned production plant and will lease a second from private industry.

When New Bedford Fish Products gets rolling on fish protein concentrate, local fishing vessels will be used to supply the raw material, Larsen said.

"I'm already making up my mind about what boats we will use from the local fleet," he said today. "They will be able to supply our needs, I am sure."

GOOD PUBLICITY FOR CITY

Larsen said the plant "has brought the name of New Bedford throughout the world. All our shipments will have New Bedford, Mass., U.S.A., stamped on them."

VioBin has been producing fish flour commercially for 12 years, says Levin.

"We can produce the product NOW," he told The Standard-Times. "We have a wide background of clinical evaluation of the product that we can now produce commercially. We have the engineering data for commercial production."

The next step, Levin and Larsen agree, should be in the direction of making other species of fish available for FPC.

Until production lines are set up, the local product will be shipped to VioBin headquarters at Monticello, for final refinement, Larson said.

He wouldn't speculate whether the U.S. government would order large quantities for the Food for Peace program.

DEFINITELY NEED PIER

"We definitely need that pier," Larsen said, referring to a request to the city to build a

bulkhead fill project at an estimated $100,000 cost to lease back to the fish products firm.

"The city certainly would benefit," he added.

Larsen said he already is training new people to work in the plant.

In Illinois, Levin stressed that, "the VioBin process is available to anyone on a non-exclusive basis."

"We can export our technology to help solve the widespread malnutrition and in overcoming, or at least delaying, for many years the prospect of worldwide starvation," he said.

Last night's announcement was welcomed in a statement by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, who said it "establishes a lifeline to a better future for undernourished millions of people throughout the world."

The secretary said the FDA label of safe for human conusmption of the highly nourishing, low-cost food additive will mean "that plentiful types of fish that have been by-passed for the human diet now can be used in the form of a readily manufactured product acceptable to every geographical area.

"Our next step is large-scale production demonstrations in pilot plants," he said.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has estimated that the United States could harvest about 12 billion pounds of fish annually from surrounding waters—about 2½ times the present annual take.

Said the bureau: "Just the unharvested U.S. fish, translated into fish protein concentrate, would supply sufficient quantities of animal protein to supplement the deficient diets of 1 billion people for 300 days at a cost of less than one-half cent per person per day."

Recent studies have reported that about 270 million children under 15 suffer from animal protein deficiencies that might be corrected by development and widespread use of fish flour.

Larsen said if any protests of the FDA decision are filed during a required 30-day period before the ruling becomes final, they will come from wheat interests who object to use of the word "flour" in connection with the fish product. The FDA said the project must be labeled as whole fish protein concentrate.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Jan. 31, 1967]

PELL SEEKS FISH FLOUR PLANT FOR RHODE ISLAND—WEST COAST SITE HUNTED

WASHINGTON.—A government production plant for fish protein concentrate is expected to be located on the West Coast, a spokesman for Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., said Monday night.

"As far as we know, the government-owned plant will be located on the West Coast," Fitzhugh Green, special assistant to to Pell, explained.

He said the Rhode Island senator plans to concentrate his efforts on having a government-leased, privately-owned plant operating in his state.

Congress last year authorized one plant to be built by the Interior Department and one government leasing contract, both arrangements to depent upon acceptance of fish protein concentrate by the Food and Drug Administration.

FDA approval of two processes for making concentrate was announced here Monday by Rep. Hastings Keith, R-Mass.

One method was developed by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the other by VioBin Corp. of Monticello, Ill. The firm's fish flour plant is in New Bedford, Mass.

There is some speculation here that VioBin would now be the likely owner of the plant to be leased by the government in its search for mass production techniques involving the concentrate.

The powdered product, developed by chemically processing hake and hake-like species, is intended primarily for use abroad. It already has been authorized for use in the food for peace program, pending FDA approval.

Official regulations for use of the concentrate will be promulgated by the FDA later this week. Rep. Keith said Monday, "We hope that the regulations will be easy to live with."

Meanwhile, while competition is expected to be keen for location of the production plant, there also is hope that Congress may authorize more facilities.

Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Me., announced late last year his intention to file a bill this year which would permit construction of three additional plants.

Actually, the Senate's bill last year approved construction of five plants. The House only wanted one and the final compromise was one government-owned and one government-leased facility.

SUPPORTED BY PRESIDENT

The general fish protein concentrate effort received encouragement from President Johnson Monday in a statement issued independently and without apparent knowledge of the FDA's favorable action.

In a message to Congress, the President said, "We are trying to develop economic and acceptable methods of converting fish protein into a usable source of food. I have directed the Secretary of the Interior to proceeded with this effort on an urgent basis."

Authorization of more fish concentrate plants and general appropriations for continuing research in this field are expected to have greater chance for success now that the FDA has rendered a favorable opinion on the product.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, Jan. 30, 1967]

VIOBIN FISH FLOUR GETS FOOD AND DRUG BACKING

WASHINGTON.—Two methods for manufacturing fish protein concentrate—one by government and one by private industry—have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for domestic consumption, Rep. Hasting Keith, R-Mass., was advised this afternoon.

The FDA gave its stamp of approval to the process developed by VioBin Corp. of Monticello, Ill., which operates a subsidiary, New Bedford, Mass., Fish Products Corp., and to a method developed by the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

FDA approval has been sought since 1961.

Officially, the FDA now states that both fish protein concentrate processes "are approvable."

This language recognizes a 30-day period in which appeals of the FDA opinion can be made by the public, in which case final permission for domestic use could be withheld.

The approval means that the concentrate protein-rich food supplement which can be fitted into native foods throughout the world—will be included in the U.S. Food for Peace program at the end of the 30-day period unless appeals are entered, Rep. Keith said.

"Isn't that wonderful?" exclaimed Carl Larsen, manager of New Bedford Fish Products Corporation. "It proves that the $2 million and many years we've invested here were worth it. This is going to be a big thing for New Bedford," Mr. Larsen said today when notified of Food and Drug approval.

Formerly known as fish flour, the concentrate uses whole fish, any of several species of hake. Since heavy Russian fishing efforts concentrated on hake off New England in 1965, there are differing opinions about how much hake is available off the New England coast.

Eventually, many different kinds of fish are expected to be used to make the product.

Fish flour originally developed by VioBin was rejected by the FDA in 1961 as being aesthetically distasteful to consumers because the entire fish was used. Since then a new FDA director has taken over.

In recent years much public attention focused on the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' process, developed at College Park, Md., under special funds appropriated by Congress.

AUTHORIZATION CLEARED

The FDA action clears a congressional authorization to build a $1 million pilot production plant for fish protein concentrate manufacturing, and to lease a second plant from private industry.

These plants will turn out large amounts of fish flour for further testing, and will develop new ways and types of fish used to make the product.

Ezra Levin, president of VioBin, long has contended that fish protein concentrate can feed the world's starving people. The government-produced product hadn't been shipped overseas because of possible propaganda backfires for sending a product not approved for domestic consumption.

VioBin's product has been used in many foreign countries for years.

Members of Congress from Massachusetts intend to press the Interior Department to locate its fish protein concentrate plant in the Bay State.

The favorable opinion by FDA is expected to be published in the Federal Register later this month. This action will signal the start of the 30-day waiting period for possible objections.

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 1, 1967]

FISH FLOUR—A VITAL FOOD WINS U.S. APPROVAL

(By Donald White)

In New Bedford Tuesday Carl Larsen was a happy man.

Larsen, general manager of New Bedford Fish Products Corp. had got wind of the Food and Drug Administration's approval of fish flour for human consumption.

New Bedford Fish Products is, according to Larsen, the only plant in the world that makes fish flour in commercial quantity—not fish meal, mark you, but fish flour. There's a difference.

Fish flour is a tremendous source of protein. An off-white powder, it is, in human consumption form, odorless and tasteless. It can be used successfully in noodles, waffles, sauces, gravy, baked goods and shake-type drinks. Fish meal is animal feed.

Fish flour has been suggested as a leading weapon in the attack on world hunger.

Until now, however, FDA had refused to approve the flour for human use, despite findings of such organizations as the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council.

It has taken FDA about six years to say yes. A big factor was that fish flour, or fish protein concentrate as it is sometimes called, is made from the WHOLE fish—head, tail, viscera—the lot.

FDA was worried that because of the flour's composition the American public might find it "unesthetic".

Another problem was the demand for proof that the product would not contain excessive amounts of isopropyl alcohol, the solvent used in the flour-making process. This was furnished.

Additional reassurance was sought that the flour would not be a cosmetic hazard and that its fluoride content would not mottle teeth. It will not, according to both National Institutes of Health and National Academy of Sciences.

So for Carl Larsen and New Bedford Fish Products, a subsidiary of Viobin Corp., Monticello, Ill., the FDA decision was the end of a long, long wait. "Ten years in which we

spent $1.5 million on something we believe in."

In the meantime, Larsen's 22-man operation in New Bedford has been making fish flour for animal feed and has not been deodorizing the product. Neither this, nor the changes that will have to be made in the plant to meet human consumption standards present any great problem, Larsen claims.

Larsen's enthusiasm is based upon the fact that his operation has a considerable head start in large-scale production of fish flour. For some time now he has been shipping animal feed flour to his parent plant in Illinois where it has been reprocessed for human consumption and sold or given away overseas.

His confidence may be tempered somewhat when he reads the fine print accompanying the FDA's apparent turnabout.

Dr. Samuel Goldblith, professor and head of M.I.T.'s Department of Nutrition and Food Science cautioned Tuesday against over-optimism.

"There has been so much to do about approval so far I must see the specifications," Goldblith said.

Two of his reservations concerned the variety of fish approved and the amounts in which the flour may be sold.

FDA specifies hake, and "hake-like species." It would be easier to use all types of trash fish.

The Government agency also says that sale of the flour is limited to one pound packages. This will prevent food manufacturers from using it in their preparations. They must make specific proposals with supporting data to the agency.

An even greater consideration may be the investment in plant and equipment that companies will have to make to get into the fish flour field. It will be tremendous and it will take years.

Gorton Corp. of Gloucester is already in the game to a limited extent. Together with a partner company it has formed an organization that is currently conducting research into fish flour.

Gorton President E. Robert Kinney applauded the FDA decision as a means by which industry will be able to assist government in helping the protein-starved nations of the world.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has estimated that the United States could harvest about 12 billion pounds of fish annually from surrounding waters—about 2½ times the present annual take.

Said the Bureau: "Just the unharvested U.S. fish, translated into fish protein concentrate, would supply sufficient quantities of animal protein to supplement the deficient diets of 1 billion people for 300 days at a cost of less than one-half cent per person a day."

To do that though, the fishing industry will have to spend money on boats and methods. Added to the time it will take to engineer and build pilot and production processing plants it looks as though the dream of solving the world's hunger problem is still years away.

[From the Patriot Ledger, Feb. 2, 1967]

FISH FLOUR

The approval of fish flour for human consumption in the United States is an act of world-wide importance.

Fish flour, or fish protein concentrate as it is called now, is a pale gray, virtually odorless and tasteless product made from whole fish. It is as versatile as any other flour; it can be used as a food additive or as a flour substitute.

The most important fact about fish flour, however, is its high nutritional content—about 80 percent is protein with the other 20 percent mostly beneficial minerals. Thus it could become an important factor for a world seeking additional food to nourish a rapidly-expanding population.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration ended a long battle over fish flour this week by approving two processes for producing it for domestic consumption. The approval also means fish flour can be made available to developing countries as part of the U.S. Food for Peace program. The U.S. could have shipped fish flour abroad without FDA approval; however, this would have left our country open to harmful propaganda on the grounds that Americans were sending food abroad that had not been declared fit for human use in the U.S.

Six years ago, the FDA rejected fish flour on the grounds that anything made from whole fish had to be considered "adulterated and filthy." Later, this agency expressed concern over the chemical process used in one method of producing fish flour. Selfish opposition came initially from bakers, millers and Midwestern wheat interests fearing competition.

While there is so far a lack of mass production facilities for fish flour—a result of the long delay in approval—the product has vast potential.

Because of high demand and poor crops in some areas of the world, food grains are in fairly short supply. The oceans, however, hold a great supply of food resources now only partially utilized. Although the FDA approved only the use of hake in fish flour for U.S. use, actually it is contended that just about any so-called "trash fish" (those not normally marketed for human consumption) could be used.

Initially, the approval of fish flour should result in a tremendous boost for the U.S. fishing industry, including New England's. In Massachusetts, New Bedford and Gloucester firms have been waiting for years to market fish flour for human use.

The long-range implications for the world are equally important. While fish flour is not a panacea for the world's food problem, once the product becomes accepted by food-short nations desperately trying to raise agricultural production, it could be an important element in their food resources—and one readily available to many nations.

[From the Brockton (Mass.) Daily Enterprise, Feb. 1, 1967]

FISH FLOUR OKAY

The Food and Drug Administration has given its approval of production of fish flour for human consumption.

Much credit must be given to Cong. Hastings Keith who long has advocated fish flour as one way to help feed the hungry people of the world.

New Bedford has a fish flour plant and if three more plants are to be built in New England it is almost certain that this state will be the site of one of them.

We are sure this decision by the FDA will be a big help to the fishing industry here in the east.

President Johnson lined himself up squarely with those pushing for the approval of fish flour when he ordered Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall to proceed "on an urgent basis" with the development of a high protein and low cost fish flour.

The FDA decision ended a six-year controversy over fish flour and again we say Cong. Keith, who helped to bring about the favorable decision, deserves full credit.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, Feb. 5, 1967]

FISH FLOUR RULING ENDS 5-YEAR FEUD

(By Leslie Carpenter)

WASHINGTON.—Seldom does a small Federal agency show the hard-headed independence from powerful pressures in and out of government that the Food and Drug Administration did in the fish flour controversy over five full years.

It is a fascinating story of how FDA got into the White House dog house, stubbornly disputed two highly regarded scientific organizations and thoroughly infuriated well-meaning religious and philanthropic leaders interested in feeding the hungry of the world.

FDA has at last ruled that fish flour is fit for human consumption, but it obviously was a reluctant decision.

Fish flour, by far the cheapest high protein concentrate devised, is made from ground-up non-commercial fish, such as hake. The powder, almost tasteless, can be mixed with any food or liquid to overcome protein deficiencies. It is and has been one of President Johnson's pet projects. He and others believe it offers the best opportunity ever to combat undernourishment globally.

In January, 1962, FDA decreed fish flour was unfit for humans to eat because it was made from the whole fish. The U.S. Bureau of Fisheries developed a process of bathing the flour in an alcohol substance to eliminate objectionable matters. The respected National Academy of Sciences then made extensive tests and on Dec. 1, 1965, reported the alcohol bath made the flour clean and all right to eat.

FDA wouldn't agree and raised another issue. Fish bones gave the flour too much fluoride, FDA contended, and eating it could cause teeth to spot. The National Institute of Dental Research launched tests and concluded last August that there was insufficient fluoride for teeth mottling.

FDA then went through a period of silence and more tests, with the rest of the government in the dark on what the agency was doing. At one point, an FDA official suggested a ruling prohibiting the sale of fish flour in the U.S., where many cities have fluoride added to their water, but approving its sale in the rest of the world, where there is little water with fluoride.

This horrified the White House and State Department, where there was one obvious conclusion: Communist propagandists would make the most out of the U.S. feeding the world's hungry a food found by its own government to be unsafe for Americans to eat.

When FDA finally gave fish flour a clean bill of health last week, another remarkable thing happened. President Johnson wanted to make the disclosure at the White House with a dramatic statement on what it meant to the underfed of the world.

But Johnson didn't get the chance to do so. One day before, some FDA official told a GOP Massachusetts Congressman, Hastings Keith, about the decision. The Republican beat Johnson to telling the press.

ISAAC HAMLIN DIES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the death in Tel Aviv last Thursday of Isaac Hamlin is a loss both for Israel and for the United States. For over 50 years, Mr. Hamlin's work in the Israeli labor movement and in Histadrut, the Israeli Labor Federation, has done much to strengthen relations between our two countries.

Ten years ago, at the age of 65, Mr. Hamlin returned to Tel Aviv from New York to become the director of the American Histadrut Center there and to preside over Beit Hamlin, or Hamlin House, which was constructed in his honor. Beit Hamlin is an institution of warmth and value which does much to facilitate contacts and close relations between Americans and Israelis.

Only last month Mr. Hamlin made a final visit to New York to attend a celebration in his honor by more than 600 friends who had gathered to pay him tribute. I was privileged to have been with him on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his devoted wife and two sons. Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from The New York Times of Februrary 17, 1967, which tells of Mr. Hamlin's efforts on behalf of Israel-American friendship in some detail:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1967]

ISAAC HAMLIN, 75, OF HISTADRUT, DIES—ISRAELI LABOR FEDERATION AID FOR HALF A CENTURY

Isaac Hamlin, a founder and officer of Histadrut, the Israeli Labor Federation, died yesterday at his home in Tel Aviv. He was 75 years old.

During 50 years with Histadrut, Mr. Hamlin told friends frequently that he was getting a "university education" because of the diversity of his work.

He recalled the day in 1926 when Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, whom he had known as a young lawyer in Boston, called him to Washington and gave him $15,000 for the Histadrut campaign.

Justice Brandeis, he recounted, asked him how many Jewish workers there were in the United States. A quarter of a million, he replied. The jurist said, "See to it that each of them gives $5 a year for Palestine, in order to build the country and to enlarge the cooperatives."

AN AVID ZIONIST

That was the goal Mr. Hamlin pursued for the next three decades. Although an avid Zionist, he was not afraid to speak out when he did not approve of steps taken by the more aggressive members of the movement.

Thus, in 1947, he took the militant Stern group to task for terrorist activities in Palestine. "Peace between Jews and Arabs is possible," he said, "and there is no room for paramilitary organizations that operate outside the framework of government."

The next year, Mr. Hamlin outlined the goal of Jews outside Israel as "the training of immigrants in new trades, productivizing them and absorbing them in agricultural and industrial cooperatives." He began a program of training for 2,000 men and women that was a forerunner of programs in effect today.

His interest in Zionism began while he was still a youth in Komarin, near Minsk, Russia. He took an active role in the Labor Zionist Party and met Channa Freedman, who was to become his wife, while working with local groups.

Mr. Hamlin came to the United States in 1909, settling in Boston, where he worked in a tailor shop by day and directed Zionist activities by night. Five years later, Miss Freedman joined him and they were married.

DIRECTED FUNDRAISING

In 1921, Mr. Hamlin came to New York to serve as national secretary of the Poale Zion-Labor Organization of America. Two years later, he joined Histadrut to direct its fundraising programs in this country.

When he was 65 years old, Mr. Hamlin moved to Tel Aviv and took over the direction of the American Histadrut Center. A building there, Hamlin House, was erected in his honor.

Last month, on his 75th birthday, he returned to New York for a celebration. More than 600 persons gathered at the Commodore Hotel to pay him tribute. There were messages of congratulations from President Zalman Shazar, Premier Levi Eshkol, Mrs. Golda Meier, former Premier David Ben-Gurion and American labor leaders.

Besides his wife, he leaves two sons, Isadore and Baruch; a sister, Mrs. Fae Weiner, and three grandchildren.

LINCOLN DAY SPEECH

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the senior Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS, made an important Lincoln Day speech in Buffalo on Sunday, February 12, which believe Members may be interested in reading. Under unanimous consent I place this speech in the RECORD:

THE REPUBLICAN ROLE IN VIETNAM

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Erie County Republican Committee, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y., Feb. 12, 1967)

In the eyes of the people, the single most crucial issue facing the nation and the Republican Party is not education, or welfare, or the state of the economy—it is Vietnam. What we say on Vietnam, the sense we make to the American people, seen from right now, is most likely to make the difference between victory and defeat in the 1968 Presidential election.

Our party has given the President more support on the United States commitment in Vietnam than his own party. I believe the people appreciate that fact—but it is not enough. We, as Republicans, must also convince the American people that we know how to wage peace.

The danger for the Republican Party is not that we will appear too soft or conciliatory; it is that we may project the impression of being too hawkish, too uncompromising, too out of step with the realities of Vietnam. Republicans do not have to prove that they will accept the responsibilities of being a world power, or that they will fight to protect United States interests abroad. But, Republicans do have to show, within the confines of unity on national security, that we know how to bring wars to a close, that we have peaceful alternatives.

General Eisenhower brought hostilities to a close in Korea. Republicans can make proposals now to bring peace in Vietnam. *And I say that we can do it better than the Democrats for one simple and compelling reason. President Johnson has become locked into the mistakes, illusions, and over-optimistic predictions of his own policies. He is so busy defending himself, making excuses, and changing facts and figures that he appears to many to have lost the initiative and credibility to make peace on his own.* People here and abroad have been questioning the effectiveness of both the Administration's military strategy and of its efforts to bring the other side to the conference table.

President Johnson made the mistakes and he feels he has to defend them. He may be defending them even at the price of extending the conflict. The Republican Party is not bound by his mistakes or his policies. Our Party is and should continue to be a party to the United States commitment to see that the people of South Vietnam have a chance freely to express their choice on who is to govern them. With one vital proviso—that they themselves are ready and willing to bear their share of the burden. Republicans can stand behind this commitment, but we can also be more flexible—and effective—than the Democrats in bringing the conflict to a close. *By being more flexible, I do not mean selling our commitment down the drain.* I do mean that Republicans are in a better position to try some new approaches because we are not tied to everything President Johnson has done, as he is himself.

Now, there are those who preach more and more force, crushing the enemy, bombing civilian population centers, invading the North as a new approach. While these proposals do have emotional appeal in some quarters, they will neither bring peace to Vietnam nor victory in our own elections. With the exception of the Spanish-American War, the people of our country have always looked toward national candidates who would either keep us out of war or bring wars to an end through negotiations if possible. Our Party cannot gain a national mandate by waving the bloody shirt.

Nor will the maximum escalation of force solve our problems in Vietnam either. I have supported our military efforts in Vietnam, and I have voted for the requisite appropriations, but I have made it plain each time that these efforts be limited and connected to rational policy objectives. Maximum U.S. force would serve only to reunify the warring factions in Communist China, heal the breach between Peking and Moscow, and probably even involve us in a major Asian land war with global dangers. And, most tragic of all—a great many more Americans would die in the process.

And even then, the guerrilla war in South Vietnam will go on. Not in Malaya, not in the Philippines, not in Greece, not in all the ancient practice of guerrilla war have guerrillas been defeated by force alone. The essence of their operation is small groups, wide dispersion, hit and run. When our troops have found them, we have been successful, but a recent typical sweep and clear operation, where we have sent as many as five thousand troops after the guerrillas, we have netted no more than a hundred or so Vietcong.

We have backed these efforts up with a program designed to bring about social and economic reform and to establish a duly elected and legitimate government in Saigon. Our Government does realize that guerrillas can lose only if they are cut off from their base in the people, only if they feel their needs are being met elsewhere, and only if they develop a greater sense of loyalty toward Saigon. We have been trying to accomplish something on these fronts—although I believe we have not emphasized them sufficiently—especially in the area of land reform.

Yet, one point must be faced and faced squarely. Wars of attrition, wars against poverty and fear, battles to establish a legitimate and responsive government take time. In Vietnam, it could take from ten to fifteen years. Even President Johnson, after long delay and equivocation, had to admit as much in his State of the Union address.

The only way to avoid both the dangers of a major Asian land war and the long years necessitated by a war of attrition is to find a negotiated way out of the dilemma. To this end, I make the following two proposals:

1. *That the U.S. should declare a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam, stating in this declaration that it expects that the cessation of bombing will not be used as a cover for*

continued infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam.

In the alternative, our government should also consider the possibility of restricting the bombing of North Vietnam to the pre-August, 1966, patterns, when bombing was concentrated solely upon access routes to South Vietnam.

2. *That the U.S. present a negotiating package, at the same time, which is designed to lead to peace talks, not a collection of vague generalities that confuses both the American people and the Vietnamese.*

We have to face up squarely to two hard questions in this negotiating package:

(a) How is the National Liberation Front to be given its role in the political and governmental processes of the post-war South Vietnam? Unless this is answered to the satisfaction of the NLF, they will not lay down their arms—no matter what agreement we may come to with the Government of North Vietnam.

(b) How is the over-all settlement to be guaranteed, that is, who will determine violations and what machinery will there be for enforcement? The procedures set up by the Geneva Conference of 1954 have not proved workable.

The cessation of bombing in North Vietnam may be of critical importance to peace—*but the bombings themselves are also important to the security of our troops, and these two considerations need to be reconciled.* I propose a cessation, not simply because of unfavorable world reaction, but because I believe that it is worth challenging the other side's representation that it will respond positively to the call for peace negotiations under such circumstance. *We cannot pledge a permanent cessation of bombing as requested by Hanoi. But we can unilaterally pledge an unconditional cessation—unconditional in the sense that Hanoi need not agree in advance to negotiate.*

If the distinction between the words "permanent" and "unconditional" seem minute, they are not. I feel justified in separating them, because the same distinction has been made in official pronouncements from Hanoi. No one can say with any certainty what the Communists will do if we cease bombing now. But, I feel we ought to explore every possibility that could lead to a cessation of hostilities.

The stakes and risks of continuing the war are so high that it is worth taking some risk to find a way out. If we see that Hanoi and the NLF give no indication of responding in good faith—as recommended by Pope Paul, U Thant, Prime Minister Harold Wilson, Premier Kosygin and many others—we can reevaluate the situation then. Nothing is permanent in war.

As an alternative, we could curtail our bombings to the earlier objective of hitting only supply routes near the South Vietnamese border. The fact that infiltration from the North has increased these past six months is a valid indication that the recent wider bombings have not made such a significant difference as to warrant the danger of their continuation. Bombing supply routes alone can still accomplish the end of putting a ceiling on infiltration.

It is true that we have stopped these bombings twice before, in May 1965 and January 1966. It is true the other side did not reciprocate. Yet, we cannot use the past to deny the future. We cannot afford to take the chance that this time it might be real.

While I consider the cessation much more promising to peace than the curtailment of bombing targets, the final choice must be left to the President because the decision must be based on security information available only to him.

Another issue must be clearly understood. A bombing cessation by itself is not the whole answer. It can only set the process of talking in motion. It has to be tied to a negotiating position that gives the other side an incentive to talk without undermining our own commitment.

Our Government has gone all out to ask the Communists to come to the peace table. But, what we must ask ourselves is what will we talk about when we get there? Hanoi and the NLF, rightly or wrongly, believe that they have been betrayed by Western powers in the past. They will, therefore, not be likely to show a desire to talk once again unless they have some assurance that our peace move can lead to something for them. This is only common sense. As they see it, they cannot lay down their arms until they believe that the people in the NLF can participate in the political and governmental life of South Vietnam. They do not trust the Ky Government. They do not want to lose their momentum in the war any more than we do.

The only way to deal with this problem is through the South Vietnam Government itself. The Constituent Assembly must move quickly to consummate its business. The military junta must approve the new constitution, too, and set the election of a new government into motion at once. The elections must be scrupulously fair and as free from pressure as possible.

It is my hope that out of this will come a government with real roots in the people, with legitimacy. Only such a government will have both the courage and the strength to deal with the NLF directly and to battle with them at the polls and within the government. The NLF does represent a significant minority of the South Vietnamese people. Otherwise they would not have been able to fight so effectively for so long. They should have the same means of expressing themselves as other minorities.

We need guarantees, too. The U.S. has not spent its treasure and its blood in Vietnam only to pull out and turn the South over to the Communists. Effective machinery is required to deal with violations of the overall agreement. Hanoi and the NLF may believe that once we are out, they can do virtually anything without fear of our returning. To guard against this, we must have more than another Geneva Conference and more than the present International Control Commission for Vietnam. Whether it be a strengthened and enlarged ICC, as I have proposed before, or a U. N. Peace Force, or something entirely new, there has to be some unit that can act swiftly and effectively to deal with violations. Moreover, such a unit must have the cooperation and support of the Soviet Union. If Moscow really seeks to end the war, it must assume some real responsibility for the peace.

These three proposals—a) cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam on the declared injunction against its abuse; b) assurances to the NLF and Hanoi of political amnesty for those of SVN who fought against Saigon; and c) effective international guarantees to meet and deal with violations—constitute a package that, I believe can lead to negotiations. They will not lead to negotiations tomorrow or next month. They require time and planning in advance of negotiations.

This is a program for peace behind which Republicans can stand. It is responsive to our own commitmetns and to the situation itself in Vietnam.

The Republican Party must also be the party which shows that it has learned the one vital lesson of Vietnam; that the American people cannot afford and are not interested in being the policemen of the world. But unlike many of the Democrats, neither are we afraid of responsibility. If we cannot and will not be the policeman, we will have to enable others to tend to their own affairs. We must be the Party that promotes the idea and the reality of regionalism—of regional solutions to regional problems.

By this means, we must make it perfectly clear to the countries of Asia and throughout the world that we intend that they should shoulder the burden of peace for themselves. We must convince them that they will have to learn to act together if they are to obtain our support. Our Republican Party has a tradition of being firm in international affairs. We also have a reputation for standing behind the tradition of self-help. We can become the Party that combines firmness and self-help into a policy for peace.

THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY CHEATING CANNOT BE INSPECTED OR VERIFIED

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I charged in a speech that the nonproliferation treaty under negotiation in Geneva contains no verification mechanisms, that is, no detection, inspection, or other machinery to prevent cheating. An item in the Frankfurter Allgemeine of February 14 states that a revised article III of the treaty will be proposed to the effect that nonnuclear signatories will be obligated to accept oversight of their nuclear facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency—IAEA—as soon as practicable. I have been asked if this language would remove my objection to getting into a treaty that fails to police the promises made. My answer is a flat no. Spurious verification mechanisms which will not verify are as much a sham as promises that are not policed. At the present time, IAEA inspection is a farce. The IAEA announced and adopted the principle that peaceful nuclear activities such as reactors and nuclear fuel fabricating and reprocessing plants should be under its inspection to prevent the diversion of fissionable materials to weapons use. And there, essentially, it stopped. As of the beginning of this year it possessed only 10 inspectors to discharge this worldwide responsibility. It has adopted no procedures to insure adequate inspection and still is fumbling around trying to learn what inspection techniques might be useful and which might be spoofed. No one yet knows how much unexplained disappearance of fissionable material during nuclear fuel fabrication and reprocessing is normal and at what point suspicion of diversion should be aroused. Even the U.S. AEC is hazy on the whole subject. Last year, it appointed an ad hoc advisory panel on safeguards which has made a report which the AEC is massaging and seems reluctant to release to the public. I rather imagine the report indicates how difficult, if not impossible, it is to monitor determined cheaters.

Talk of IAEA inspectors sounds great. The blunt truth is that there is no such

thing as meaningful IAEA inspection. This is the actual situation in the real world, despite what the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and our State Department disarmament negotiators would like us to believe. This is the situation at a time when new electric power reactors are being installed at a fast clip all over the world. One knowledgeable expert has estimated that even a modest sized 150,000-kilowatt nuclear generating station will produce annually, as a byproduct, enough plutonium for more than 30 atomic bombs.

Tomorrow is Washington's Birthday. He is the man who could not tell a lie. But others before and since Washington have been capable of this kind of deception. It has given rise to such expressions as "credibility gap." And, on the international treaty scale, it has given rise to the need for verification mechanisms which actually verify. IAEA inspection lacks this characteristic. The IAEA suffers from a financial incapability to carry on an adequate inspection program. This incapacity is likely to continue during the foreseeable future. The IAEA suffers from a technical incapability to determine what techniques and what instrumentation and what statistical data is required for adequate inspection. This incapacity also is likely to continue indefinitely. IAEA has toyed with a "chastity belt" approach to inspection involving such things as the placing of seals on reactor fuel chambers. It has toyed with the "slaughterhouse" approach of stationing inspectors in fuel fabrication factories, even though they may be fallible, foolable, or corruptible. In the end, it probably will be determined that adequate inspection requires a "dehumanizing" approach involving the invention of complicated, tamperproof, computerized monitoring instrumentation and its installation on a worldwide scale, wherever nuclear and nuclear-related activities are carried on. Then it will be rediscovered that Communist countries will tolerate neither part nor parcel of such goings on within their borders.

MINNESOTA STATE LEGISLATURE ASKS RESTORATION OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in today's RECORD a copy of a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorializing the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of Transportation to maintain the Federal highway program at its 1966 levels.

I include the resolution, together with its letter of transmittal from the secretary of state, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
St. Paul, Minn., February 17, 1967.

To the President of the United States; Senators in Congress from Minnesota; Representatives in Congress from Minnesota; the Vice President of the United States; chairman of the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate; chairman of the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of Transportation of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit, as requested by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, Resolution Number 2 Memorializing the President, the Congress and the Secretary of Transportation to Maintain the Federal Aid Highway Program at its 1966 Levels.

This Resolution and Memorial passed the Senate on February 6, 1967 by a vote of 62 ayes, 2 nays, and passed the House of Representatives on February 14, 1967 by a vote of 130 ayes, 0 nays, and was signed by the Governor of Minnesota on February 17, 1967.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota.

S. F. No. 289

[Introduced and Read First Time Jan. 26, 1967, by Messrs. Larson and McCarty, Referred to Committee on Public Highways. Reported Back Jan. 27, 1967. To Pass. Read Second Time Jan. 27, 1967.]

A resolution memorializing the President, the United States Congress and Secretary of the Department of Transportation to maintain the Federal-aid highway program at its 1966 levels

Whereas, the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Transportation in late November of 1966 advised all states of a cut in their authority to obligate Federal Aid Highway Funds for fiscal 1967 as well as a retroactive prohibition on obligating any funds not yet obligated from previous apportionments as of June 30, 1966; and

Whereas, the State of Minnesota had $23,100,000 authorized, but not released for obligation as of June 30, 1966, and an additional appropriation of $102,300,000 was made in October 1966, making a total of $125,400,000 of which only $76,400,000 is now available for obligation during this fiscal year, a reduction of $49,000,000; and

Whereas, improvements in Minnesota's highway program are essential to the economic growth and development of Minnesota, and vital to our national defense program, curtailment of less essential programs should be considered; and

Whereas, the State of Minnesota has geared its highway planning and steadily increasing construction in reliance on the promises, announced policies, budgets, statutes and urgings of the federal government; and

Whereas, the private construction industry has increased its employment and capital investments to meet anticipated highway department programs; and

Whereas, the Federal-Aid cut will create employment difficulties in both state government and private industries as well as losses in capital investments; and

Whereas, the Federal-Aid cut will severely curtail this state's efforts to achieve an adequate state highway transportation system and to fulfill its obligations to complete its portion of the interstate highway system; now therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota do respectfully urge the Congress of the United States do at the earliest possible time devise and approve legislation which will restore all Federal-Aid Highway Funds to the levels in effect and contemplated in November 1966, prior to the cut back.

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota transmit copies of this memorial resolution to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota, to the Vice President, to the Chairmen of the Committees on Finance and on Commerce of the Senate, to the Speaker and the Chairmen of the Ways and Means and Public Works Committees of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Department of Transportation.

LOCAL SUPPORT FOR THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCDONALD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week one of the leading feature writers for the Detroit Free Press, Judd Arnett, endorsed the spirit of the recently introduced Human Investment Act. I feel it aptly indicates a growing realization that the Federal Government cannot effectively assume sole responsibility in solving the many complex problems facing our Nation.

The article referred to follows:

AN INDUSTRY JOB CORPS?

(By Judd Arnett)

In the Sunday edition of this megaphone of free speech our Glenna McWhirter, who writes like an angel and resembles one somewhat unleashed a study on the War on Poverty in Oakland County.

Mickey, as we call her hereabouts, found that during 1966 the two Oakland "Opportunity Centers" charged with meeting the needs of the people procesed 3,211 clients. Of these, 1,152 wanted jobs.

Most of them did not find employment, nor could it be found for them. Why not? Let us move on to Marie Johnson, a Negro leader quoted in the story:

"The poverty program here has made no efforts to meet the major needs of the poor, which are for jobs and better housing. People are sent to the Michigan Employment Securities Commission and MESC sends them home, because they have no training or skills. Nothing has been done for job training."

With few exceptions, what you have just read stands as a nationwide indictment of the War on Poverty—it hasn't been able to upgrade the skills of those, the great majority of the underprivileged, who want and need gainful employment. To perhaps even a greater degree, other government programs in the past have also failed.

Again—why? The notion is entertained here that the reason for failure may be found in the fact that private industry has never been seriously enrolled in a massive attempt to train those eager for new skills. Instead, various efforts have been made to "go it alone," to set up separate centers with instructors recruited from the work force, and too often the equipment has been inadequate and the courses offered out of concert with the actual needs of industry.

What would be wrong with the government approaching industry—General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, General Electric, Burroughs, U.S. Steel and all the other giants—along this line:

"Thousands of Americans need the job training and the skills you could teach them. In turn, you need a reservoir of competent workers, ready to step into jobs as retirement and other forms of attrition make these openings available.

"Therefore, the government will pay you to train these people. They are not to engage in actual production, nor are they to compete with workers already employed. But there are many procedures, many skills they can gain from both observation and instruction, and in your machine shops and technical areas there are many doors to be opened for them. Please help in solving America's most pressing problem!"

Would industry respond? Who knows?—they have never been asked! And there are, of course, many problems to be considered, including the accomplishment of meaningful training without the interruption of normal production.

But generally speaking, industry has met greater challenges. I think, too, there is some feeling of responsibility for those who have been cast aside because of automation and other factors.

Anyhow, under my government, friends, we would give this wildeyed scheme a whirl! In view of where we are and where we are headed, what would we have to lose?

JUDGE EDWARD CONNOR

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDONALD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Wayne County, Mich., as well as his many friends all over this country, mourn today the passing of Judge Edward Connor.

I have known Ed for many years both as a colleague on the Board of Wayne County Supervisors and as a close friend. He has been an invaluable adviser and a notable leader. I only hope that I someday can claim the number and quality of friends and the impressive accomplishments of Judge Edward Connor.

The following remarks on the accomplishments and contributions of the late Judge Edward Connor of the Wayne County recorders court will appear in the March 1967 issue of American County Government, published by the National Association of Counties:

EDWARD CONNOR—1908–67

Judge Ed Connor, President of the National Association of Counties, passed away on Saturday, February 18, 1967, following heart surgery. At the time of his death he was Judge of Wayne County Recorders Court, a position he assumed on January 2, 1967.

Prior to his judgeship he had served as Councilman of the Detroit City Council since 1948, having been reelected to that post some six times. He served a term as President Pro Tem of the council.

Under Michigan law, a Detroit City Councilman also serves as a Supervisor of Wayne County. Judge Connor so served for nearly two decades. He served as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors from 1954 to 1958 and had a second term in 1964.

In April, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson reappointed Judge Connor to represent counties on the 26-member Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. He was an original member of that body with his appointment by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in December, 1959, and was reappointed by President John F. Kennedy in 1962.

He was appointed by the Surgeon General of the United States in February, 1963, to the 15-member Advisory Committee on Urban Health Affairs. In December, 1963, Judge Connor was appointed to the National Advisory Environmental Health Committee of the Surgeon General.

Judge Connor served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Michigan State Association of Supervisors and was reelected to a new term on the Board in January, 1967. He served as a member of the Urban Development Committee of the Michigan Municipal League; a Trustee of the Metropolitan Fund, Inc.; and Director of Forum for Detroit Area Metropolitan Goals.

Judge Connor served as a member of the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission, to which he was first appointed by Governor Kim Sigler and was subsequently reappointed for six consecutive terms, including one year as its Chairman.

He was the father of the Supervisors Inter-County Committee, organized in 1954, and served until 1958 as its first chairman. He was reelected Chairman in April, 1964. The Supervisors Inter-County Association is the organization through which the Boards of Supervisors of Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Monroe, Washtenaw and St. Clair Counties deal with metropolitan area problems.

In 1960, Judge Connor was an unsuccessful candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of Michigan.

Judge Connor made many major contributions to the development of the National Association of Counties (NACO). He was prime mover in the organization of NACO's first Urban Affairs Committee; the First and Second Urban County Congresses; the First National Legislative Congress; the securing of the Ford Foundation Urban Information Reporting and Technical Advisory Service grant and many other developments. He keynoted NACO's 1960 conference in Miami and served as General Conference Chairman of NACO's 1959 conference in Detroit. He was first elected to the NACO Board in 1959. In 1962 he was elected fourth Vice President and was elected as President in July, 1966, at the National Association of Counties Regional Problems Congress in New Orleans.

Judge Connor served on numerous state agencies, including the State Apprenticeship Board of Indiana. By appointment of former Governor G. Mennen Williams, he served as Chairman of the first Housing Study Commission in Michigan; Chairman of the Michigan State Technical Committee on Public Works in the Civil Defense Organization; Member of the Michigan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; Member of the State Committee of water, sewer, drainage and water rights problems in Michigan; Member of the Governor's Study Commission on Metropolitan Problems. Former Governor Swainson appointed him as member of the Constitutional Convention Citizens' Advisory Committee on Local Government.

EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

He received an A.B. degree from the University of Notre Dame in 1930. He was employed in an industrial plant and in sales while studying law at the University of Notre Dame. He was admitted to the Indiana bar in 1935, and the Michigan bar in 1951.

Judge Connor served in a number of executive positions in federal agencies from 1935 until 1943, including State Supervisor of Adult Education for the Public Works Administration, as analyst of community needs in the War Public Services Division of the Federal Works Agency, and with the Chicago Regional Office of the War Manpower Commission.

He was appointed in 1943 and served until 1948 as Executive Director of the Citizens' Housing and Planning Council, later known as Future Detroit, Inc., a private agency supported by the Community Chest, and later by labor and industry, to develop a better metropolitan community.

He was one of the founders and a former director of Public Bank, Detroit.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Judge Connor was born in Chicago in 1908. He married the former Hilda Radermacher in 1930. He is survived by three children: Edward, Michael, Patricia. The Connor family lives at 19321 Greydale, Detroit.

AFFILIATIONS

Honorary member of:

The 425th Infantry Officers' Mess, Detroit.

Detroit Cooks' Union Local 234, AFL.

Local 1324, International Brotherhood of Longshoremen, AFL.

Michigan Society of Architects.

Association of Retired Detroit Police Officers.

Detroit Police Lieutenants' and Sergeants' Association.

Governmental Accountants and Analysts Association.

St. Lawrence Seaway Pioneers.

Sgt. Stanley Romanowski Post 6986, V.F.W.

Honorary president of AFSC&ME, Local 836, City of Detroit Professional Recreation Employees.

Member of:

Knights of Columbus, Geo. F. Monagham Council.

Detroit Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men's Committee on Civic and Social Action.

State Bar of Michigan.

Notre Dame Law Association.

Notre Dame Club of Detroit.

Catholic Lawyers Society.

Gaelic League.

Knights of Equity Court Six.

Loyal Order of Moose.

Detroit Lodge No. 34, B.P.O. Elks.

Local 189, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO.

Old Newsboys' Goodfellow Fund of Detroit.

Detroit and Michigan Artists Memorial, Inc.

Detroit Press Club.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Wayne County Civic League.

17th District Democratic Organization.

Democratic State Central Committee.

Democratic National Committee.

Father Stapleton's Boys.

Tuberculosis and Health Society.

International Fraternity of Delta Sigma Pi, Gamma Rho Chapter.

Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Trade Union Leadership Council, Inc.

First Friday Club of Detroit.

Catholic Youth Organization.

Board of Trustees of Detroit Conservatory of Music.

North Redford Association, Inc.

PROPOSED GENERAL REVISION OF THE PATENT LAWS

Mr. KASTENMEIER. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing the administration's bill calling for general revision of the patent laws.

President Johnson's economic message for 1967 promised a long-overdue mod-

ernization of the U.S. patent system. The term "long overdue" was well chosen, because it has been more than 100 years since the last major overhaul of our patent laws. In that period, our economy has changed from one based predominantly on agriculture to one based predominantly on manufacturing and service industries.

There is no doubt that the patent system has served us well in the past. It is part and parcel of our free enterprise economic system, with incentives for the individual and the businessman to build a better mousetrap. But is the patent system adequate for our present day needs and is it adequate for the tasks of tomorrow? To find the answers to these questions, the President appointed a number of distinguished private citizens and public officials to form a special Commission on the Patent System. Its mission was to find out how well the current system is meeting our national and international goals, to look for any possible improvements, and to come up with changes the Commission felt necessary to strengthen the patent system.

After a lengthy and painstaking study, the Commission submitted its report to the President, making a number of specific recommendations. The draft legislation sent to the Congress by the President today is based upon the recommendations of the Commission.

I am pleased to introduce this legislation, and I sincerely urge all the Members to give their close scrutiny, their careful consideration, and ultimately, I trust, their solid support to this important step for modernization of the patent system.

The purpose of the legislation is to, first, raise the quality and reliability of U.S. patents; second, reduce the time and expense of obtaining and litigating patents; third, accelerate the public disclosure of new technology; and fourth, harmonize our patent system with the practices of other nations, with the long-range goal of an international patent system. Under an international patent system, a single application would lead to protection for the inventor in many countries around the world.

I should like to point out, for the benefit of the Members, that this legislation deals with the procedures of the Patent Office, with the mechanics of the patent system. It is completely separate and apart from the question of Government patent policy, about which we have heard so much. The question of Government patent policy is concerned with the rights to inventions arising out of research and development projects funded by the Federal Government. The bill I have introduced is intended solely to make patent procedures capable of meeting the demands of modern American society.

Patents are provided for by the Constitution. They have helped bring this Nation to the technological leadership of the world. I believe we must now do our part and enact legislation to assure that our rapidly changing science and technology are supported by a patent system that can also change with the times.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1967, I introduced a bill—H.R. 1020—to raise the limits of life insurance for our Armed Forces from $10,000 to $25,000. Since I first took up this issue in the 89th Congress, support has been steadily growing. I was very heartened to see that the President endorsed the need for an increase in his January message to Congress on "America's Servicemen and Veterans."

This Nation first took steps to make adequate life insurance coverage available to veterans in 1917, when we entered World War I. At that time, 50 years ago, it was felt that the Nation should make a maximum of $10,000 available to the men that were being asked to fight and die in our defense.

The $25,000 increase proposed in my legislation is reasonable and equitable. It is simply taking $10,000 in 1917 dollars and adjusting it to the cost of living index of today. In other words, $10,000 in 1917 dollars equals $25,000 in 1967 dollars.

This is a conservative proposal. It will not change any part of the existing program. It merely gives back to our service men and women what inflation has taken from them during the last 50 years. This bill will not put the Government in the life insurance business. The present program issues life insurance with the cooperation of over 500 private life insurance companies and it will remain this way.

My proposal will provide for five things:

First, it will raise the present maximum limits of insurance from $10,000 to $25,000. This will be available to all men and women serving in our Armed Forces, regardless of years of service or rank.

Second, the entire life insurance program will remain completely voluntary. No person will be forced to buy anything that they do not want. The serviceman may waive the insurance entirely, or he may choose to insure himself in lesser amounts than $25,000, in multiples of $5,000.

Third, a serviceman who has previously chosen to have reduced coverage or to waive the insurance may avail himself to the $25,000 insurance by just passing a physical exam. In this way the serviceman and his dependents will not face undue hardships from lack of life insurance upon a transfer overseas, or because of a mistake in judgment.

Fourth, all persons entering the Armed Forces will automatically be insured for the full amount, unless they choose otherwise.

Fifth, the life insurance will be convertible upon leaving the service, and the serviceman will be able to have his converted policy with the same private company that insured him in the service.

The present group life insurance premium per month for the serviceman is $2 for $10,000 of coverage. This is computed as the serviceman's share of the premium for life insurance group rates, without the war risk premium. The Government pays the war risk part of the premium. The same principle would be carried forward under my program.

Last September, Congressman Paul H. Todd, Jr., who first sponsored the measure, said:

> I believe that it is wrong to ask a person to serve his nation only to have him find his nation unwilling to make realistic life insurance protection available for his family.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we must work to make this measure law so that our servicemen may be confident that their families will have adequate protection.

NEED TO REVISE THE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—XXII—THE NEGRO AND THE DRAFT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I had reported previously on the percentage of nonwhite conscription into the Army with a sectional analysis of recruiting districts and Army areas during the months between July 1965 through May 1966.

Now, I wish to focus on an examination of the nonwhite draft rates by several individual induction centers throughout the United States. For example, the 31 Louisiana parishes making up the induction center, whose headquarters is at New Orleans, contain a Negro male population, ages 18½ through 25, of about 32 percent of the total male population in that age group. This is based on the 1960 census figures. The nonwhite induction rate between July 1965 through May 1966, however, was 43.4 percent of the total inductions. Similarly, the counties within the boundaries of the Oakland, Calif., induction center have a Negro population of 5.3 percent. The total nonwhite population, according to the 1960 census, comprises some 8.8 percent. Yet, the nonwhite conscription rate was 13.3 percent between July 1965 through May 1966.

Other examples are as follows:

Induction center	Negro population percent 1960 census	Nonwhite draft percent July 1965–May 1966
New Haven, Conn.	4.2	9.2
Jackson, Miss.	40.2	45.6
Raleigh, N.C.	33.7	39.0
Houston, Tex.	21.0	35.4
Shreveport, La.	32.7	41.3
Coral Gables, Fla.	16.3	27.5
Richmond, Va.	27.3	37.0
Jacksonville, Fla.	21.5	27.0
Fort Jackson, S.C.	35.5	43.8
New York, N.Y.	11.2	14.4
Los Angeles, Calif.	5.9	10.1

The reasons for high nonwhite draft percentages are several and they shall be dealt with in future statements.

SHOWING THE INTEGRATED FLAG

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the February 11 issue of the Economist published the best summary I have read on the visit of the U.S. aircraft carrier *Roosevelt* to Capetown, South Africa. I will include it in the RECORD with my remarks for the benefit of the Members.

Following the *Roosevelt* incident the missile-tracking ship *Sword Knot* was diverted from Durban, South Africa, to Mombasa, Kenya. This is consistent with U.S. opposition to apartheid. I hope the State and Defense Departments will continue this policy of finding ports other than in South Africa in which our ships can be serviced and our men enjoy shore leave.

The article follows:

SHOWING THE INTEGRATED FLAG

Some say that the American aircraft carrier *Franklin D. Roosevelt* should never have docked at a South African port, others that it should and that, once at Cape Town, the Navy should have been allowed to behave as it would in any other friendly port. Nobody says that the ship should have made the visit without letting the men go ashore. This is what happened last weekend, but nobody planned it so; the Administration was pushed this way and that and ended up in a position that annoyed everybody and pleased no one.

Now that it is over it is obvious enough that a visit to the land of racial apartheid by a great warship, having in its complement of 3,700 men a cross-section of Negroes and whites not very different from the population of the United States itself, was bound to be a political event. A precedent existed in the affair of another aircraft carrier, the *Independence*, which was to have made a similar refueling stop at Cape Town in May, 1965. Dr. Verwoerd, who was South Africa's Prime Minister at the time, laid down racial conditions which the United States refused to accept, the visit was called off and the *Independence* refueled at sea. Since then the Navy has been chafing at having its movements interfered with; some of its smaller ships, tankers and the like, have continued at call at Cape Town from time to time with their crews respecting local law and custom when they went ashore. But little ships get little attention.

During this period the State Department appeared to interpret its policy as being a more definite stand on principle than it actually was. In particular, Mr. G. Mennen Williams, then Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, took a position of principle when he expounded to a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in March, 1966, what the Administration was doing to express its disapproval of apartheid. Mr. Williams told the subcommittee that "calls" (in the plural) in South Africa by American naval ships and aircraft had been cancelled "rather than accept the application of racial conditions to our personnel." The liberals in Congress took his statement to mean what it said. This accounts for the vehemence of their indignation last week: when they learnt that another big ship was to stop at Cape Town in circumstances in which, quite obviously, "racial conditions" were going to be firmly applied to any men who went ashore. Either they had been deceived or there had been a backsliding.

Probably they had been deceived. Mr. Williams himself certainly meant what he said. Now out of office, he said last weekend that he thought that the case of the *Independence* had established a principle which he felt had been departed from. But the Administration points out that the sticking point in the difference with South Africa about the *Independence* concerned the ship's operations, not the social activities of its crew. Dr. Verwoerd had made it a condition of the visit that racially mixed aircrews from the carrier should not land at South African airfields. This was the principle that the United States rejected.

Confronted by angry liberal Congressmen with Mr. Williams' words of last March, the Administration said that he had not been generalising but had been talking about the particular case of the *Independence*. The congressional critics do not believe this nor, obviously, does Mr. Williams. But the statement was drafted for him, no doubt, with the usual paper-passing between departments and the usual concern to avoid offence to opposite schools of thought. While this went on the Navy was going as it thought fit. It is perhaps fair to conclude that the Administration was papering over the gap between those who felt that disapproval of apartheid should be expressed in a definite policy about visits of ships to South Africa and those who wanted the Navy's operational convenience to go unrestricted.

If this was the game, it worked well enough until the time came for the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* to leave Vietnam at the end of a tour of war duty and return to its home port in Florida. Geography said that the best route was westward and round the Cape of Good Hope. The ship's cruising range dictated refuelling somewhere in the region of southern Africa. At 62,000 tons she is too big for most ports; the French have a naval base in Malagasy which might have done, but the French are unwilling to give facilities for any American military movement connected with the war in Vietnam and so they were not even asked. In the name of economy the Navy preferred not to refuel at sea by tanker, which would have cost an extra $250,000 or so. It was also not averse to reasserting the principle that operational convenience, not politics, ought to come first.

It may as well be admitted that American sailors like Cape Town and that Cape Town likes American sailors, or did until last weekend. Some South Africans felt that Dr. Verwoerd had gone too far with his stipulations for the *Independence* visit and they prepared to make the visit of the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* the occasion for a friendly demonstration of hospitality. The visit might have gone through without a hitch, shore liberty, segregated social life and all, but for the coincidence that while the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* was ploughing the Indian Ocean the American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa held its annual meeting in Washington. Aware of this meeting, the African specialists in the State Department warned the relatively new Under Secretary, Mr. Nicholas Katzenbach, that, if he gave in to the wishes of the Navy and agreed to the visit, he would have a row on his hands. As a former Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach was well able to appreciate that the Negro leaders would not like it. But the pressure from the Navy Department was strong and the arguments of economy and convenience prevailed.

When the Negro Conference on Africa opened on January 26th, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, the old Negro labour leader, questioned the rightness of the visit in his keynote speech. Before the conference ended Mr. Katzenbach came to explain the Administration's position, but when he mentioned the extra cost of refuelling at sea as an argument for stopping at Cape Town he met nothing but scorn; the Negro leaders saw a principle at stake and refused to accept that the principle was too dear at $250,000. An indignant resolution was passed and the row was on. But by now it was too late to make other refueling arrangements.

The row then shifted to Congress, where last week a group of liberals drafted a letter of protest to President Johnson; this got 41 supporters. Probably these liberal Congressmen are in a minority nowadays when it comes to demanding a strong stand of principle against South Africa or, for that matter, against the Smith regime in Rhodesia. But, after the assurances they had had from Mr. Mennen Williams and after the President's own high-principled and sympathetic speech to the African Ambassadors in Washington last May, they could make a fair case that the Administration was letting them down. On February 3rd, the day of the ship's arrival at Cape Town, a deputation of them went to the Pentagon to see the Deputy Secretary of Defence, Mr. Vance, and the Secretary of the Navy.

The deputation consisted of men who believe that naval visits to South Africa are wrong and ought to be stopped. As one of them said, "If South Africa were Red China, arrangements would be made to refuel at sea." By this time it was impossible for Mr. Vance to meet their wishes, but he announced a concession. The crew, he said would be allowed "modified shore leave in connection with integrated activity only" and orders to that effect were sent off to the captain of the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*. Not much is available in Cape Town in the way of racially integrated leisure pursuits and the captain presumably decided that the new order was unworkable; his reaction was to cancel shore liberty altogether. He did hold open ship to huge crowds of visitors, naturally including many pretty girls, to whom the sailors, marines and airmen of whatever colour declared freely their chagrin at not being allowed ashore. He also allowed a party made up of both races to march off together to a blood bank, where their blood was packed in containers and duly ticketed with its racial origin.

Naturally the last thing that the liberal Congressmen want is to be labelled as having denied these men shore leave on their way home from the war. But this was the way it worked out for the liberals. One of their chief enemies, Representative Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, who is not only a white supremacist but also chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, has had a field day. Demanding to know what kill-joy struck this blow at the morale of the "battle-weary" servicemen, he urged that the guilty authority should be rebuked, made to apologise and then summarily sacked. One of the liberals retorted that the thing to do was for the Navy to make its fuelling and shore liberty arrangements "where our servicemen can be treated with honour and dignity." The liberals stand by this position, but the feelings of many of them are mixed. A Negro journalist and former member of the Administration, Mr. Carl Rowan, said in a broadcast that the crew of the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, including the Negroes among them, would have had a friendlier reception ashore in Cape Town than they can expect at their destination and home port in Florida.

As is customary the Administration declares its policy, whatever that may be, to be unchanged. On the face of things it does appear to have been edged into a somewhat harder attitude than before towards dealings

with South Africa in which the race laws may touch American servicemen and, by extension, American officials. There is uncertainty how far this hardened attitude will hold good for the future. Some think that the Navy will get its revenge. But the Negro movements and their liberal sympathisers will be watching the Administration's dealings with South Africa more closely than they did. A falling-out with South Africa is something that the Administration certainly did not want, particularly at the present moment when it is hoping, if not for real co-operation, at least for tactful restraint on the part of the South African government in its reaction to the United Nations' sanctions against Rhodesia.

MUTUAL FUNDS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, another class of consumers which the President's message considers is the over 3.5 million persons who have bought tens of billions of dollars of mutual fund securities with their savings. Viewing the Nation's investors as consumers is consistent with the Congress' long-established recognition of the need for investor protections if persons relatively unfamiliar with the intricacies of finance are to have confidence in the Nation's securities markets. The Securities Act of 1933 established disclosure as a hallmark of investor protection. The Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and amendments of it, provided antifraud measures and regulatory controls over the exchange markets and over-the-counter securities markets. The Investment Company Act of 1940 supplied additional regulatory protections for persons who invest in American business through the medium of investment companies.

The report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on "Public Policy Implications of Investment Company Growth" is the first major report on investment companies by the SEC to the Congress in 27 years. It found that the mutual fund industry's dramatic growth, to an extent unforeseen in 1940, presents problems which call for improved measures for investor protection. The Commission's thoughtful and detailed analysis and its suggestions for legislation deserve and undoubtedly will receive careful consideration from the Congress as will the views of members of the securities industry and of the investing public.

The mutual fund industry currently represents 6 percent of the total investment capital in the principal financial markets. In sum, mutual funds represent assets of over $38 billion. Numerically, the mutual funds rank fourth, behind banks, insurance companies, and trust and pension funds, in total assets. They represent the second largest holder of stocks. I present these statistics to give an indication of the massiveness of the financial juggernaut of which we are speaking. I think these statistics clearly belie the general impression that mutual funds are a relatively new and rather small industry. New they are. Small they are not.

The relative newness of mutual funds has caused them to be relatively free from regulation. Their practices and profits are not subjected to the same scrutiny and review as are the practices of other institutions of similar standing in the financial industry.

However, it does not follow that because they are large they necessarily should be closely regulated. What does follow—and I hope this message will lead to it—is the recognition of the fact that this industry's role in the economy has not been fully assessed.

It should be our objective in analyzing this message to make a full and complete review of the part played by the mutual fund industry in our Nation's economy. In this view, I think the proper focus of our deliberations on this subject should be to pose the question: Is the size of the profit margin accorded mutual fund managers warranted by their contribution to the public interests? The question is framed in this manner because it is clear that mutual funds currently have a substantial incentive to expand their operations—the authorization to apply a "very heavy front-end load," up to 50 percent of the first-year payments made by the purchaser. This gives them a significant profit incentive. An advantage which other, competitive institutions do not enjoy. We must, therefore, ask ourselves whether, as a matter of public policy, this advantage should be given mutual fund administrators. We must inquire as to whether there is some singularly valuable contribution that these individuals make which entitles them to this favored status.

The President is to be congratulated for recognizing that reevaluation of the need for additional regulation is a question affecting the national public interest and calling for our attention.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, despite the great strides we have made in this century toward recognizing the inherent dignity and worth of each individual there are still countless examples in which women are not afforded equal rights. In property rights, inheritance rights, divorce, the right to work for a living, the right to compete on equal terms with all others engaged in the same work, to own and control one's earnings, in education, engage in all lawful occupations, jury service, Government service, employment under Government contracts and other phases of life women are still discriminated against and society is the loser.

I urge the Congress to give constitutional authority to the moral laws of equal rights and adopt the resolution I submit today amending the Constitution by adding that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

EXTENDING VOTING FRANCHISE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of House Joint Resolutions 18 and 56. We are now in an age of educational opportunity and achievement unmatched in the history of mankind. The involvement of our young people in the mainstream of their government is likewise unparalleled in our history. We are dealing today with an ever increasing early maturation of the young as expressed by the increasing public services they perform.

At the University of California, Berkeley campus in 1964:

First. Students raised $9,062 for Cal Camp, a camp for underprivileged children staffed by 50 volunteer students.

Second. Two hundred and sixty-two students spent 20,000 hours tutoring Berkeley public school students.

Third. Thirty to forty students removed 200 cubic feet of refuse from a Berkeley hillside, removed 200 old tires from Albany mud flat, and cleaned up the east side of Aquatic Park. All volunteer work.

For over 30 years the Cal fraternities have sponsored a big brother program to aid in the rehabilitation of delinquent boys.

The Peace Corps has at one time or another had 791 volunteers enlisted from Cal, far more than any other campus in the Nation. Likewise, VISTA has had 114 Golden Bear volunteers serving.

It has become increasingly apparent that with the arrival of this new found experience and academic achievement has come the entitlement to exercise of the vote. Extension of the voting franchise to the 18- to 21-year-old segment of our citizenry is a natural and logical step in the development of our democratic society.

OUR OUTDOOR RECREATION CHALLENGE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, all of us, particularly those who live in the cities and suburbs of America,

know well the value of outdoor recreation opportunities—the chance to get away from it all. But, unfortunately, as our numbers increase, the opportunities for outdoor recreation seem to decrease. Growing population and affluence, more leisure time and greater mobility are combining to make existing outdoor recreation facilities inadequate.

In his 1965 message on natural beauty, President Johnson pointed out:

> A growing population is swallowing up areas of natural beauty with its demands for living space and is placing increased demand on our overburdened areas of recreation and pleasure.

Then, just last month, the President reminded us in his message on protecting our national heritage that "we must act promptly to assure that we can acquire needed recreation lands." I thoroughly agree.

Since 1946, the use of national and State park and forest systems has increased nearly 2½ times. In the next decade, recreation demands will outstrip population growth by at least two to one.

These demands are creating something of an outdoor recreation crisis, and it is particularly acute in urban areas. A large part of our existing recreation facilities—most national and State parks and nearly half our local parks—are located in rural areas, out of easy reach for many city dwellers.

The great majority of our fellow citizens live in urban and suburban communities, and the number is increasing. The noted planner, Constantinos Doxiadis, estimates that urban and suburban areas will contain more than 90 percent of our population within 35 years, compared with about 70 percent today.

Macomb County, Mich., in my congressional district, illustrates clearly the recreation demand created by rapidly growing urban and suburban populations. Today, more than half a million persons live in Macomb County. By 1970, the population will exceed 600,000. Ten years later, it is expected to reach 860,000. Yet Macomb County's recreation facilities, which also help meet the needs of neighboring areas, are about adequate for an area with a population of 400,000, assuming normal use.

The outdoor recreation problem in urban-suburban areas is complicated by the increasing difficulty of obtaining land for parks, and land costs are escalating at a rate of 10 percent a year or more. Land which might otherwise be used for recreation development is being used for other purposes—for homebuilding; for construction of office buildings; for highways, sidewalks, parking lots; for almost everything but recreation development.

Our available land is disappearing. As much as 1 million acres of undeveloped land is developed each year, and the costs of developed land for outdoor recreation are virtually prohibitive—nearly nine times those of acquiring undeveloped land.

The Federal Government, I am pleased to say, has not stood still in the face of the outdoor recreation challenge. Congress has expanded the national park, forest, and seashore systems; we have enacted the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the open spaces land program and other measures to increase and improve the recreation opportunities available to the people of our country.

But only one Federal program—open spaces—is designed particularly to help meet the recreation needs of areas with higher densities of population. And, in my opinion, this program does not go far enough—or fast enough.

Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the needs of our population in the 1970's and the 1980's, we will need greatly expanded recreation opportunities, and I mean opportunities where the people are—not hundreds of miles away or across the country where the average working man or woman may not be able to enjoy them.

Do not misunderstand me—we do need our great national parks; our wilderness and primitive areas; our national forests, lakeshores, and seashores. But we also need playgrounds; neighborhood parks; ball diamonds, swimming pools, and tennis courts, and other local recreation facilities.

I shall continue to support—and I urge others to support—efforts to expand and improve our national parks and other larger outdoor recreation areas. As a new member of the Interior Committee, I am looking forward to the opportunity to work even more closely in this vitally important legislative area.

But I am disturbed, Mr. Speaker, that we are not doing more for our fellow citizens in the cities and suburbs who may not be able to get away to visit a national park or a national seashore. We should be moving forward with a comprehensive program to help local communities do a better job of acquiring and equipping recreation areas in urban areas. And we should move forward now, not wait for land prices to rise to prohibitive levels and then complain that we cannot afford it.

With these thoughts in mind, I am today introducing legislation to expand and improve the open spaces land program. My bill would improve the program in three ways:

It would increase the authorization for land acquisition and development, add to the types of facilities for which development funds may be used and permit the use of development funds on land other than that acquired under the open spaces program.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my bill or similar legislation will be favorably considered by the 90th Congress, and I insert the text of the bill H.R. 5865 at the conclusion of my remarks:

H.R. 5865

A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land and for the acquisition of outdoor and indoor recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by inserting ", for the development and redevelopment of existing parks, recreation areas, and other open space," after "the Nation's urban areas".

SEC. 2. Section 702(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: ", or the development or redevelopment, for open-space uses, of existing open-space land";

(2) by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Development or redevelopment of land (whether acquired under this title or existing at the time of such development or redevelopment) for open-space uses may include (1) the purchase, construction, renovation, and rehabilitation of recreational buildings and other outdoor or indoor recreational centers or facilities, whether housed or not, which complement the parks and recreational uses to be made of the land; and (2) the acquisition of equipment, which may include built-in equipment and the necessary enclosures, as well as any other items, such as suitable furniture and playground and athletic equipment, which are necessary for public utilization of the recreational opportunities that are available at such recreational buildings, centers, or facilities."; and

(3) by striking out "and development" in the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof ", development or redevelopment".

SEC. 3. Section 702(b) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out "$310,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$620,000,000"; and

(2) by striking out $64,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$128,000,000".

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 705 of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows: "Grants under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of acquiring such interests, the necessary demolition and removal of improvements, and acquiring recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment."

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of, the Private Calendar. I hope this might be of some value to the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the five House calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all private bills are referred. Private bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions, and so forth, as distinguished from public bills, which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only five were private laws. But, their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress—1885–87—the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available—passed 1,031 private laws, as compared with 434 public laws. At the turn of the century, the 56th Con-

gress—1899–1901—passed 1,498 private laws and 443 public laws—a better than 3-to-1 ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee of the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62d Congress—1911–13—changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause 6, which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932 and then adopted in its present form on March 27, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills: First, those authorizing the payment of money for pensions; second, for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims procedure; third, those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream; or, fourth, those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising postwar and cold-war flood of private immigration bills. The 82d Congress—1951–52—passed 1,023 private laws, as compared with 594 public laws. The 89th Congress—1965–66—passed 473 private laws and 810 public laws.

Under rule XXIV, clause 6, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesdays of each month. The consideration of Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Private Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained. Bills unobjected to are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection. Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph, and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matter so stricken out shall not again be included in an omnibus bill during the session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved into their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed severally.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follow the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order. When the previous question is ordered on a Private Calendar bill, the bill comes up for disposition on the next legislative day.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the official objectors system the House has established to deal with our great volume of private bills.

The majority leader and minority leader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar objectors during a Congress. The objectors have the responsibility of carefully studying all bills which are placed on the Private Calendar. When the Private Calendar is called, the objectors are on the floor ready to object to any private bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Seated near them to provide technical assistance are the majority and minority legislative clerks.

Should any Member have a doubt or question about a particular private bill, he can get assistance from the objectors, their clerks, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The great volume of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. Those rules limit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the calendar is called. The agreement is as follows:

Reaffirming the policy initially adopted on June 3, 1958, the members of the Majority and Minority Private Calendar Objectors Committees have today agreed that during the 90th Congress they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of seven calendar days, excluding the day the bills are reported and the day the Private Calendar is called.

It is agreed that the majority and minority legislative clerks will not submit to the Objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

This policy shall be strictly observed except during the closing days of each session when House rules are suspended.

The agreement was entered into by the majority objectors—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]—and the minority objectors—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

I feel confident I speak for my colleague objectors when I request all Members to enable us to give the necessary advance consideration to the private bills, by not asking us to depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

Also, I respectfully ask on behalf of the official objectors that all committees considering private legislation assist us in meeting our responsibility to the House by reporting the bills sufficiently in advance of the day the Private Calendar is called to enable us to give the bills the study and consideration they deserve. The cooperation of committees in this regard will greatly facilitate the work of the official objectors for the Private Calendar.

PROBLEMS IN CONTEMPORARY LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in February of 1967, as we honor the men and women around the Nation who compose our law enforcement agencies, two momentous events have occurred to underscore the problems in contemporary law enforcement: the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, and the President's unique message to Congress on crime prevention. Never before has this Nation witnessed a more concrete manifestation of the Federal Government's commitment to war against crime and the causes of crime.

My office has been in contact with the major police agencies in my congressional district—the Syracuse Police Department and the Onondaga County Sheriff's Department—and I can assure you there are no more dedicated groups than these. They have told me of their growing alarm over the social disease we call crime and of their sometimes frustrating attempts to combat it with understaffed, underpaid and antiquated departments. One thread runs throughout their commentaries—and I am sure this is the case in every metropolitan area in the country—they simply do not have the financial wherewithal to handle the situation.

Mr. Speaker, no one, least of all myself, wants to see a national police force as such. Our system is predicated on local control of police agencies. The harsh fact remains, however, that the National Government can no longer keep its blinders on while the cities writhe in collective pain.

The President's Commission has put the problem in excellent perspective; the President's message to Congress has shown us some specific vehicles for rectifying the problems; and both Chief William Smith and Sheriff Patrick Corbett have offered me some specific areas capable of improvement.

I think we made a significant breakthrough during the 89th Congress with the enactment of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act. I think also, though, that we only touched the surface.

In conversations between my office and the police agencies in my district, several excellent points have been raised. Contrary to the popular myth that police and sheriff's departments are principally interested in solving crimes, I have come away with the distinct impression that

most law enforcement officials are more interested in preventing crimes. Therein must lie the thrust of our efforts—to eradicate the roots of crime. This necessarily entails technical tools, training centers for our law enforcement officials, and additional manpower, not just patrolmen on the beat, but researchers and instructors capable of working with our youth. It means lighting up our streets and cleaning up and expanding our already pathetically inadequate parks and recreation facilities. It means raising the salaries of police personnel to make the jobs attractive to qualified people.

If I may be permitted the liberty of paraphrasing an old axiom: a dollar for prevention is worth more than $10,000 for detection, trial and possible confinement.

I am proud to represent a district whose police and sheriffs are among the most capable and dedicated in the Nation; I am prouder yet over the prospect that this Congress will give these men and women the tools to do a better job.

Aside from the enormous costs involved in crime prevention and detection, there is a broader issue at stake: it is the right of every citizen to the security of both his person and his property. As surely as a society is morally obliged to blot out the causes of crime, so also is it obligated to guarantee the safety of all its citizens. We can measure, on a dollars-and-cents basis, the costs of criminal activities in this Nation; we cannot, however, measure the mental anguish caused by fear for one's personal safety.

The report of the Presidential Commission on the number of people who are afraid to venture out after dark is indeed a frightening item. We have striven, and indeed continue this very hour to labor, to afford our allies peace and security, and yet we are woefully remiss in our labors to guarantee our own citizens the safety of their neighborhoods.

Obviously, not all of the sundry proposals contained in the President's message, nor all of the 200 specific proposals contained in the Presidential Commission's report will be accepted by Congress. Some will be modified; some will be rejected outright as unworkable; others will be legislated.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge my colleagues too vigorously to examine in detail these two documents. They do not contain a cure-all for our social ills, but they do take us one step down the road to a better, safer, and healthier America.

THE FIGHT AGAINST LAWLESSNESS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I for one applaud the President for a statement which finally gives the Nation a reasonable expectation that the resources of the Federal Government will vigorously be directed against lawlessness. The statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, over the past decade, have indicated a rising crime rate that has reached the proportions of a national disgrace. Local and State law-enforcement agencies have been unable to contain it. It is therefore incumbent upon the Congress to provide additional weapons in this fight and assure the modernization and coordination of local law-enforcement authorities to the end that citizens may enjoy their constitutional rights of domestic tranquillity.

I shall be very sympathetic to receiving and studying the measures which the President has sent to implement this program.

WORLDWIDE FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are many motives which can induce nations to undertake grand initiatives. Among the most comprehensible and laudable of these are both enlightened self-interest and a desire to live up to the nation's own best ideals and most noble standards. When these two motives are harmoniously joined, the initiative commands our admiration and support.

The President's message on the worldwide food shortage has starkly and persuasively portrayed the apocalyptic specter of famine which mocks the aspirations of half the globe's inhabitants. We have undertaken a timely initiative to share with other governments our perception of the threat which this specter poses to the stability and orderly progress of all mankind. I think it is obvious that it is in our Nation's best interests to cooperate with the rest of the world in devising ways to solve a problem which might one day affect us even more centrally than it does today here in the United States.

We Americans are rightfully proud that in addressing broad human problems which cut across national frontiers and impinge upon men everywhere, successive U.S. Government, supported by the American people, have tried always to look beyond this country's interests and to choose those policies which would commit us to a constructive contribution in areas of general humanitarian concern. We cherish a sense of involvement with and commitment to our less fortunate brethren across the globe and we truly believe that anything which undermines their confidence in their future possibilities for growth and development diminishes us the more. If there were no other compelling reasons, a simple humanitarian concern for doing the right thing by our fellow man would cause the United States to enlist for service in the war on hunger.

The war on hunger has, potentially, great scope and many dimensions. An international effort to supplement the self-help measures of countries which are most affected by recurrent food shortages and problems of overpopulation holds great promise for the future. Meantime, India, which, because of sheer size, must deal with perhaps the world's most serious food-population equation, has the immediate, pressing problem of providing food grains in the weeks ahead to those parts of the country which have been severely afflicted by drought during the past 2 years. This is a problem which permits no delay. Human beings are in need, but their misery can be alleviated by our prompt action. Our stake in humanity dictates a favorable American response to India's request for speedy assistance.

DAVIS COLLEGE OF BUSINESS RECEIVES ACCREDITATION AS A JUNIOR COLLEGE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of justifiable pride that I wish to inform you and my fellow Members of the House of Representatives of an honor that has come to a college in the Ninth Congressional District of Ohio. The school is the Davis College of Business in Toledo which has just received accreditation as a junior college. It is one of only 41 business colleges in the United States that has been granted this advanced standing by the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, an agency recognized by the U.S. Office of Education.

Over 100 years ago, in 1858 to be exact, young ladies wearing bustles and young men sporting sideburns and frock coats enrolled for the first time in the Toledo Business College. At the new school they studied elocution, fancy lettering, and calculus. In 1881, M. H. Davis, a professor from Albert College in Belleville, Ontario, joined the faculty and later became its president. He soon introduced Toledo's first typewriting course.

Upon the death of his father in 1904, Thurber P. Davis left the University of Michigan to head the rapidly growing school. In 1948, Ruth L. Davis took over active management of the school and, upon her father's death in 1956, became the third member of the Davis family to serve as president of the college.

Toledo today is a far different city than it was 109 years ago, and if a business school graduate of 1858 could inspect the present Davis Junior College of Business he would be amazed at its 109-year growth, both in size and in the wide range of its present curriculum.

In 1858, Toledo was a small town. Its total population was less than 12,000. But Toledo was strategically located on the Maumee River with an excellent harbor, and it was on the most feasible water level route between Chicago to the west, Detroit to the north, and the east-

ern seaboard. It was even then a city destined to become an important transportation hub and center of industrial activity. Toledo has grown tremendously since then and is now rated as the 45th marketing area in the United States.

I am proud to say that Davis Junior College of Business has matched its city's growth and is today recognized as one of the leading colleges of its type in the United States. Its officers have been prominent in local, State, and national education affairs, and its recent accreditation as a junior college is ample evidence of the scope and quality of its instruction.

I think that one of the very fine things about Davis Junior College is that its programs are designed to provide the business community with graduates who are not only well grounded in the technical aspects of their professions, but are also conversant with the more subtle phases of business life. Ruth Davis expressed this very well, I believe, when she said that the school wanted to graduate good secretaries, good accountants, good computer analysts, but that, even more importantly, they wanted their graduates to be able to adjust easily to a business environment and to progress because of their desire to continue to learn and their ability to relate well with other people.

H.R. 2—THE RESERVE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2 and join my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in urging its unanimous approval by this body.

I believe that the bill, as written, will give stability to strengthen the Reserve components of the armed services as well as clarify the status of National Guard technicians.

Title I of the bill has as its primary objective the establishment by statute of a reserve components structure that will enable these components to more fully and effectively meet their mobilization readiness requirement as established in the contingency and war plans approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

Title II will provide a retirement status and eligibility for National Guard technicians who have heretofore been denied a retirement status of any kind because, while they have been paid by Federal funds, they have been deemed to be State employees of the National Guard of the several States.

Early enactment of this measure will insure action this year by the other body which, unfortunately, did not happen last year due to lack of time.

I strongly urge a favorable vote for H.R. 2, to establish a more viable National Guard.

THE NATIONAL HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION ACT OF 1967

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today the National Homestead Exemption Act of 1967. This act would translate into Federal law one of our oldest and finest traditions and beliefs; namely, that a man's home is his castle. The act would exempt from levy by the Federal Government the homestead of any family.

Under the present law, a person who has worked hard and for many years to provide a home for himself and his family may lose that home to the Federal Government through a forced sale because of a lien against him personally for failure to pay income taxes. While I would not belittle the importance of the income tax and the need to enforce the income tax laws fairly and uniformly, it seems to me to be a harsh and unjust remedy for the Federal Government to deprive a person or a family of their home because of a tax lien.

Several States have statutes on the books exempting homesteads from liens of this sort. A State exemption, however, does not prevent the Federal Government from levying against any property with a Federal lien. My bill would merely extend the principle established by Texas and other States which have erected protective walls around the homestead and have said to the Government, here you may not enter—a man's home in our society is his castle.

I urge my colleagues in the House to give serious consideration and to support the National Homestead Exemption Act of 1967.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, no country in the history of mankind has been so blessed with an abundance of resources as has our United States, and no country has been so blessed with the tools to transform these resources into the goods and the services we want and need. This transformation has borne such rich fruit that until very recently we have not been concerned with the small garner of bitter fruit among the harvest. Now, however, we can no longer afford to overlook it, it is too much with us; it threatens the quality of our existence.

It is to these bitter fruit that the President addressed himself in his message on protecting our natural heritage, and it is about one of them, air pollution, that I wish to say a few words now.

The Congress and the administration took the first steps to control air pollution nationally with the Clean Air Act of 1963. Under this act and its amendments we have made real progress: we have expanded our knowledge of how to control pollution; we have begun to use our authority to abate pollution where it flows across State boundaries; we have taken the first big step toward curbing the single greatest source of pollution in the country—the automobile; we have taken action to make Federal installations models of air pollution control; and we have stimulated the creation and development of State, regional, and local agencies by granting them Federal moneys.

We have done all this in the past 4 years, and we find that it is not enough. We cannot escape the fact that air pollution is worsening, and we cannot escape our responsibility to take more effective action and to take it now. Whatever else we do to control pollution, we must remove the barriers that now stand in the way of effective abatement.

We must, of course, also expand our research, but we cannot afford to wait until we have all the answers. The answers we have today will serve very well. In fact they must, because the problem grows more serious each day. We must, in addition, streamline the procedures now used to see that the citizens in one State do not have to suffer from the pollution released in another. And we must take steps to see that the controls on automobile emissions are and remain effective. But most important is our obligation to see that nothing hinders the control of the emission of pollutants to the atmosphere.

Today, the control of emissions is in the hands of State and local authorities. Many States have no legislation with which to control their pollution. Others have legislation but have not yet set up effective enforcement procedures. And everywhere there has been a common resistance by industry to laws and regulations and enforcement. This resistance is not unreasonable, for it is based on economic grounds. Why should I, says the industrialist, put out all this money for pollution control, with the result that I will have to raise the price of my product, when my competitor in another State does not have to. I cannot in conscience ask this sacrifice of the businessmen in my State. Nor do I wish to say to any man who is considering building a plant in my State, "Of course, it will cost you more to operate here than in that other State; but don't forget, the air is purer."

With the passage of the Air Quality Act of 1967, uniform emission control levels will be established across the country. And once these levels have been established, the biggest single bar to the control of industrial air pollution will have dropped. The instruments of control and their operation will be expensive, but the expense will fall evenly, and no industrialist need fear that he will have to bear burdens in controlling air pollution that this competitor will not.

UTILITIES AND OVERCHARGE

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Montana, Senator LEE METCALF, and a member of his staff, Mr. Vic Reinemer, have joined forces to produce a book, "Overcharge," which makes a number of documented charges against our Nation's utility companies.

Forbes February 1 edition and the Missoulian of Missoula, Mont., February 5, printed reviews of this publication. I insert the two reviews in the RECORD:

[From Forbes magazine, Feb. 1, 1967]

LEE METCALF: WASTING MONEY?

A liberal Democrat, Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana naturally is anathema to right-wingers in his state who have fought to retire him to private life for over a dozen years. This he accepts as inevitable. What irks him is the fact that his opponents are financed in part by the Montana public utilities, particularly the Montana Power Co.

Last year, the former Stanford athlete (boxing and football) and Montana Supreme Court justice was up for re-election. In preparation for what he knew would be a bitter campaign, he asked his aide, Vic Reinemer, to dig into the records of the Federal Power Commission for everything bad he could find about the public utilities.

Reinemer, a former newspaperman (associate editor of the Charlotte, N.C., News) and magazine writer, dug far beyond Montana. The result was a book, *Overcharge*, which assails not only the public utilities in Metcalf's own state but the entire industry. Published last month, with both Reinemer and Metcalf listed as the authors, *Overcharge* may cause as much trouble for the nation's utilities as Ralph Nader's *Unsafe At Any Speed* did for the auto companies.

On the basis of Reinemer's research, Metcalf is now pressing for the creation of a special Senate subcommittee to investigate utilities. His campaign is winning support on the Hill.

In substance, *Overcharge* makes two accusations: First, that electric bills are entirely too high. Second, that public utilities are using the public's and their stockholders' money for political activities. Discussing the book the other day, Metcalf argued:

"I haven't just taken my feud with the Montana Power Co. nationally. When we got into it all, when we saw what was happening around the country, we realized that these companies were making an outrageous profit and using it to fight political battles. When investors find out what these companies are doing with their money, it's going to be something!"

Overcharge makes a poor case for the contention that electric bills are too high and that utilities' profits are "outrageous." To compare profits in the utilities industry with profits in the transportation industry, for example, as the book does, obviously is reaching way out into left field, since the transportation industry has long been sick. And no other industry is as closely regulated as utilities in regard to rates and profits.

On the other hand, the book does amply document the contention that many utilities are helping to finance right wing political activity. The book names names. It lists 13 utilities that contribute to the Southern States Industrial Council, an organization that attacked the United Nation's UNICEF as "completely Communist dominated." It lists one utility that in a single year contributed to five different ultra-right organizations.

If the Senate does decide to investigate the charges in *Overcharge*, the utilities are in for trouble. A great many consumers, Republicans as well as Democrats, may agree that their money shouldn't be used for political activity of any kind. And not only consumers. It is a safe bet that many utility stockholders are far from agreeing with the minority causes that some of their companies are financing.

[From the Missoulian, Feb. 5, 1967]

ILLS AND CURES: RATING A POWERFUL BOOK

(By Al Darr)

Sen. Lee Metcalf's perennial charge, that investor-owned utilities (especially Montana Power Co.) are flim-flamming the consumer, is expanded and amplified this season in Overcharge, by Sen. Metcalf and Vic Reinemer.

This book-length editorial runs to 338 pages, including seven appendixes and 34 pages of footnotes.

We are paying through the nose for electricity, and the investor-owned utilities are reaping exorbitant profits.

Those are the senator's basic theses. What's more, he contends, the prime beneficiaries of these exorbitant profits are often an inner circle of company officials who enjoy tax-free income through stock options.

Metcalf and Reinemer are clearly two angry men in this book, and they've mustered a young galaxy of figures to reinforce their argument.

Utilities, by and large, enjoy a non-competitive situation. We can't fairly call their operation "risk enterprise," because they have a captive clientele, and people just naturally prefer electric lights to kerosene lamps.

Yet utilities do sometimes talk as though they were codiscoverers of electricity, still faced with a tough advertising chore.

Even public utilities like the Omaha Public Power District spend considerable sums in building and maintaining a bright image.

I worked briefly in public relations for a sprawling rural power district in southeast Nebraska. We weren't "the REA," but we owed money to the REA, and we envied Omaha its highly concentrated and highly remunerative "load."

We noticed, too, an ironic thing.

The larger power districts, like OPPD, went out of their way in advertising to suggest a free-enterprise structure in their operations. One district even called itself "the company" on TV, and I thought that a bit too much. The appeal was, of course, aimed at Nebraska's traditional spirit of economic independence, which has a kinship with Montana's tradition but maybe not so pristine.

Public or private, the utilities do seem to have enough leisure to indulge their empire-building tendencies, and, as Metcalf and Reinemer repeatedly point out, the utilities can't honestly declare themselves part of the big competitive struggle that we call American free enterprise.

The crux of the Metcalf crusade appears to be regulation. Power companies, like all monopoly utilities, are ostensibly regulated by public service commissions in their respective states or by the Federal Power Commission.

But state regulatory agencies just don't have the manpower, the accountants, to begin to make proper audits, the authors point out, even if these same agencies had the will to be firm.

Chapter 6 of Overcharge explores company contributions to charities, chambers of commerce and the like. Even the FPC, which regulates rates in relatively few cases and usually protects the consumer's interests, ruled that charitable contributions "of a reasonable amount" could be listed as an operating expense. This means the customer pays for the utilities' benevolences.

Utilities can of course charge the customer just what the regulatory agency will permit. Metcalf and Reinemer argue that regulatory agencies approve rates in rubber-stamp fashion, not necessarily because they're "in the pocket" of the power companies but because they aren't equipped for the detailed investigations that rate proposals demand.

Profit is understandably the prime incentive in investor-owned utilities operations. Without regulation, or with only token regulation, the monopoly firm will just naturally seek to fatten profits at consumer expense and, unless an unusually strong hue and cry goes up, the firm will get away with it, meanwhile advertising its virtues with well placed donations and well developed ad campaigns.

Metcalf and Reinemer point out early in their book that every profit-seeker needs regulation, either the pressures of competition or agency regulation that will serve the public interest.

They maintain, with reason, that public power districts or cooperatives or municipal power systems operate under elected boards that are usually consumer-minded, interested primarily in the best service at lowest rates. This is unquestionably true of rural cooperatives, where pressure on a board member comes quickly over the party line or across the fence.

News media could be a strong force on the consumer side, too, the authors say, but the news media are perennial recipients of utilities advertising revenue and utilities bonbons. If newspapers, radio and TV stations can thus be bought at the expense of the public interest, they are clearly derelict.

Authors Metcalf and Reinemer give the investor-owned utilities an unmerciful pounding in Overcharge. There must be a great deal of truth in which they say because they name names like they never heard of civil libel and they document their facts.

I'd have preferred a less bewildering, even less vindictive array of evidence in favor of a cold dispassionate breakdown on what Montana and the nation could do to bring about lower power rates.

I've always hankered after electricity at one cent per kilowatt hour, like they have in Seattle.

CEMETERIES REMAIN OPEN

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has very wisely seen fit to end its national cemetery closure policy, which in the past year led to the closing of two national cemeteries—Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey and Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery in California. These cemeteries will now be reopened and three other national cemeteries scheduled to close in the next few months will now be kept open for burials.

Perhaps even more important, the end of the policy of closing our national cemeteries will give impetus in the Congress to an effort to establish a reasonable and equitable national cemetery policy.

I have been impressed, Mr. Speaker,

with the leadership that has been provided by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in attempting to resolve the growing national cemetery crisis. The VFW worked assiduously to convince the Department of Defense that an end to the closure policy was necessary.

At a time when the VFW and other veterans organizations might have derived some satisfaction from the termination of the closure policy of the Department of Defense, they have been faced with an additional matter of deep concern. I refer to the action of the Department of Defense in restricting burial in Arlington National Cemetery to certain classes of persons. The action of the Department of Defense is unfortunate. More than that, the VFW calls the Defense Department's action to restrict burials in Arlington unlawful. Commander in Chief Leslie M. Fry of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has asked the Secretary of Defense to rescind the Department's discriminatory order restricting burials in Arlington.

Typically, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has offered the President full cooperation in seeking a reasonable and equitable solution to the problems in Arlington National Cemetery and elsewhere in the national cemetery system.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Secretary of Defense should rescind the order restricting burials in Arlington. I offer, for the record, the statement of VFW Commander in Chief Fry regarding the new burial policy in Arlington National Cemetery. I offer also copies of telegrams sent to the President and the Secretary of Defense by Commander in Chief Fry. And I offer, as well, a memorandum prepared by the Veterans of Foreign Wars regarding the lack of legal authority for the restrictive policy at Arlington National Cemetery. I hope that this policy will be rescinded immediately so that the energies of all concerned can be applied toward the development of an equitable national cemetery policy.

NATIONAL CEMETERY REFORM NEEDED

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, as a World War II veteran and member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which has jurisdiction over the national cemetery system, I am deeply concerned over the fact that the entire future of federally operated cemeteries seems to be buried in a quagmire of indecision and indirection. In the absence of any clearly defined interment policy, I feel the whole question of federally operated cemeteries is one which needs thorough study, evaluation and reconstruction.

I urge a thorough investigation of the national cemetery situation by the Interior Committee.

Today I have introduced legislation to reorganize the administration of the national cemetery system. At the present time, there are, I believe, 17 cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration in association with medical facilities, such as the Sawtelle installation in Los Angeles. There are also 13 national historical burial sites under the Department of the Interior, like Gettysburg Military Park. And in addition, there are 85 national cemeteries operated by the Department of the Army, such as Arlington National Cemetery.

This is clearly an unnecessary duplication of effort. It is inefficient and careless. I have proposed in my bill that all cemeteries be administered by one agency—the Veterans' Administration.

My bill is different from similar legislation in that it protects the historical nature and landmarks of the military parks and historic burial sites now under Interior. It also will allow for continuation of the military ceremony and security traditions which we now have under Army jurisdiction.

My bill establishes an office of liaison in the Veterans' Administration to coordinate such activities and responsibilities with both the Army and Interior Departments.

I believe that a full study of the national cemetery situation is necessary to explore means of fulfilling the national obligation of this country to those who have fallen in its battles. And to avoid the pitfalls of putting the Federal Government into direct competition with the private and religious cemetery administrators, we must seek to avoid unnecessary costs in land purchase, maintenance and administration of national cemeteries. And at the same time, we must do something to meet the increasing requirements for veteran burial sites.

There must be a balancing of these two positions. Some have suggested a universal burial allowance program for veterans which would allow their families to purchase burial sites in private cemeteries near the family home. Others have suggested changing the criteria for eligibility to include a more narrowly defined group of veterans. These ideas should be explored fully by the House Interior Committee as it consults with officials of the Army and the Veterans' Administration and the Interior Department.

By consolidating the various types of cemeteries under one agency, preferably the Veterans' Administration; by combining a burial allowance program for those who prefer interment in private or religious cemeteries, with a more selective cemetery program; and, by utilizing for cemetery purposes appropriate federally owned land sites, as I have proposed in my bill H.R. 3159, we should be able to meet our Nation's obligation to provide for our military veterans dignified memorials to their lives of service.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4573. An act to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4573) entitled "An act to provide, for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEBT LIMIT CEILING

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4573) to provide for the period ending on June 30, 1967, a temporary increase in the public debt limit, together with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means would advise the House as to any knowledge he might have concerning the message which we have just received from the other body and in what area the bill might be amended.

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

Mr. HALL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Thank you. It is my information that the Finance Committee during consideration of this matter decided in its wisdom to make the $336 billion limitation a permanent ceiling whereas it was a temporary ceiling as it passed the House. Now, if there are any other amendments to the bill, I am not aware of those amendments.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas care to make any comment about what his committee and/or the conferees might feel about accepting this Senate amendment which comes as rather a bolt out of the blue in view of changing the ceiling as passed by the House, by simply permanentizing it?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will yield further, let me respond to my friend from Missouri in this way, and I am not trying to duck the question:

Without reference to this particular amendment, let me call my friend's attention to the fact that it has always been my desire, when I go to conference,

to prevail upon the conferees of the other body to see the light and accept the version of a bill that is passed by the House of Representatives. In all probability I would go to this conference with the same thought in mind, although I have not had an opportunity to examine the Senate version.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate that expression on the part of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and I indelibly do know the position of the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, my only point in raising the question, I am sure the gentleman understands, is that this would be a matter which should be displayed to the various Members in order that they can vote and react accordingly.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for responding to these questions.

Mr. MILLS. As the gentleman from Missouri knows, I certainly agree with the gentleman's statement in that regard.

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

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

There was no objection.

Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KARSTEN, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

There was no objection.

EXTENDING VOTING PRIVILEGES TO CITIZENS UNDER THE AGE OF 21

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter during my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on the very day that the 90th Congress convened I introduced House Joint Resolution 18 which would extend the voting privilege to our 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old citizens. As of February 16, 17 of my distinguished colleagues in the House had introduced similar resolutions: Messrs. DE LA GARZA, EDMONDSON, FEIGHAN, GALLAGHER, HECHLER of West Virginia, HELSTOSKI, JACOBS, O'HARA of Michigan, OLSEN, PATMAN, RODINO, ROUSH, ST. ONGE, SAYLOR, WALKER, WOLFF, and DAVIS.

In the other Chamber, a legislative first was achieved, I believe, when the majority and minority leaders cosponsored a joint resolution to extend the suffrage to persons 18 through 20 years of age.

Thirty-four other Senators joined with Messrs. MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN in sponsoring this joint resolution: AIKEN, BAKER, BAYH, BIBLE, CANNON, CASE, COOPER, DOMINICK, FONG, GRUENING, HANSEN, HARRIS, HATFIELD, HAYDEN, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, METCALF, MONDALE, MORSE, MORTON, MOSS, NELSON, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SPARKMAN, THURMOND, TYDINGS, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota; it is of particular interest to note that among the cosponsors is the venerable Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is the oldest Member of Congress. Moreover, the distinguished Senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], a former Member of this body and advocate then of the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old voting, introduced on January 16 of this year his eighth joint resolution to lower the voting age.

With but a month of this Congress having transpired, therefore, we note that already 20 separate joint resolutions have been introduced and 54 Members of Congress have expressed the conviction that a constitutional amendment to permit 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds to vote should be submitted to the States. By contrast, a total of only 28 Members endorsed legislation to this effect during the entire 89th Congress. We have surpassed this mark already. It is apparent that enthusiasm and interest for this proposal is high and that support is bipartisan. The time to act is now. I fervently hope, therefore, that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER] will see his way clear to speed a House vote on this proposal, up or down, during this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, since 1942, support for lowering the voting age has been persistent and the list of persons and organizations endorsing the idea is indeed impressive. The Library of Congress has compiled a list of these individuals and organizations, which is printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I am sure that my fellow Members will find it of interest and benefit.

Enthusiasm for lowering the voting age has been highest, of course, during periods when our country has been engaged in armed conflict, as we are now in Vietnam. In fact, the first serious proposals to submit to the States a constitutional amendment to this effect were sponsored during World War II, when the draft age was lowered from 20 to 18. In 1943 hearings were held by the House Judiciary Committee on then Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH'S joint resolution to lower the voting age to 18. But the measure was not reported from committee. The Senate Judiciary Committee did report Senate Joint Resolution 127 on July 1, 1952, but no vote was ever taken.

In his state of the Union message of January 7, 1954, President Eisenhower said:

> For years our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 have, in time of peril, been summoned to fight for America. They should participate in the political process that produces that fateful summons. I urge Congress to propose to the States a constitutional amendment permitting citizens to vote when they reach the age of 18.

On March 15 of that year, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported Senator William Langer's joint resolution, which had been introduced in 1953. The measure was debated May 21 and defeated by a rollcall vote of 34 yeas and 24 nays, only five votes short of the necessary two-thirds required for passage. It is worth noting that several of the Senators who spoke against the resolution were not opposed to lowering the voting age but favored individual State action rather than a constitutional amendment.

I think, however, that there is a compelling reason for employing a constitutional amendment to achieve this worthy goal. Most of our States have complex amending procedures: procedures which make it virtually impossible to enact an amendment. It is not uncommon, for example, that two successive legislatures must favorably act upon a proposed amendment and that it must then obtain referendum approval before it becomes law. The use of a national constitutional amendment, requiring only that State legislatures approve or disapprove, circumvents such bottlenecks while preserving for the States the final determination of whether the Nation shall have 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old voting.

Thirty-eight States will have to vote approval before the amendment—if submitted—would be ratified. That is a sizable number which, when reached, will indicate near consensus on this proposal.

An added dividend with a national constitutional amendment, and a very important dividend to my way of thinking, will be uniformity of voting age throughout the land. As we all know, this does not presently exist because four States permit persons under 21 to vote: Georgia and Kentucky at 18 years of age; Alaska at 19 years of age; and Hawaii at 20 years of age.

The reasons supporting extension of the vote to citizens between 18 and 21 are well known and persuasive.

The late and beloved Speaker of the House, Mr. Sam, once said, "It makes me tired to hear all this talk about the young generation going to hell in a hack; they're a lot smarter than I was at their age." True words. A 1962 national children's preference study by the American Hobby Federation pointed out that 78 percent of our young people read the newspaper every day—a 10-percent increase from the previous survey; that 80 percent reported reading 10 or more books a year—a 7-percent increase over the 1960 tabulation; and that 84 percent, as compared with 73 percent in 1960, said they read weekly and monthly magazines. These figures are surely higher now.

In other words, by the time our young people reach the age of 18 they are well read and, as has been often pointed out, very politically minded. Educators have stressed that "the real value of education comes not from its acquisition but from its association with responsibility."

For many Americans, high school represents their last formal education. Having just completed courses in American history and government, they are enthusiastic about politics and they are informed; yet we deny them access to the ballot.

The use of 21 as the voting age in 46 of our States dates from medieval England and knight's service. Those dark ages are over—long over—and it makes no sense to suppose that 21 is a relevant determinant of majority today. In fact, the quality of our education has rendered it obsolete.

There are valid reasons for supposing that 18 is a far more relevant majority age. For example, our young men and women can marry without parental consent in most States at the age of 18. They can serve in the Peace Corps or work for the Federal Government. Many between the ages of 18 and 21 hold jobs and pay taxes. How about that great American rallying cry: "No Taxation Without Representation"?

The age of compulsory education is not above 18 in any of the States. In almost every State and the District of Columbia, persons 18 and above must stand trial in criminal court. The law no longer considers them juveniles.

In a number of States persons between the ages of 18 and 21 are permitted to enter into contracts. Half the States permit the execution of a will for personal property at the minimum age of 18. Twenty of the States permit a will of real property at the same age. Life insurance companies recognize an adult as anyone 18 years of age or older.

The child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act do not apply to one 18 or older. Welfare aid cannot be given to one 18 or over unless he or she is handicapped.

Why indeed are all the above noted privileges and responsibilities deemed appropriate to 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds but not the privilege of voting?

Those who study voting behavior have noted that persons in the age bracket 21–30 have one of the lowest voting participation percentages in the electorate. I contend that one cause of this is the denial of the vote between the ages of 18 and 21. Enthusiasm wanes too often because of the 3-year cutoff from the political process. Studies of 18-to-21 voting in Kentucky have indicated that this unfortunate trend is to some degree offset by permitting younger citizens to vote.

Democratic government is rendered viable and enduring only by an electorate which accepts its responsibility for the course of public affairs and which is capable of prudent judgment.

Eighteen-year-old voters would be fresh from the study of our struggle for political liberty and of the institutions which render this liberty effective. Their study would have become really meaningful for them because they would have realized while in school that political responsibility would be given them at the same time as the other responsibilities of adulthood. And they would be still habituated to the discipline of reasoned and logical thinking imparted to them in school.

And 18-year-old voters in general would offer the country other qualifications as well as vivid understanding of representative government and capacity for political judgment.

Our schools try to inculcate a sense of responsibility in students by impressing them with possibilities for the immediate future after graduation and by preparing them to fulfill these possibilities by encouraging them to undertake achievement on their own. Such achievement generates self-confidence which, in turn, makes future possibilities seem really possible.

But think of the sense of responsibility for the public state of affairs which could be imparted to high school students if they were given real responsibility for political judgment and choice at the age of 18. Anticipation of really taking part in the electoral process would combine with studies of history and civics to bring about in young people the feeling that government belongs to them and that they must answer for quality of that government.

Eighteen-year-old voters would, I am convinced, measure up to the qualifications required of the electorate in a democratic country—the capacity for judgment and a strong sense of responsibility.

Moreover, the assumption that the majority of 18-year-olds are capable of taking responsibility for their government, that is, are capable of political judgment and choice, is verified by the figures on education in our country.

Thirty years ago, only 32 percent, or about one-third, of adults in the United States between the ages of 25 and 34 were high school graduates. In 1962, according to the Bureau of the Census, the proportion of high school graduates in the same age group had risen to 64 percent, or about two-thirds.

Thirty or more years ago, the argument might have been made that experience should make up for lack of education in qualifying young people to vote. This argument no longer holds. The great majority of young people in the age group of 18 to 21 have completed secondary education, have studied American history and political institutions, and are, on the average, far more qualified to vote at 18 than their predecessors of 30 years ago.

And I believe that the combination of education and real, political responsibility would engender in young people a deep sense of obligation to participation in the electoral process and a tremendous enthusiasm regarding public affairs.

After all, in terms of the long-run future, young people have the greatest stake in the solution of political issues. They should not be forced to reap what they have not sown.

And young people, in spite of being deprived of the right to vote, have demonstrated their pressing concern with America's future by taking part in organized, political activity.

Both the young Democrats and the young Republicans accept 18-year-old members. Both of these groups take part in our political life. Both of them conduct political workshops or committees in order to study contemporary issues. Both of these groups write and publish and distribute political literature. Both offer rewarding opportunities for political experience to young men and women under 21 as well as older. Both of them demonstrate the enthusiasm with which young people confront the Nation's tremendous problems.

The educational attainment of young people today combined with the irrepressible hopes for the future which characterize youth would render them responsive to the real responsibility of political choice. But take away the chance to exercise real responsibility, and many young people, I am afraid, never acquire interest, or lose whatever interest they had, in public affairs. During what I would call the dormant citizenship years, the years from 18 to 21, America loses many potentially well-informed voters. And those who have lost interest by the time they are 21 are added to the number of Americans who rarely if ever vote.

I do not deny that lowering the voting age would create a tremendous new impact at the polls on election day. I also am not unware that, because of this very reason, there are some persons who feel this is politically unwise. But I think it would be healthy because it would expand the number of persons able to participate in elections. And it would necessitate us to further lend our ear to the voice of our younger voters.

In New Jersey, for instance, I checked the 1960 census figures to determine what sort of an impact an 18-year-old voting age would have in the State. According to the 1960 census, there are 195,558 New Jerseyites between the ages of 18 and 21. While there are no definite figures available on the number of persons between 21 and 30, I know that there would be a great increase in voter participation in this age group also if we had an 18-year-old voting age.

At this point I want to place in the RECORD the following figures:

County	18-year-olds	19-year-olds	20-year-olds
Atlantic	1,608	1,377	1,359
Bergen	7,721	6,161	5,936
Burlington	4,962	4,851	4,534
Camden	4,706	3,705	3,752
Cape May	808	712	692
Cumberland	1,331	1,094	1,113
Essex	10,656	9,514	9,588
Gloucester	1,685	1,404	1,325
Hudson	7,514	6,490	6,735
Hunterdon	791	532	565
Mercer	4,100	3,810	3,509
Middlesex	5,231	4,434	3,907
Monmouth	3,794	3,448	3,172
Morris	2,782	2,250	2,167
Ocean	1,303	1,234	1,167
Passaic	4,468	3,810	3,975
Salem	875	775	731
Somerset	1,400	1,134	1,100
Sussex	613	497	514
Union	5,459	4,231	4,238
Warren	892	839	577
Total	72,699	62,303	60,556

NOTE.—According to 1960 census figures, there are 195,558 New Jerseyites between the ages of 18 and 21. 3,500,000 New Jersey residents are 21 or over.

I might add in conclusion that a majority of the American people support extending the vote to this segment of the population. When George Gallup first asked this question in 1939 only 17 percent of the population favored lowering the voting age to 18. By 1943 it had

grown to 44 percent and in 1954 peaked at 63 percent in favor. For the past 11 years it has held steady at 57 percent approval with about 40 percent disapproving.

The combination of these factors overwhelmingly recommends that Congress pass and submit to the States a constitutional amendment permitting our 18- to 21-year-old citizens to vote. Let us do so now.

ADDENDUM

Below is a partial list of individuals and groups which support the 18-year-old vote proposal:

GOVERNORS (PAST AND PRESENT)

Ellis Arnall, Georgia; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Edmund Brown, California; James Byrnes, South Carolina; Averill Harriman, New York; Christian Herter, Massachusetts; Theodore McKeldin, Maryland; Robert Meyner, New Jersey; Nelson Rockefeller, New York; John Dempsey, Connecticut; Carl E. Sanders, Georgia; Adlai Stevenson, Illinois.

OTHERS (PAST AND PRESENT)

John M. Bailey, Democratic National Committee Chairman.

William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Leonard Hall, Former Republican National Committee Chairman.

H. Stuart Hughes, Professor of History, Harvard.

James K. Pollack, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan.

Eleanor Roosevelt.

Robert Wagner, Mayor of New York.

Phillip Wilder, Professor of Political Science, Wabash College.

ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS

AMVETS (Rufus H. Watson, National Legislative Director, in Hearings before a Senate Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, 1953).

B'nai B'rith Young Adults Convention, 1960.

Fair Franchise Committee, New York, 1967.

National Municipal League.

National Student Congress, August, 1966.

New Jersey Student Committee for Undergraduate Education, Convention, 1966.

Numerous College and University Student Organizations (Student Governments, Young Democrats, Young Republicans, etc.) at the following campuses: Adelphi College, New York, Drake University, Redlands University, University of California, Los Angeles, University of Colorado, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Mississippi, St. Petersburg Jr. College, Florida.

President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, 1963.

United States National Student Association.

United States Youth Council.

Vindication of Twenty-Eighteen Suffrage (VOTES), and these affiliates: Connecticut Organization for 18-Year-Old Voting, Massachusetts Organization for 18-Year-Old Voting, United Committee for Nineteen-Year-Old Voting Privileges of New Jersey, Youth Suffrage Association, West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] has brought this subject to the attention of the House of Representatives. He has done yeoman work in stirring new interest in this vital subject. My colleague has mentioned the fact that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has for many years, along with other members of both parties in both bodies, introduced resolutions to lower the voting age to 18.

Mr. Speaker, there is strong and rising support in the Nation for this move.

Just a few minutes ago on the floor I was talking with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. COWGER], the distinguished former mayor of the great city of Louisville who sits on the other side of the aisle. He told me of the great success of the lower voting age in Kentucky, where those who are 18 are allowed to vote. He told me also of the tremendous stimulus toward civic responsibility among high school and college students by reason of this Kentucky law. He mentioned the registration drives among young potential voters, and the increased awareness on the part of these young men and women as they have the opportunity to exercise the right of franchise.

From a freshmen Republican in the House representing the neighboring State of Kentucky, I then talked with that grand young Democrat from Illinois, our colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, who celebrated his 85th birthday on April 28. Perhaps one of the reasons we have an increased interest in the subject of the 18-year-old vote at this time is because so many young men in this age bracket are fighting in Vietnam. Well, our beloved colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] enlisted in the Spanish-American War at the age of 15. He was a grizzled veteran at 18. He told me a few minutes ago that at the age of 18 he felt well equipped to exercise the franchise, and no doubt he was better equipped than many 21-year-olds. Be that as it may, he also remarked that today he is very strongly in favor of a constitutional amendment such as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] and several of our colleagues have introduced.

On the floor of this body, I have previously mentioned the fact that our educational system has developed to a point where 18-year-olds today are more intelligent and better equipped to vote than were 21-year-olds in the early days of our Republic. In addition, many more young people are finishing high school and attending college than at any time since World War II, and the recent drive against dropouts has resulted in a far better education for all 18-year-olds.

Speaking now of my own State of West Virginia, we have suffered the loss of an unusually high number of younger people, particularly in the 1950's, who went to other States for economic reasons. We feel that the 18-year-old vote would give young people a voice in the kind of future they would like to see for West Virginia, and thus give them a greater stake in helping to build West Virginia.

All over the Nation, medical science has enabled people to live longer. This means that the average age of the electorate has been steadily increasing. Lowering the voting age to 18 would help restore the age balance in the electorate.

I believe also that the enthusiasm and idealism of young people is an ingredient which government and politics need in greater quantities today. Lowering the voting age to 18 will help raise the moral tone of government at all levels. Before an individual establishes an entrenched economic interest, he is inclined to think in broader terms instead of plugging so strongly for selfish economic interest, and although I do not say the latter is necessarily bad, I believe it would be placed in better perspective and balance through lowering the voting age.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, and also the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has indicated his strong support of this constitutional provision, inasmuch as the Members of the House of Representatives know that the State of Georgia at the present time has on the statute books a law authorizing voting at the age of 18.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence on the floor of the House of Representatives this afternoon, of my friend from the State of Georgia [Mr. BRINKLEY], a very distinguished colleague of mine on the Committee on Science and Astronautics. I would like to ask my good friend from Georgia how the 18-year-old voting law has worked out in the State of Georgia; and, whether he feels that that law has been of benefit in its application in the State of Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to respond to the question propounded to me by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER]. For two decades in the great State of Georgia, we have been trusting our young people with the right to cast their ballot in our State and National elections.

Mr. Speaker, we are gratified with the progress which has been made in this direction. We commend this policy to other States, because we feel that the operation of the voting rights of those 18 years and over in the State of Georgia, will be reflected across this great Nation as a whole and that the young people across the Nation will respond with equal responsibility, in a trustworthy fashion and a responsible fashion. It gives me great pleasure to hear the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] make these remarks.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRINKLEY], and I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] for his comments. I am

sure that in view of the respect which the Members of the House of Representatives hold for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], his support in behalf of this legislation will represent a great assistance in helping to enact it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Members who are supporting legislation that would make 18 the minimum voting age in all of our 50 States.

Coming from the State of Georgia, where we permit our residents to vote at this age, I can testify that this is a sound practice and that it can play a great role in developing responsible citizens.

But even if it were less valuable, I would support this measure for the simple reason that it is just. Under the conditions that now prevail in all of our 50 States, 18 is the logical age at which a citizen should be permitted to take an active part in his government.

If he is like millions of his fellow Americans, he is already holding down a full-time job by the time he celebrates his 18th birthday. And that means he is paying taxes. But in 46 of our States, this man must help support his government for 3 years before he has any voice whatever in the way his government is run.

This injustice is great enough by itself; but when an 18-year-old is serving in one of our armed forces, the injustice is multiplied. This man not only contributes part of his wages—he may even have to contribute his life to protect a government he has no voice in.

I can think of no practice that is more at odds with the spirit of our Constitution than this one is. So I urge that all of us in this body band together and pass legislation that will correct it immediately.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would extend the right to vote to all our citizens who have attained the age of 18 years.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege during the last election campaign to address and answer questions from members of two political science classes at one of Pittsburgh's fine high schools, Taylor Allderdice.

I was impressed with the broad knowledge the students had of the American political system and their understanding of the issues involved in my own local campaign. They displayed a strong interest in the affairs of their city, their State, and their Nation, and expressed a keen desire to demonstrate their sense of responsibility by voting.

Since the election, I have asked several of my colleagues about their experiences with young people in their districts, and their reactions confirm my feeling that American youth today is well informed, well versed in the American political process, and eminently qualified to participate in that process through voting in elections at all levels.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is at the age of 18 that most of our young citizens are most strongly motivated to become responsible contributors to our democratic system.

In the later high school years, they are offered a broad range of history, social science, political science, and civics courses, all designed to heighten their interest in and their sense of responsibility for our Nation's democratic process.

At the same time, improvements in all our communications media make it possible for our young citizens to stay abreast of events in their localities, in their States, and across the land. Their studies enable them to interpret what they see, hear, and read with a great deal of sophistication.

But, Mr. Speaker, of our 2,900,000 high school graduates this year, only 55 percent, or 1,595,000 young people, will go on to some form of higher education. The others, 1,305,000 of them, will enter the labor market or the Armed Forces to begin participating fully in the productive or protective functions of our national life.

For these youthful citizens, all of whom must live under the laws we pass and some of whom must die for the policies we support, there is a 3-year wait before they can claim a voice in determining these laws and policies—the right to vote.

These are 3 years in which their early interest in politics and their desire to vote may subside permanently, 3 years in which the chance to develop a habit of voting may be lost, perhaps forever.

For college students, this problem is less acute. Their awakened interest in politics and public issues is nurtured in both curricular and extra-curricular activities. They can develop the habit of voting in campus mock elections and political polls. They emerge from college at 21 ready to exercise their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I think it can be fairly argued that 45 percent of our Nation's young people—increasingly well educated, affluent and influential young people—are being denied at a critical stage in their lives the privilege and responsibility of voting.

I sincerely believe that a constitutional amendment granting all our citizens who have reached the age of 18 the right to vote would prove itself of great value not only to our young people but to the Nation as a whole.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to introduce similar joint resolutions, so that we may quickly extend the privilege of full participation in our democratic process to the fine young citizens of this and future generations.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to add my voice to those of distinguished colleagues who today have joined their efforts to call attention to an issue which should receive the attention of the House and be resolved at the earliest possible date.

The issue is whether the voting age shall be lowered to 18. I most emphatically assert that it should.

Legislation to lower the voting age has been submitted to this body year after year since the end of World War I. And I might add that the arguments supporting this move have become more persuasive with each passing year.

An 18-year-old today is mature in terms of awareness of his society, his environment, his Nation, his Government, and his responsibilities of citizenship.

Young men and women today attain, by their 18th birthday, a degree of education, experience, and practical knowledge much more advanced than was the case in earlier generations. This is because their schools are better and more of them have completed high school by the time they are 18. It is also because radio, television, periodicals, and newspapers expose them to the affairs of their communities, States, Nation, and the world to a degree impossible in earlier generations.

Today's young people are the best informed in all of history. They are fully prepared for the responsibilities of citizenship and, in my view, entitled to assume those responsibilities which I have no doubt they would discharge with great distinction.

The young men and women of today have demonstrated their desire to serve their Nation in valuable and laudatory ways as members of the Peace Corps, VISTA, and as members of the Armed Forces. It seems to me a grave injustice to them that while they are being urged to serve and represent their Nation in foreign lands, to carry out vital programs in depressed areas of their own, and conscripted to defend our country under fire of an enemy, they should be deprived of the right to vote until they reach the age of 21.

These young people have a great stake in the destiny of our Nation. They are bound by its laws, serve in its wars, enriched by its triumphs, and impoverished by its failures.

They are entitled to a voice in their government's affairs. They are entitled to a voice in selecting their political leaders. They are entitled to share the responsibility for enacting and repealing laws. They are entitled to a vote.

A lowering of the voting age is dictated by justice and commonsense alike. The young men and women on whose behalf I speak today are fully qualified and clearly entitled to the right to vote. To continue to deny them that right would be sheer nonsense and blind folly for they have much to contribute in interest, zeal, idealism, and a fresh point of view which can only serve to enrich our great democracy.

Let us act to enfranchise these young Americans. Let us permit them to make the contribution to good government which I know they can. Let us extend to our young sons and daughters the privileges and burdens of full citizenship which they are eager and able to assume.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I can remember a debate when I was in high school on the topic: "Resolved that 18-year-olds be allowed to vote." A child born the day that high school debate took place is, today, old enough to vote under our present laws. We have been talking about this idea for a long time and, frankly, I haven't heard any new arguments, pro or con, in years.

Lowering the voting age has almost

become one of those comfortable, perennial issues that, like the weather, everybody talks about. I think the 90th Congress should do something about it.

I am, today, introducing a bill to amend the U.S. Constitution to lower to 18 the age at which American citizens may vote. I hope this bill, and similar ones introduced here in the House and in the Senate, will receive prompt and favorable action.

There is one, overriding point which convinces me young people of this age should be allowed to vote. That reason is simply that they are ready: ready in the sense that they have the knowledge of government and current events at least equal to that of citizens over 21, and ready in the sense that they have the motivation and interest. I can find no more interested, lively, or concerned audience when I travel through my district of Washington State, than when I speak to high school or college students. They know the issues; they ask questions that reflect thought; and they are earnest in their search for answers.

The vast majority of young people in this Nation demonstrate the maturity and responsibility to exercise the franchise. I will stand behind that statement, a few beatniks and delinquents to the contrary notwithstanding. I know how we adults hate to admit it, but our age groups are not immune to irresponsibility, apathy, and immaturity. This kind of minority wall always be with us, whether 18 or 80. That there are an irresponsible few should not be held against 18- and 19-year-olds any more than against 35- or 50-year-olds.

More important to consider is what happens to the eager young person in those 3 years between his graduation from high school and his becoming eligible to vote. Graduating from high school with their interests whetted, most 18-year-olds are primed for full participation in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship that is their birthright. For 3 years, during which they can be married, become parents, serve in the Armed Forces, be legally responsible for their actions, assume financial responsibilities—for those 3 years when they are getting their first full taste of the individual responsibilities of adulthood, they are denied participation in the ultimate right and responsibility of a citizen of a democratic society—the right to vote.

It is small wonder, then, that there is a tendency for their interest in public affairs to atrophy. By the time they can vote, the momentum of 12 to 15 years of formal education, community encouragement, and parental effort is lost.

I firmly believe that we can encourage a more penetrating and sustained interest in public matters if we make it possible for 18-year-olds to participate fully in the affairs of their communities and our Nation.

What we have been saying to young people is, "Get ready. On your mark. Wait."

Now it is time to say, "Go."

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my good friends JIM HOWARD and KEN HECHLER on their fine statements today and for bringing this issue to the attention of the House. I wholly agree with their remarks and urge that we take action to make 18 years the minimum voting age in this country.

This generation of students manifests the concern and idealism of young people regarding the society in which they live and the wrongs which can be eliminated. The response to the ideals enunciated by President Kennedy and the programs of public service—the Peace Corps and VISTA—is one among many keys to the high level of interest and energy of youth. High school and college students are invaluable aids in local projects, additionally, in the war on poverty and the civil rights movement.

Young people today are more intense, better educated, more aware than ever. Our schools teach government and history and stress the values of participation and democracy. There is no more fundamental form of participation than the exercise of the franchise. At age 18, young men and women are both qualified and responsible and deserve a voice in their government.

From the age of 18, in almost every way but the ability to vote, an individual is considered an adult—he may be employed and earn his own living, he is no longer considered a juvenile and may be committed to a Federal prison or a State penitentiary, and he must register for the draft, possibly to fight and die for his country without ever having had the right to vote. Being subject as an adult to these vital and important laws, he must be able, in a democracy, to contribute to determining who makes these laws.

Some will contend that military service involves only physical maturity and does not qualify one for voting but this is begging the question. I do not know of a time in the history of this country when political and intellectual maturity has been a qualification for the vote. If subject to conscription to serve their nation, these young people ought to have the full rights of citizenship. The demands and pressures of modern society, the higher educational level, the greater awareness and involvement—all these are persuasive reasons why young adults today are capable of assuming the responsibility they should have.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with a number of my colleagues today by introducing a proposed constitutional amendment which would permit 18-year-olds to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

It is only fair that these young citizens should be allowed to vote. After all, when they become 18, they are considered old enough to sign job contracts, be treated as adults by our courts, serve in our Armed Forces, and pay taxes.

In addition, it seems to me that we should do all we can to encourage our young citizens to take part in our democratic process. When they graduate from high school, their interest in government and public affairs is at a high pitch. Very often, this interest continues through their college careers. Continuing to deny them the right to vote, while encouraging them in other ways to take an active part in the political life of our Nation seems to me contradictory and self-defeating.

A national poll taken within the past 18 months indicates that there is substantial acceptance for lowering the voting age to 18. Fifty-seven percent favor such action, 39 percent oppose it, and 4 percent are undecided. Other polls taken during the last 12 years show almost identical results.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the Congress to act on this matter, and I am pleased to join my colleagues in both bodies in this effort to grant an important privilege to these young people who contribute so much to our Nation.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing support in the Congress for a constitutional amendment to lower the national minimum voting age to 18. As Members on both sides of the aisle express their support and opposition to this proposal I would urge that congressional hearings be scheduled so that every consideration may be given to this measure and all voices heard.

I am today introducing a resolution to extend the right to vote to citizens 18 years and older. While the Vietnam conflict has highlighted the much publicized argument that "those old enough to fight are old enough to vote," I believe there are other convincing arguments for this constitutional amendment.

The 1963 report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation emphasized that by lowering the voting age, we would be extending the right to vote to those who are immediately interested in public affairs as a result of the educational phase which they are completing. The Commission stated:

> Despite the growing enrollment in institutions of higher education, it is a fact that only a minority of Americans are still in school when they near or reach their 21st birthdays. We believe that each State should carefully consider reducing the minimum voting age to 18.
>
> If 18 is adopted as a minimum age, we also recommend programs under which registration of students could be facilitated through voter registration days at high schools themselves.

This proposal will also have the dual effect of strengthening academic freedom and bringing to the electorate a group of young people who are energetic and idealistic in their view of the public service.

Another factor to be considered in support of such a constitutional amendment is that by granting the right to vote to persons in the 18-to-21 age bracket, we will be placing added responsibility on that group entering upon a new phase of community responsibilities.

Perhaps by encouraging our young people we can begin an effective "citizenship involvement" program.

The major argument against a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age has been that persons under 21 years of age lack the maturity of judgment and experience to exercise the right to vote. I must reject this argument on the basis of my experience with the young people of America and on the basis of

our changing educational standards, during the past 20 to 30 years.

Our young people have lived through periods of hot wars, cold wars, propaganda wars. They can appreciate the real horrors of war. They have experienced educational advances far beyond expectations of 20 years ago. They are better equipped to meet the responsibilities of the franchise, than prior generations and they are more aware of the domestic and international problems which face our Nation.

They are Democrats, Republicans, and independents—they do not appear to be any more "liberal" or more "conservative" than a cross section of the adult voting population. Most importantly, they do have minds of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the right to vote carries with it great responsibilities and for this reason I want to broaden the base of "citizenship involvement." There is wide bipartisan support for this proposal in the 90th Congress and I hope these efforts prove successful.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 I introduced a bill to lower the national minimum voting age to 18. This year I, along with many of my colleagues of both parties, have reintroduced this legislation. I believe that the time has come for action on this vital measure.

Many of the traditional arguments for the vote at 18 have been put into a new perspective by the rapidly changing world.

Certainly the 18-year-old of today is much better educated and has been exposed to a far larger segment of the world than his counterpart at the time the minimum age was established. The communications explosion has placed the events occurring in any part of the world into living rooms in all parts of our country. Television and radio have radically changed the world; Lani Bird, the communications satellite recently put up over the Pacific, is being discussed to give live coverage of the war in Vietnam, for example.

Where a man formerly had to rely on a local newspaper or cracker-barrel discussions for his information about the world, we have now two or three newspapers at his easy disposal. Many papers have correspondents in every corner of the globe and wire services report detailed and factual information from every nation on earth.

The American education system has produced a youth of particular sensitivity to the great events of our times. Increased political activity is just one of the manifestations. Youth is more concerned about the structure and value of our society than they have been in the past. Certainly they would and should be able to translate this concern into an intelligent and informed vote.

I would hope that prompt action can be taken on the issue of lowering the minimum voting age to 18. Our youth have demonstrated to us that they are ready; we have an obligation to allow them to enter the mainstream of American political life.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the idea of the 21-year age minimum for voting is based only on tradition, and an outmoded tradition at that. Nowhere is it granted more sanction than an uncertain shibboleth of a bygone age provided—an age which also barred voting rights to women and created or permitted other artificial barriers to a universal franchise.

In our day, when the whole thrust of the extension of democracy is to make it easier for qualified people to vote, the maintenance of the arbitrary and artificial 21-year limit is unjustified and undesirable. Contemporary moves to enlarge the electorate and extend the basic privilege of the franchise are typified by the vote now granted to Spanish-speaking residents of New York, for example; the lowering of needlessly long residence requirements in numerous States; the Voting Rights Act which has won the vote for hundreds of thousands of Negroes; the abolition of the poll tax; and removal of other unnatural impediments.

The battles to extend the right of the ballot to women were won only after decades of effort against the obstructionist weight of inertia and skepticism. The battles to insure the ballot to the Negro were won after many years more of even more active obstructionism.

The fight for an 18-year-old franchise has also been going on for many years. Nearly a quarter century has passed since the first State extended the ballot to its 18-year-olds. Since then at least three other States have lowered the voting age below 21. And for the past 15 years, efforts have been partially successful—only partially—in Congress to establish 18 as the voting age through a constitutional amendment.

Our history shows that this reform, like the others, will come in time. The year 1967 should be the time—such an act would be especially timely in a day when the Nation's young people are looking for a "signal" from their elders which will express the Nation's respect for the judgment and the responsibility of the younger people. Responsibility conferred will be responsibility grasped, in ever-widening circles. This gesture of confidence in our young people will reap little-realized dividends for the Nation. I repeat, now is the time for the 18-year-old veto to be achieved through a constitutional amendment to achieve the goal more effectively than possible through action by individual States alone.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues, Congressman KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, and Congressman JAMES J. HOWARD, of New Jersey, in supporting a House concurrent resolution proposing a constitutional amendment which would permit persons 18 to 21 years old to vote. I have joined them in introducing a resolution which would reduce the national minimum voting age to 18.

Today American boys between the ages of 18 and 21 are fighting and dying in the jungles of southeast Asia; yet they cannot vote. They are old enough to be drafted but not old enough to vote.

Today young Americans 18 to 21 are working for the Federal Government or holding down jobs in the private sector of the economy. They are paying taxes to finance the operation of their Government; yet they cannot vote.

In many of our States, persons in this same age bracket may enter contracts; may marry; may purchase life insurance; or may draw up a will. They are judged mature enough, intelligent enough, and responsible enough to engage in these activities; but they cannot vote because, it is argued, they are not mature enough, intelligent enough, and responsible enough to exercise the franchise. Does this make good sense?

Objections are raised to justify withholding the ballot from them. It is suggested, for example, that they lack the experience and education requisite for casting an intelligent ballot. This claim, however, is far from valid. Indeed, studies demonstrate that young persons leaving high school today are far better educated than their parents' generation; that they are very interested in politics, and knowledgeable about it; that they are ripe and ready for joining in the political process. Yet, in all but four of our States, they are denied access to the ballot for 3 precious years.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing magical or permanent or necessary in maintaining 21 as the voting age limits in 46 of our States. Indeed, evidence suggests that 18 is a more reasonable minimum for the entire Nation. By transmitting a constitutional amendment to the States. Congress may bring this laudable end to pass. At the same time it will reserve to the States the final voice in determining the voting age, which accords with their constitutional prerogative.

This action by Congress would be in step with our progressive tradition and our commitment to the democratic process. Let us, therefore, demonstrate good sense. Let us show faith in our 18- to 21-year-olds by permitting them to vote.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 334, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the right to vote to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18.

I have long maintained that the voting age should be lowered to 18, and throughout my political career I have worked toward that end. This joint resolution is identical to one which I introduced in March 1966. In 1964, while serving in the Senate of the State of Michigan, I sponsored a similar amendment to the Michigan State constitution.

The justification for lowering the voting age to 18 grows more compelling with each passing year. In the past decade, this country has witnessed a significant growth in the maturity of our younger citizens. It is easy to see the concern and enthusiasm which these young citizens hold for our national affairs. The Young Democrats and Young Republicans are noticeably active in every election. The work of young people in the Peace Corps, the VISTA program of the war on poverty, and the Headstart program, shows their eager aggressiveness and their willingness to accept responsibility.

At the age of 18, most young people are fresh from high school and are ready to enter our universities, the Armed Forces, or their life occupations. At this time, they are richly endowed with knowledge of political and civic affairs. This knowledge should not be allowed to stagnate over the 3-year period before they are of legal voting age.

I wish to share with you, these lines written by the newspaper editor, John S. Knight:

> The accomplishments and achievements of youth outnumber the news of delinquencies and crime by a margin of 10 to 1. The youth of today are better informed and far more perceptive than we were at the same age.

Further, our young adults serve in the Peace Corps around the world demonstrating the real image of America's greatness; fight in Vietnam; staff political campaign headquarters or distribute political literature during election time. They can marry; drive at 18 in all States; be under the same penal codes as those 21 and over; be denied welfare aid unless handicapped; do not come under the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; are considered adults by life insurance companies, the Federal Government, and Webster's Dictionary; bear firearms; and sign legal documents.

The 18-year-old vote was first advocated by President Eisenhower and subsequently supported by President Kennedy and President Johnson. It has been a plank in the Democratic and Republican platforms for many years.

In Georgia and Kentucky, the voting age has been lowered to 18 for over 10 years. In a poll taken by University of Kentucky political science students in 1960, 80 percent of the students vote in general elections as compared to 59 percent of all persons of all ages. Although the two newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, do not permit 18-year-olds to vote, the minimum voting ages are liberal: 19 for Alaskans and 20 for Hawaiians.

The conclusion seems to me inescapable. Young men and women are already taking part in the American political process, offering their resources and in many cases, their lives for democratic ideals we all seek to promote. That they should be doing this without the most basic of all political rights—the right to vote—seems to me a serious inconsistency.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment which would grant 18-year-old citizens of the United States the right to vote. Many of my colleagues in the 90th Congress, on both sides of the aisle, have introduced similar or identical legislation. The debate over lowering the voting age of American citizens on a national basis has continued in Congress over the last quarter century. During this period, arguments both for and against this proposal have been publicly aired. Further, this dialog has continued in depth at all levels of the broadcast and news media in this country so that most Americans are fully apprised of proposals to reduce the voting age. In my district and around the country, I have found increased support for such proposals. In my opinion, a constitutional amendment allowing 18-year-old citizens to vote is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, with the exception of Alaska, Hawaii, Georgia, and Kentucky, the States have retained a minimum voting age of 21 since colonial times. Since the earliest days of this country, our social, economic, and military needs have undergone drastic change and have grown radically in number and intensity. American citizens of all age groups have assumed growing responsibilities in filling these needs. Perhaps no group has responded as well to the demands of the new challenges faced by the American people than our young men and women between the ages of 18 and 25.

Mr. Speaker, those who support lowering the voter age requirements to 18 are casting votes of confidence for the American educational system. There is no comparison between a high school or college student of colonial days and the high school or college student of today. It is a good assumption that today's students aided by better teachers, better textbooks, better facilities is, thus, better educated than his counterpart of 100 or even 50 years ago. Also, more Americans today than in any other period in this Nation's history have had the opportunity to take advantage of these educational improvements. In 1966, more than 12 percent of the 18- and 19-year-olds in this country had completed from 1 to 3 years of college. Approximately 25 percent of Americans between 18 and 24 are attending college today. Almost 50 percent of American 18- and 19-year-olds have completed high school. Many more graduate from high school by the age of 20. Moreover, never have we had a better informed group of high school students. Mandatory courses in U.S. and world history, American Government, civics, and economics in our high schools have fostered great civic awareness among our youth. From the above reasons, it is evident that the young people of today are better equipped than ever before to exercise the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems facing American democracy today is a general voter apathy. There is reason to believe that the idealism and enthusiasm youthful voters could add to our elections would be a healthy influence on our American Government. And, as Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has said, American youth under this proposed amendment would take on political responsibilities at a time when they will be more apt to place the national interest above those special interests which they may later acquire. Often we lose many potential voters who are well informed and enthusiastic students of government at 18 but have grown away from their government by 21 because of their commitments to job and family or are displaced and cannot register because of military service. The 18-year-old is generally still in his original neighborhood, has just completed a study of government, and is ready to register and vote. Once started, he remains an interested participating citizen.

This country has increasingly depended upon 18-year-old citizens to respond to its military commitents. The war in Vietnam is an excellent example of the burden this age group has conscientiously accepted. Furthermore, proposed changes in the draft would make 18-year-olds even more liable to military service and battlefield conditions than they presently are. It is my position that at the same time our youth should have a stronger voice in decisions which have such an impact on their lives.

We have depended upon our young men to defend us in times of war and they have not failed us. Should we not place the same confidence in their ability to choose those who will seek to keep the peace?

Mr. Speaker, our limited experience with an 18-year-old minimum voting age in the United States has been successful. Both Georgia and Kentucky have provided the Congress and the people of the United States with laboratory proof that the legitimate fears expressed by many in opposition to this amendment are unfounded. Further, proof that our young citizens, under the age of 21, are responsible voters has been shown in the experiences of Hawaii and Alaska, whose minimum voting ages are 20 and 19 respectively.

Therefore, I urge the support of the Members of this 90th Congress to enfranchise our young people who have demonstrated their mature dedication to this country.

NONPROLIFERATION TREATY FLUNKS COST-EFFECT TEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we are ever advised to shop around, buy the items best suited to our needs, pay the necessary price, but no more. We are urged to keep something in reserve in order to have options for coping with changed circumstances when unknown events confronts us. All this has been reduced in the Pentagon to a computer-aided science known as "systems analysis," whereby Secretary McNamara claims we now possess the most cost-effective military establishment ever known to man. One of the key features of the systems analysis technique is to look seriously at every conceivable alternative solution to a problem to ascertain the most effective solution in relation to cost. Another key feature is to reserve as many flexible options as possible for quickly and cheaply switching to better and more cost-effective solutions as the problem itself changes or becomes better defined. Systems analysis is a fine tool for efficient operation of a large defense establishment so long as it is used sensibly and those who employ it refrain from becoming obsessed with delusions of godlike infallibility.

Unfortunately, there has been no application whatever of systems analysis to the problem of nuclear weapons spread. A strict nonproliferation policy made sense when the atomic bomb first was developed and the United States pos-

sessed a very valuable nuclear monopoly. We lost the monopoly, but still cling to the policy. There has been nuclear spread and it has mainly been to ill-natured hands. Still we cling to the myth of nonproliferation as though it were a hovering angel of peace. With tunnel vision we refuse even to look at alternatives which now or in the future might better serve the security interests of the United States. Instead, we begin negotiations today in Geneva on a nonproliferation treaty which forever will foreclose our option to choose any of these alternatives, no matter how sorely they may be needed to defend our country. The Johnson administration is bending every effort to hammer into an international agreement a policy which for 20 years has failed. It does so in absolute violation of the systems analysis principles requiring examination of alternatives and reservation of options. If at some future time supplying purely defensive nuclear armament to a trusted, hard-pressed ally would thwart the designs of an aggressor, the treaty will bar us from doing so. Our alternatives will be limited to letting the ally fall or rushing to its rescue with American bodies as we did in Korea and Vietnam. The treaty will surrender in advance a more favorable, cost-effective option.

This is but one of many hidden price tags on the pact that so many treaty-blinded, international-minded editorial writers fail to disclose while praising the Geneva negotiations to the skies. Before more such pundits fall victim to the herd instinct and disserve their readers with superficially considered editorial recommendations, they should look over such thoughtful literature on the proliferation question as: Daugherty, James E., "The Nonproliferation Treaty," Russian Review, January 1966; Kintner, William R., "A Reappraisal of the Proposed Nonproliferation Treaty," Orbis, spring 1966; Robison, David A., "Learning To Live With Nuclear Spread" and "Softening the Impact of Nuclear Spread," Air Force and Space Digest, August and October 1966; Schlesinger, James R., "The Strategic Consequences of Nuclear Proliferation," the Reporter, October 20, 1966; and Teller, Edward, "Planning for Peace," Orbis, summer 1966.

NEW YORK ATTACKS NARCOTIC ADDICTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1967, the State of New York will begin an attack in depth against the scourge of narcotic addiction. On that date, New York's program of commitment, treatment, aftercare, and research into the problems of narcotic addiction goes into effect, after many months of planning and preparation. The State expects to spend $81 million during the first year of the program.

This is inspired leadership, by a great State, in the fight against a disease which strikes down our youth, and lines the pockets of the worst criminal elements in our Nation. It is a disease which not only destroys its victims, but also forces them into crime and prostituton, and thus spreads its vile effects far beyond the lives of the afflicted and their families.

The State of New York is unfortunate to have within its borders fully one-half of all the identifiable narcotic addicts in the United States, but the problem is not of New York's making. It is a result of geography and social conditions. As the greatest seaport and airport center, and as the melting pot for migration and immigration, it is a vulnerable target.

New York is doing its best to meet its responsibility in this war against spreading contagion. But the Federal Government has not taken up its responsibility. We have not been able to stop the flow of dope which comes into this country through seaports, airports, and thousands of miles of border. It is well nigh impossible to seal off all means of narcotics entry, though we should certainly add to our pitifully small forces arrayed against it, and I shall soon offer legislation for that purpose.

The alternative is to do our best to prevent the disease of narcotic addiction from making further inroads. Last year, the Congress passed the Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1966, and it was signed into law. I was privileged to join in the sponsorship of that act.

This is a good start toward helping narcotic addicts to help themselves, but a mere law on the books cannot achieve that purpose. It will not work—it cannot work—without funds. The President's budget, early this year, did not include $15 million needed to fund the act. More recently, the President's message on crime did not ask for such an appropriation. I plan to offer legislation soon to provide such funding.

However, we must have hospital facilities for the addicts who take advantage of the Rehabilitation Act and voluntarily seek aid. In New York State, this aid will be available, when that State's enlightened antiaddiction program is in full effect.

But even $15 million for the Narcotics Rehabilitation Act of 1966 will only make a small start toward carrying out the Federal Government's moral, financial, and legal responsibility.

We must provide meaningful financial assistance to the States to inspire them to take enlightened action, such as New York's, and to help them succeed in their programs. For that reason, I have sponsored a bill today to provide such assistance to States which establish and operate treatment, rehabilitation, and aftercare services for narcotic addicts.

This bill provides $55 million a year for the fiscal years starting on July 1, 1967, 1968, and 1969. Such funds would be apportioned among States whose plans for such programs have been approved by the Surgeon General. States would also receive technical assistance in designing, locating, constructing, and operating special hospital facilities for narcotic addicts.

The bill provides for the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Hospital Facilities for Narcotic Addicts in the Public Health Service. The Surgeon General would serve as Chairman, and ex officio members would be the Federal Commissioner of Narcotics and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Eight additional members would be appointed by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary.

The Advisory Committee would be charged with the responsibility of carrying out studies, investigations, and reviews of proposed programs, thus adding critically needed data to our pitifully meager store of actual information about the causes, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of narcotic addiction.

The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Advisory Committee and the Secretary, would promulgate regulations to establish standards for construction and equipment for hospital facilities, for care and treatment, and for post-hospital care and rehabilitation services.

The bill also outlines the methods by which States may apply for financial assistance, make regular reports to the Surgeon General, and consult with the Surgeon General on plans and programs.

Federal assistance to the States would be three-quarters of the cost of construction of hospital facilities for narcotic addicts, three-fifths of the cost of operation, and one-half of the cost of proper and efficient administration of State narcotic addiction programs.

The maximum amount available to any individual State would be based upon the ratio of that State's narcotic addict population, to the total number of narcotic addicts in all the States. This ratio would be determined by the Surgeon General, on the basis of surveys conducted by his office once every 2 years.

Most of us are aware of the fact that other drugs, beside narcotics, have assumed considerable social importance. However, the addictive effects of such drugs—the hallucinogens, depressants, and stimulants—remain a moot point. If the Surgeon General, through study and consultation, should determine that other drugs are also addictive, financial assistance should be provided for facilities to combat such other addictions.

I ask you to remember that the program of financial assistance I have outlined is aimed at an epidemic disease which strikes families in all economic strata, and is capable of spreading its misery in any part of our Nation.

We have concentrated mainly on arrest and punishment in our attack against narcotic addiction. In recent years, we have acquired a deeper knowledge and understanding, and we know that we must heal the sufferers, and help restore them to useful places in society.

Without significant Federal assistance, the States alone cannot mount an effective war against this disease. And without such an effective war, we leave the way open for the scourge to rage unchecked.

I am certain that the Congress, recognizing the critical, immediate need for this action, will take steps to act on this legislation with as much forthrightness as possible.

A GRATUITOUS SLAP AT THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Department of Agriculture last Friday in issuing a purchase authorization for the vegetable oil is a gratuitous slap at the Congress and a grave affront to U.S. servicemen fighting in Vietnam.

The Congress must somehow insist that the Executive enforce the law. Notwithstanding an opinion by the Comptroller General dated February 2, the Secretary of Agriculture nevertheless went ahead with the oil authorization in clear violation of the Findley amendment to last year's Agriculture appropriation bill.

If this type highhanded action is allowed to continue, the Congress may soon become nothing but a tourist attraction.

Text of my letter to the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office:

DEAR GENERAL STAATS: Notwithstanding your opinion of February 2, 1967, in which you advised the Secretary of Agriculture that expenditure of appropriated funds in connection with a vegetable oil shipment to Yugoslavia under Public Law 480 would be illegal under the "Findley Amendment" to the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1967, the Department has in fact issued a purchase authorization (Number 11-433) for such sale. There is every indication that the Department of Agriculture is determined to complete the transaction.

Accordingly I request that the General Accounting Office take appropriate action, which would include among other things: 1. Taking exception to this transaction to the extent that appropriated funds are used either directly or indirectly, whether in the form of services by salaried employees, use of consumable supplies, or other;

2. Taking exception to this transaction to the extent that funds and other resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation are used;

3. Making a detailed report to the Congress.

Thanks for your always excellent cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

The action of the executive branch in issuing a purchase authorization for $9,625,000 worth of vegetable oil for Yugoslavia at subsidized interest rates is a gratuitous slap at Congress and a grave affront to U.S. servicemen fighting in Vietnam.

Under the terms of the agreement, the Tito regime will get credit subsidies worth over $2 million, as it has 14 years in which to pay for the commodities and will be charged interest at only 3½ percent. The interest is approximately half the rate U.S. firms currently pay to borrow money.

In acting in direct violation of the Findley amendment, the executive branch made a mockery of the legislative process. The amendment prohibited use of appropriated funds for this purpose, and I have verified the fact that appropriated funds were utilized in the preparation and issuance of the purchase authorization and will necessarily be used at the several stages of the processing which will be required before the transaction is completed.

It is an affront to our servicemen in Vietnam because the Tito government has not only likened our war policies to Hitlerism but has permitted regular shipments of medical supplies to be sent to North Vietnam.

On December 13 the Belgrade radio station acknowledged that 13 shipments had been made and announced that "the aid drive for the people and fighters of Vietnam has been widely accepted by the Yugoslav people and various organizations." Only recently a mob of thousands stoned our consulate in Zagreb.

It is difficult for me to understand why our Government should aid a regime which helps our enemy. The action of the executive branch is a breach of faith with Congress because Secretary of State Rusk on September 27 wrote to Speaker MCCORMACK promising that the Findley amendment would be enforced.

Perhaps the most thorough and persuasive argument against carrying out the vegetable oil shipment was prepared in the office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Through the courtesy of Mr. Claude Coffman, general counsel, I was provided with the text of this draft statement. Set forth below is the text together with the text of Mr. Coffman's accompanying memorandum:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1967.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: In response to your request, I am enclosing a copy of the tentative draft of an opinion prepared in this office on the question of carrying out the agreement entered into with Yugoslavia under Title IV, P.L. 480.

I wish to emphasize that this is a tentative draft which was not signed or issued by the General Counsel and does not represent advice given by the General Counsel.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE T. COFFMAN.

[Draft]

To: The Under Secretary.
From: General counsel.
Subject: Findley amendment to the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967.

We understand that the Department of State has asked the Department of Justice to rule on the question set forth below relating to the Findley amendment to the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967 (Public Law 89-556). The Department of Justice has asked for the views of this office and accordingly, I am providing herewith our opinion with respect to this problem.

The question has been raised as to whether the Findley amendment would bar the issuance of a purchase authorization to implement an agreement with the Government of Yugoslavia under Title IV, Public Law 480 because of shipments of medical supplies which are being made from Yugoslavia to North Vietnam. The provision reads as follows:

"To partially reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a-11, 713a-12, $3,555,855,000: *Provided*, that no funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or administer programs for the sale of agricultural commodities pursuant to Title I or IV of Public Law 480, 83rd Congress, as amended, to any nation which sells or furnishes or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to North Vietnam any equipment, materials or commodities, so long as North Vietnam is governed by a Communist regime."

We understand that the medical supplies are furnished by an organization known as the Coordinating Committee for Assistance to the People of North Vietnam comprised of the following organizations:

The Socialist Alliance, The Trade Union Federation, The Association of Veterans Federations, The Youth Federation, The Yugoslavian Red Cross, The Student Union, The Conference of Social Activities for Women, and The Yugoslavian League for Peace and Independence and Equality of Peoples. The medical supplies consist of donations of blood and voluntary contributions of medicines and bandages which are consigned to the North Vietnamese Red Cross. Specifically, the question arises whether the above-quoted provision applies in a situation where medical supplies are being donated by organizations which we understand are considered by the Department of State as private rather than governmental.

In our view the Findley amendment is intended to apply if the government of any nation or any private entity within the nation supplies by donation, sale or otherwise, equipment, materials, or commodities of any kind, including medical supplies to North Vietnam.

The term "nation"[1] is not defined in the proviso or elsewhere in the appropriation act. The proviso applies to programs for the sale by the United States of commodities under Titles I and IV of Public Law 480 where the term "nation" is used in more than one context. In some cases it appears synonymous with governments of nations. In many other cases it is used in a broader sense. For example, in Section 101 "The President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly nations. . . . In negotiating such agreements the President shall—'(a) take reasonable precautions to assure that sales under this act would not unduly disrupt . . . normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries;'"

The term "country" in paragraph (a) which is synonymous with the word "nation" is used to refer not merely to trade with governments but also to private trade. Foreign currencies accruing under Title I may be used for purposes specified in Section 104 which include "promoting balanced economic development and trading among nations." (Section 104(e)). For these purposes loans are made to U.S. business firms for business development and trade expansion in such countries and to domestic or foreign firms for establishment of facilities for aiding in the utilization of and markets for U.S. agricultural commodities. Also, under Section 104(g) currencies may be used for loans made through established banking facilities of the friendly "nation" from which the foreign currency was obtained.

---

[1] The term "nation" is ambiguous. Its most famous use occurs in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution where the words "commerce with foreign nations" refer to commerce with nationals of foreign countries as well as to commerce with their governments. In an opinion of the Attorney General dated August 29, 1963 (42 Op. A.G. No. 14), the opinion was expressed that the term "foreign nation" as used in the Cargo Preference Act was not limited to foreign governments but included sales of surplus commodities under Title IV of P.L. 480 to the private trade which were not of a purely commercial nature but were for the purpose of assisting the economies of friendly nations.

In Title IV, as well, language is used which makes clear that the use of the term "nation" is not confined to governments of nations. For example, in Section 401 it is stated that the purpose of the title is among other things "to assist the economic development of friendly nations by providing long term credit for purchases of surplus agricultural commodities for domestic consumption during periods of economic development so that the resources and manpower of such nations may be utilized more effectively." Also, in providing authorization for agreements with the private trade it is provided that such agreements shall thereby assist "the development of the economies of friendly nations."

The question at issue was not discussed in the debates in Congress on the appropriation bill or in the committee reports. The provision was included in the bill as adopted by the House. Subsequently, hearings were held on this limitation before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations (see Supplemental Hearings on H.R. 14596 regarding Limitation on Shipments Pursuant to Public Law 480 89th Congress). The following discussion appeared with respect to this provision:

"Senator HOLLAND. This covers not only government shipments but also private shipments; does it not?

"Mr. MANN. That is not clear, Senator. Our lawyers have construed this, and there is some considerable ground, I think, for debate, to apply it to government-to-government transactions.

"The bill, as it is now worded, the pending amendment, I think, leaves it somewhat unclear.

"Senator HOLLAND. Do you think it ought to be clarified if the amendment be changed in the Senate or by conference so as to make the prohibition applicable to recipients of Public Law 480 aid who ship military strategic goods to North Vietnam in such a way as to cover only government shipments of all kinds whether it is government or private?

"Mr. MANN. I think we would be inclined to say if the amendment were changed so it is limited to strategic and military, that it might apply to all exports to North Vietnam regardless of whether they came from the private sector of the public sector.

"Senator HOLLAND. That would be my opinion also, but I wanted the record clear on that. Maybe there are other questions.

"Mr. MANN. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, if the committee and the Congress were to give the President discretion, there is some advantage in leaving this a little bit vague because it would be helpful to us in our negotiations with foreign governments to reduce even the private sector trade. We would like to eliminate that, too, if we could.

"Senator HOLLAND. Do you mind suspending just a moment. I have a call. I must take it and don't want to miss any of this. I would be glad to put Senator Stennis in charge, but if we could suspend, I would like to hear it all.

"Senator STENNIS. No, thanks, Senator; I will wait.

"(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) (Supplemental Hearings, Agricultural Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1967.)"

The Senate Committee reported the bill with the Findley amendment modified to apply "unless the President determines that the national interest requires otherwise." In conference, the House prevailed and the bill, as enacted, contained the provision adopted by the House.

It may be noted that Mr. Mann did not take the position that the language applied only to government shipments; instead, he stated that there was considerable ground for debate, that the bill left the matter somewhat unclear and that if the amendment was restricted to strategic and military supplies it might be applied to *all* exports to North Vietnam regardless of whether they came from the private sector or public sector.

Important in determining the meaning of this section is the discussion relating to similar provisions in the Food for Peace Act of 1966 by the same Congress within a short period after adoption of the Findley amendment. In the bill adopted by the House the same language was included except that it was extended to bar aid with nations trading with Cuba as well as with North Vietnam. The provision was changed by the Senate and the Conference Committee Report further modified the provision as it passed the House to apply it only where there were shipments of certain commodities specified in Title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, 82d Congress (popularly known as the Battle Act) and to give the President discretionary authority. See Conference Report to accompany H.R. 14939, No. 2075, Sept. 23, 1966). The House rejected this provision and sent the bill back to conference. The discussion in the House throws light on the intent of the rider to the appropriation act.

Mr. Cooley, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, stated with respect to the Conference Report on the Food for Peace Act of 1966 (Report No. 2075, Sept. 23, 1966):

"Mr. Speaker, the only controversy that now remains is the controversy dealing with the involvement with North Vietnam and Cuba. Mr. Speaker, *we had very strict language in the House bill which provided that no latitude was given for shipment of any articles to those areas.*" (Italics supplied.)

After describing the change made from the original House provision in the Conference bill, it was stated:

"Personally, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the House working its will on this proposal. In view of the fact that I feel that way about it, I would like to ask unanimous consent that conference report be returned to the conference in an effort to further insist upon the House language being incorporated in the final draft of the conference report." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 19, page 25315.

In the course of debate it was stated further by Mr. Abbitt, a member of the Committee on Agriculture, as follows:

"I wonder how we are going to live with that. We have people over across the water being shot down and killed. Yet these so-called 'friendly nations'—and I doubt their friendliness, if this is what they are doing—are demanding our help and at the same time are trading with our enemy and thereby building up the enemies' war power.

"I believe it is time to take a firm stand. We should no longer coddle our enemies. We should no longer permit our so-called friends to do that. If they do that, they are not friendly.

"I say we must strike out all trade in any manner with nations which continue to aid and assist in the building up of the military might of those who are leading the fight against us. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 19, page 25317.

"* * * * *

"I must say that there are a lot of materials besides military goods which can be and are helpful to an enemy. If we are going to keep our boys in Vietnam we must call a halt to any way of helping the enemy or in any way permitting nations that we are assisting to help the enemy maintain its hostilities, to build up its armed forces, or in any way continue to wage a war which has been so devastating to our fighting forces.

"I hasten to say that the language in the House bill as reported out by the Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, is limited to concessional sales under Public Law 480 and does not in any way affect food donations to hungry people anywhere in the world and I urge our Members to stand with us and insist upon the strong House-passed language rather than the weak-kneed provisions in the conference substitute. Unless this is done, *medical supplies will continue to flow into North Vietnam* and also into the Castro regime in Cuba." (Italics supplied). CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 19, page 25312.

Again in debate, Mr. Chamberlain stated:

"It is important, therefore, that every opportunity be taken to discourage any trade with North Vietnam. Certainly no piece of legislation should contain provisions which tolerate this trade. This traffic in fact has been tolerated far too long. The Secretary of Agriculture in behalf of the administration demands that we not hold it against any of our so-called friends if they help North Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot understand how it can be in our national interest to offer aid or subsidized Government business to any country *which permits help to a regime that is daily taking its toll of American lives. . . .*" (Italics supplied).

Mr. Nelsen further stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 19, page 25324:

"It is argued that the countries affected by this provision are sending only small amounts of 'nonstrategic goods' to North Vietnam and Cuba. However, we know in our own economy, which is infinitely stronger than those of our enemies, that all goods are strategic during wartime. The supply of 'nonstrategic' articles can be of great assistance in freeing a country's productive capacity for strategic goods.

"Either way, the trade amounts to valuable assistance to the declared enemies of the American interests and the interests of the free world. We cannot justify special subsidized sales of American food to countries which choose to assist our wartime enemies in this way. The House must reinsert the ban provision." (Italics supplied.)

After debate, the Conference Report was returned to Conference Committee by a vote of 306 to 61 on a motion by Mr. Belcher with an instruction to the Managers on the Part of the House to insist upon the language of Section 103(d)(3) of the House bill.

The Conference Committee then adopted the following language in Section 103(d)(3) which defines a friendly country to exclude:

". . . (3) for the purpose only of sales of agricultural commodities under title I of this Act, any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba or North Vietnam (excluding United States installations in Cuba) any equipment, materials, or commodities so long as they are governed by a Communist regime: *Provided*, That with respect to furnishing, selling, or selling and transporting to Cuba medical supplies, nonstrategic raw materials for agriculture, and non-strategic agricultural or food commodities, sales agreements may be entered into if the President finds with respect to each such country, and so informs the Senate and the House of Representatives of the reasons therefor, that the making of each such agreement would be in the national interest of the United States and all such findings and reasons therefor shall be published in the Federal Register. . . ."

The language used in the Act as it applies to North Vietnam is the same as in the proviso used in the appropriation act and we believe should be accorded the same meaning in both statutes. It appears clear that the ban of the above-quoted provision applies to the furnishing of medical supplies to North Vietnam in view of the specific exception which applies to countries providing medical supplies to Cuba. There would, of course, have been no need for the exception if the language "equipment, materials, or commodities" did not include medical supplies.

The debate and the vote to recommit the original conference committee report make manifest, in our opinion, the view of the House (which originated the Findley amendment) that assistance should not be given to any nation which through its government or any private entity within the nation provides materials, equipment and supplies of any kind to North Vietnam. Accordingly, we believe that the issuance of a procurement authorization to Yugoslavia at this time would not be in keeping with the intention of the rider to the appropriation act.

The provisions of the rider are similar to language in Section 107 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1967 (Public Law 89–691). Sections 107 and 116 provide as follows:

"SEC. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long at it is governed by the Castro regime, in addition to those items contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any other articles, materials, or supplies of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war or of strategic significance to the conduct of war, including petroleum products.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam.

"SEC. 116. No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country that sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to North Vietnam any of the items mentioned in subsection 107(a) of this Act."

Section 107 dates back to 1962 and Section 116 to 1965. After the first year of administration of Section 107, the House Committee which considered the foreign aid appropriations bill requested the administration to provide a statement of its application. The statement is attached here and appeared in the Hearings on the "Foreign Operations Appropriations for 1964," 88th Congress, 1st Session, 1963, pages 2317 to 2319.

This statement was concerned with the part of the provision that prohibited aid to nations permitting ships or aircraft under its registry furnishing supplies. In this context the term "nation" can reasonably be construed to mean governments and has been so construed.

On the other hand, with respect to the ban on aid to countries which furnish supplies to prohibited areas, we are not aware that in the years of operation of the program the administration was ever confronted with the issue of whether the provision applies not only to the government of a nation but to a private entity within the nation.

The purpose of the Findley amendment as well as Section 103(d)(3) of the Food for Peace Act would be easily thwarted if the provisions were narrowly construed to be inapplicable if supplies were furnished to North Vietnam by organizations of a nation which are not strictly speaking a part of the government of the nation. The furnishing of supplies to North Vietnam give aid or comfort to the enemy regardless of whether they are furnished by the government or a private entity within the nation. Most governments (including Yugoslavia) have controls upon exports, and exportation to areas such as North Vietnam occurs only because the government permits it to occur as a matter of deliberate government policy. This would be particularly true in a country governed by a Communist regime. To distinguish between the government of a nation and a private entity within a nation in applying the Findley amendment, results in an artificial distinction, which in our view would be violative of intendment of the provision.

THE COMING DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the day of decision on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Congress must study every phase of the trade picture. The damage done to our industrial and employment economy in the last 5 years must not be brushed under the rug with rosy promises of future benefits to the American people.

I remember well the fantastic promises and predictions of great prosperity made by the then Under Secretary of State, George Ball, Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, and Secretary of Commerce, Hodges.

I sat in amazement in the House Committee on Ways and Means and heard the repeated flat declaration that the Kennedy round through the operations of the new agreement would create from 4 to 6 million new jobs.

The truth of the matter is that jobs have been lost by the thousands in steel, glass, ceramics, vegetables and fruits, canned goods, gloves, textiles, and in almost every U.S. industry, especially consumer goods such as transistors and electronic oriented products.

The attached article by Carroll P. Streeter is important and ought to be read by every Member of Congress and particularly by our trade negotiators in Geneva.

All of a sudden the American representatives are working day and night trying to pull a rabbit out of a hat in order to put into effect a 50-percent tariff slash on thousands of articles for fear that the Congress may awaken to the serious dangers in our present trade policies.

And now Mr. Speaker, it will soon be 33 years since the first Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934. This was the program of free trade that was to pacify the world. Since that time we have seen World War II come and go, no less than the Korean conflict, while now we are at war in Vietnam.

It is high time that we take a look at this program that was to bring such wonders to the world. Under this program the United States has reduced its duties an average of some 75 to 80 percent. What has been the effect on our trade?

The following facts are irrefutable and may be attributed in great part to the trade program:

First. The competitive position of the United States in world markets has deteriorated seriously since 1958.

Second. U.S. exports have declined relatively compared with those of other countries.

Third. U.S. imports have shifted more heavily to finished manufactures.

Fourth. Rising imports of finished manufactures have produced feverish efforts to modernize and automate in order to reduce manpower needed per unit of production in this country.

Fifth. Displacement of labor, increase of retraining burdens and outlays for poverty have resulted from efforts of domestic industry to remain competitive at home and abroad.

Sixth. This country has been running a trade deficit in recent years instead of enjoying a surplus ranging from $4 to $7 billion per year since 1960, as official reports have shown. This would become clear if the statistics were corrected to report our imports at what they cost us, laid down at our ports rather than their value at foreign points of shipment, which is the basis of present reports; and if further, the statistics were stripped of our exports of subsidized sales made abroad and those made under Public Law 480, food for peace, and similar shipments made under AID.

The 1966 trade balance in merchandise was a deficit of some $2 billion in terms of competitive private commercial trade, instead of a surplus of nearly $4 billion as officially reported by the Department of Commerce.

Seventh. The true U.S. export surplus nas been confined almost exclusively to capital goods industries and semimanufactured chemicals.

Our capital goods exports are weighted heavily with shipments destined for the establishments of American-owned subsidiaries abroad, stimulated by the large flow of investment capital into foreign fields. These American-owned establishments have enjoyed sales expansions abroad at a rate far outstripping the increase in our exports.

Eighth. American capital, in search of lower production costs, has moved abroad at rising levels until curbed by governmentally inspired voluntary restrictions. The purpose of these huge investments has been (a) to participate in foreign markets from within, as a partial substitute for exporting from this country, which, with the exception of capital equipment and a few other products, was becoming more and more difficult; (b) as a base for exporting to third countries, such as Latin America, Africa, and Asiatic countries; and (c) shipping to this country items that particular companies do not manufacture here but that may be produced here by their domestic competitors.

Ninth. Our agricultural exports are also in a deficit position but for governmentally assisted exports, sales for foreign currencies and giveaways.

Tenth. A number of important domestic industries have shifted in recent years, from a net export to a net import position, such as textiles, steel, petroleum, typewriters, sewing machines, automobiles. These are among our foremost industries in point of technology.

Eleventh. Our merchant marine has dropped from the No. 1 spot in the postwar world to fifth or sixth place at the present time. While trade has increased over 600 percent since 1935 our merchant

marine has stood almost still in point of tonnage carried, and American-flag ships carry less than 8 percent of all our foreign trade.

Mr. Speaker, if that record is the way to spell success we need a change of words. To me it looks like a dismal failure, one that confronts this country with an unenviable future in world trade.

It cannot be denied that these results were courted by those in our Department of State who, with their like-thinking colleagues in other departments, wielded the meat knife over our tariff like whirling dervishes swinging sabers rushing fanatically into battle, with much emotion but little thought.

Let me enlarge on some of the points I have made. I mentioned the declining share of our exports in world market. The shrinkage in our share of the world market in manufactured products has been 20 percent in the past 10 to 12 years. Half of the shrinkage has occurred since 1960. This does not mean that our exports have declined but that other countries have been gaining at our expense. They are outdoing us in the exportation of manufactured goods, and let me point out that manufactured goods use more labor in their production than do raw materials and unprocessed agricultural products.

On the import side we have been increasing imports of manufactured goods more rapidly than our exports of these products. In the case of machinery our exports have increased 75 percent from 1958 to 1965. This was one of the highlights of our exports since total exports increased only 45 percent.

Yet, compare our proud record in machinery exports with our imports of machinery, and you will find that they increased well over three times as fast as our exports, or by 272 percent from 1958 to 1965. It is true that we are still exporting more machinery than we are importing, because of the high level of our foreign investments; but if the present trend continues much longer we will turn from an export to an import basis in machinery, just as we have done in a number of other products, such as steel, textiles, and automobiles.

I do not have to tell you that when the importation of manufactured goods increases faster than that of raw materials we are making a poor trade so far as employment is concerned. The reason for importing more manufactured goods lies exactly in the fact that the savings are greater when we do so, because of the low-foreign wages. The discrepancy between our costs and foreign costs of production increases as more labor is used in production. This is what happens with finished goods compared with raw materials.

This explains why our imports of raw materials and unmanufactured foodstuff have lagged. There is not as much cost to be saved. Our imports of manufactured goods other than machinery increased four times as rapidly as our imports of inedible raw materials or 125 percent compared with 30 percent.

Now if we turn to exports we find the same principle holding down our exports of manufactured goods, other than machinery. These exports increased only 29.7 percent, while imports, as just stated, increased 125 percent. In other words, we find it hard to sell abroad the goods that incorporate all the steps of production, as do manufactured goods.

Let us look at a few specific industries.

When it comes to inedible raw materials our exports rose 67 percent, or from $1.14 billion in 1958 to $2.85 billion in 1965. This was a rise two and a half times as high as the increase in imports of these products. The reason, once more, is very clear. We find it easier to increase our exports of goods in which labor costs are held down because only one or two steps of production are incorporated. High labor cost is not accumulated through four or five steps as happens with many manufactured products, but only one or two steps.

On the other hand there is less advantage in importing raw materials than manufactured products. As I have already said, there is not as much saving in cost because not much labor has been incorporated.

If we turn to metals and manufacture, we find our exports increased only 31.9 percent from 1958 to 1965, while imports increased 146.8 percent. In 1958 our exports of these products still exceeded imports. The export surplus was $254 million. In 1965 the tide had turned. Imports exceeded exports by $1.1 billion. This was quite a switch and should tell us something useful about our competitive position in world trade. It should also tell us something about the wisdom of a trade policy that brings about such a radical switch in so short a period of time.

Yet there are those who would cut our tariffs another 50 percent across the board.

In textiles other than clothing a similar swing-about has occurred. In 1958 we exported more than we imported. In 1965 our imports surpassed our exports by $271 million. Our exports during that period increased 22.2 percent, but our imports rose by 110.7 percent, or five times as fast as our exports.

In the case of clothing a similar outstripping of exports by imports occurred. Exports rose by 52.1 percent but imports climbed by 212.1 percent, or by $369 million as compared with an export increase of only $49 million.

This swing-about has occurred in spite of the long-term trade arrangement whereby other countries restricted their cotton textile exports to us. If 1966 statistics were included the deficit would be much greater, because imports have been coming up very rapidly.

Our trade planners had looked with great confidence to exports in the past few years to pull the chestnuts of our balance of payments out of the fire. We all should remember the big export campaign mounted by the Department of Commerce including a long list of foreign trade fairs in other countries.

Well, in spite of all that, our exports fell behind. From 1964 to 1966 our exports increased 12.7 percent while our imports rose 37.6 percent, or three times as fast as exports. This was in 2 years' time.

If we want to get at the real situation in our exports we should take a look at the trend of all exports except machinery exports, agricultural exports, which have been buoyed by foreign aid and subsidies, and exports of chemicals. That leaves a long list of exports of all kinds of products.

If the three mentioned items are left out the remainder of our exports increased only 6.7 percent from 1958 to 1965.

Mr. Speaker, this increase was on the basis of value. However, unit values of finished manufacture exports rose from an index of 99 in 1958 to 111 in 1965—Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962, table 1215; and 1966, table 1259, page 874. This meant that there was an actual decline instead of an increase.

Let me make it clear that I am not against machinery exports, or chemical exports or agricultural exports, but let us not be deceived by what happens under special conditions with respect to these goods. I have already explained that our machinery exports have increased considerably, because of the great increase in foreign investments by our industries. Far from proving that we are competitive the increase is attributable to the fact that our industries are going abroad precisely because we are not competitive in foreign markets with our exports. They go abroad to take advantage of the lower wage costs.

To show our true competitive position, we are therefore justified in studying our exports minus the expansion in machinery exports to get a better picture of what is happening in our trade in other products, which greatly outweigh machinery exports. The machinery export boom may not last in any event. Already we see machinery imports increasing three times as fast as exports from 1958 to 1965.

We are also justified in leaving out agricultural exports because their rise in turn has been greatly stimulated by foreign aid shipments, outright grants, sales for foreign currencies, and by governmental subsidies. Such exports therefore obscure what is our true competitive standing in foreign markets.

Mr. Speaker, stripped of special cases of export expansion that do not reflect competitiveness, our export position today is distinctly one of weakness and not one of strength.

This is a fact that the American public should know if our trade policy is to be shaped by our national interest.

For some years now our Commerce Department has been giving out reports on our foreign trade that have given the impression that everything is going fine. This is an outright fraud on the public. Our foreign trade statistics have been used to conceal and not to reveal the facts of our competitive position in the world. They have not been properly analyzed to show their true meaning.

I have already said how the distortion of our trade balance takes place; and I refer to the balance of trade and not the balance of payments. Let me simply repeat that our official import statistics make our imports look smaller than they are, by recording their value at the for-

eign point of shipment. This excludes freight, insurance, and a variety of other costs incurred in laying down the goods in our ports. This undervaluation was a minimum of 10 percent or $2.5 billion in our 1966 imports of $25.6 billion, so that our imports cost us well over $28 billion.

Actually the undervaluation was even greater than the 10 percent found by the Tariff Commission as representing the average freight and insurance charges. The Commission itself said:

> The value used by most foreign countries for duty and statistical purposes includes not only freight and insurance charges, but additional costs . . . known to range from an insignificant amount to as much as the charges for freight and insurance, or even more.

On the other hand our exports as reported to the public include governmentally assisted exports and are not confined to exports that move because we are competitive in world markets. U.S.-financed exports—principally AID shipments and subsidized wheat and cotton—are estimated at $2.9 billion for 1966 on the basis of the first three-quarters. Therefore, instead of our exports of competitive products being $28.9 billion—exclusive of military shipments—they were $26 billion in terms of private competitive transactions. That left us with a trade deficit of at least $2 billion instead of a surplus of nearly $4 billion as reported by the Department of Commerce.

This is the true measure of our competitiveness in world markets. It would be easy I am sure, for us to export more than we do now if we would pay for more exports, but it would not improve our true export surplus. It would no more improve our balance of trade than do those present exports that owe their existence to the fact that we, the taxpayers, pay for them. We pay outright for those that move under AID and subsidize others to the extent this is necessary to make them competitive.

I have said that we really do not enjoy an export surplus even in agricultural products although our official export statistics make it appear as if we had a surplus of some $2.2 billion in fiscal year 1965–66. Our gross exports, including AID shipments, were $6.68 billion; imports $4.45 billion. See U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade, USDA, February 1967 supplement, pages 2 and 19.

However, $1.6 billion of the export shipments were made under Government programs. This would bring the $6.6 billion down to $5 billion of so-called commercial exports. These commercial exports, however, include shipments of highly subsidized wheat, wheat flour, raw cotton, and a few other farm products. Such shipments, not included under the $1.6 billion exports under Government programs, amounted to $1 billion in 1965.

I will tell you why these "commercial" exports should not be treated as representing competitive sales. They are sold abroad at prices well below those received by the farmers in this country. In other words, the domestic price on these farm products is so much higher than the world price that the Treasury has to make up the difference. If we want to ship these products we have to cut the price below the domestic level. The difference is made up to the farmer out of the Treasury.

Therefore if these exports, although not a part of Public Law 480 or AID, are listed as "commercial exports," as they are in our official statistics, they give a false impression of our competitive position. If they are left out, our competitive exports drop to $4 billion in the record year 1965–66. Imports in the same fiscal year were $4.454 billion. Therefore on a competitive basis we did not enjoy a surplus at all. We had a deficit. In place of a surplus of $2.2 billion we had a deficit of $450 million.

Mr. Speaker, it makes quite a difference how import and export statistics are presented. They are presented in the manner in which they are given to the public in order to show a comfortable export surplus so that the sharp tariff reductions contemplated under the Kennedy round can be justified. This is a false and reprehensible use of statistics. Also it pleases the Department of Commerce to continue to deceive the public because a handsome export surplus makes it appear as if that Department had done a superb job of trade promotion, which, obviously, it has not. Otherwise we would not be in the deficit position I have just described.

The Kennedy round is still on the agenda of the President's special representative for trade negotiations. In view of the competitive disadvantage under which nearly all of our industries are already operating, further tariff reductions should be called off. The handwriting on the wall is clear and unmistakable. Unless we are bent on painting ourselves into a real corner we should proceed on the basis of facts and not on statistics that represent gross distortions of the facts.

When the so-called experts were predicting great things and millions of jobs for U.S. workers out of the Trade Agreements Act, the Members of Congress predicted the opposite.

The facts are clear to those of us who want the facts. No American industry can compete with foreign imports regardless of how they automate without Government subsidy.

The cotton and wheat shipments that make up the chief arguments of free trade advocates would be wiped out overnight if we took away our Government subsidies.

Further, if the American enterprise system believes it has the know-how, the finances, and the equipment to successfully market our products without Government aid they are headed for oblivion in the industrial field.

They may survive with cartels and that is the only other way they can hope to hold their own in foreign markets. This, of course, would help them retain their percentage of the U.S. market which after all is the world's richest market.

When the chips are down no nation is going to be willing to see its workers in all fields of endeavor out of work for the benefit of an international group of importers and exporters, exploiters of the peoples of backward and emerging nations, men in the main with only one sense of loyalty, loyalty to the almighty dollar in any form.

Mr. Speaker, I present more evidence of these complexities of this problem with a rundown of the wheat problems, its relationship to the rest of our economy. I also wish to present a call for action by the United Textile Workers.

The material referred to follows:

[From the Farm Journal, March 1967]

HOW BIG A MARKET FOR YOU IN EUROPE?—THE NEXT FEW WEEKS WILL TELL

(By Carroll P. Streeter)

Watch what happens between now and midnight June 30, for in that period the future of your big cash market in Central Europe will be decided for the next several years.

The six nations of the Common Market (Germany, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy) are your biggest dollar customer abroad—*$1.6 billion worth a year.*

This big market is right now up for grabs, with the Europeans trying to take more of it for themselves and we striving not only to hold our share but increase it.

The battle, which FARM JOURNAL has reported by sending editors to Europe four times since 1960, has been growing in intensity. It will come to a climax in the GATT negotiations [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] in Geneva, Switzerland, between now and June 30. That's when our Trade Act expires. That will mark the end of the "Kennedy Round."

To see what our prospects are, I've just taken a swing around Central Europe including Geneva, and here's what I found:

Three amazing things are due to happen over there July 1, no matter what happens before—*and each will affect you:*

1. On that day the Common Market will put into operation Common Agricultural Prices for farmers in all six nations on 90% of their commodities (with the rest to follow by 1968). Imagine it:

French farmers will suddenly see their prices go up 10% while German farmers will swallow hard and take 10% to 15% less. As a group *prices will shoot up 7% to 30%,* depending upon the commodity and the country.

2. On that day all tariff barriers between the six will vanish. Here are countries that have been at war with each other twice in the last half century. Each has been trying with every protective device known to man to shield its own food supply and its farmers. From here on there'll be one food supply, not six, which should help preserve peace among former enemies.

Farmers of these nations will suddenly be exposed to one another competitively. Apple growers in Italy will ruin some German fruit growers. Dutch poultrymen will put some chicken raisers in France out of business. The adjustments will be excruciating, but they'll be bravely made in an attempt to be "European."

Meanwhile these nations will buy more from each other, less from us.

At the same time tariff walls against our products will be raised to protect the higher prices just established within. We don't belong to the "club." Nor are these ordinary tariffs. Normally tariffs are fixed amounts, tacked on to world prices. If world prices go low enough, the combination can be climbed over.

The Common Market has thought up an ingenious device known as "variable levies." Figured daily on grains, they are the difference between the world price and the Community's Common Agricultural Price. They vary, all right, as much as necessary on any given day; but the level of protection always ends up the same, and it's high.

No matter how much more cheaply we can produce, we have no competitive advantage. And of course that's the idea. The farmers of Europe on their small acreages are no match for us in production costs, even though they often get higher yields per acre.

As one European farm leader put it to me quite bluntly: "We don't intend to let your rich American farmers run our little farmers out of business. You have your farm policy; this is ours."

We have been urging the Community to adopt relatively low Common Agricultural Prices, both for their sake and ours. Theirs because high prices merely perpetuate an inefficient agriculture, bring on high food costs, then high labor costs and inflation. Ours because high prices stimulate more farm production over there, making it harder for us to sell.

We've urged lower tariffs and said we'd lower ours. That's what the Kennedy Round is all about. But here the Europeans are, approaching this great meeting for liberalizing trade with tariffs they have just put higher!

Up to now we've done well selling them our farm stuff, except for poultry and wheat, despite the fact that variable levies have been in effect since 1962 on several of our major commodities. Since 1960 we've increased our farm exports there by 42%. In 1965–66 they were 16% better than a year earlier.

Europe has been booming since our Marshall Plan helped put it on its feet (although it is in something of a slump now). People there have been eating more meat and other protein foods. Although western Europe's farm production has risen, demand for food has risen faster.

Consequently we've had a fast-growing market, especially for feedstuffs. Feed grains have been the top performer, with soybeans second (there's no tariff against them because Europe can't raise its own).

Feed grains and soybeans will continue to be our best sellers. Europe will raise most of her own poultry and livestock, but if her people can continue to increase their meat eating, as they want to, she will never raise enough feed. She doesn't have the land for it.

Wheat is another story. The Common Market is not only self-sufficient in soft wheat, she is dumping great quantities on world markets, in competition with us, by paying a whopping export subsidy of $1.35 a bushel. (Our own export subsidy on wheat is around 5¢.)

Europe has to buy durums and hard wheats to blend with her own, but they get most of the latter from Canada because the Canadian wheats are "stronger" in protein. Consequently our wheat sales to Europe are slipping and doubtless will continue to decline.

Poultry furnishes the classic example of what can happen when prices and tariffs are hiked too high. You may remember the "chicken war" of 1962—which we lost decisively. Tariffs against our broilers were then around 5¢ a pound, and we had a growing business of $59 million a year. Then the Community decided they'd raise the chickens, so they hiked the tariff to 13¢, and by 1964 got it up to 18¢.

We retaliated by raising our tariffs on brandy, trucks and starches. Nevertheless, all this killed our broiler market, as intended, although we still sell some chicken parts and turkey. But it did something else. The Europeans, particularly the Dutch, went head-over-heels into broilers.

The little farmers of Brittany in northern France, hard-pressed to make a living with grain, envisioned chickens as their salvation. They sat back awaiting happy days.

But alas! The Community was presently flooded with chicken, and started dumping it abroad, of course with an export subsidy, which demoralized our market in Switzerland and Austria.

Before long prices had fallen to 15¢ a pound.

The enraged farmers of Brittany descended on the town of Morlaix by busloads. They attacked the town hall, bashed in the door with a battering ram, threw chicken manure and dead chickens around. Not until three riot squads of police reached the scene with tear gas was the town square cleared.

What are our prospects after July? That depends on whom you ask. The Europeans I talked to quite naturally assured me we have nothing to fear. They had three arguments:

1. While the Community will raise more food under the stimulus of higher prices, it can't raise a lot more. Livestock yes, but not grain. There will be some increase in yield per acre, but all the good acres in northern France (the best farming region in Europe) are already producing full blast, they say.

2. Unless Europe has a depression, growing demand will sop up increasing supplies and then some. So far that's been the truth, but the new high prices aren't yet in effect.

3. Farmers' costs will go up right along with their prices, taking much of the incentive out of farming harder. Their costs have been going up, all right, but prices will surely leap ahead of them this summer.

Our agricultural representatives over there are worried.

"Every commodity we ship to Europe, except cotton and soybeans, will be hurt—not just by higher local production but by the higher tariffs against us," says one of our most experienced observers over there. Actually, even cotton and soybeans may feel some competition from African vegetable oils. The Community now has two associate members, Turkey and Greece, and preferential trading agreements with 16 African nations.

French farmers can put marginal land under the plow for barley and corn when the price is right. She had more land in cultivation in World War I than she has now. French plant breeders have developed corn that does well as far North as Paris. With better prices, more of southwest France could be irrigated.

See what we are up against in Germany:

As of last Oct. 25, our No. 3 yellow corn brought $1.75 a bushel, freight paid, at the German border. We paid a levy of $1.15 a bushel to get it in. This plus a few other costs made the total price $2.96.

French corn of equivalent grade was $2.60 at the border, paid only 23¢ duty, had a total price of $2.89. So the French got 85¢ more at the border than we did, but undersold us by 7¢ in Germany!

And that was last October. Come July they won't pay their 23¢ duty while ours will be higher. Who do you think will get the business?

Our only hope is that demand in Germany will boom so much that the French can't supply all of it, no matter how hard they try. Barring a recession, that's likely to happen.

This much is sure, though: However much we manage to sell, we'd sell more if the prices and levies over there hadn't been put so high. It is small comfort to be told our share of the market won't *shrink* when the whole market is growing. We want growth, not the status quo.

The ironic thing is that it is we who are paying in large part, both for the stimulus within the Community and the export subsidies with which it dumps its stuff elsewhere. We're financing our own competition through the levies we pay!

The Community, already gigantic, will doubtlessly expand in the next few years to include Britain, Ireland, Scandinavia and other countries around the edges, which will make access the more important for us.

What can we do about it?

Well, at the moment our only hope lies in the GATT negotiations in Geneva. We'd like to have the Community lower its Common Agricultural Prices and variable levies.

It looks as though we had surrendered on that front; instead we are now trying to get an International Grains Agreement. In that we are asking a firm percentage of the farm market over there, thus assuring us a share of growth, with a firm commitment of help in feeding the world's hungry nations.

The Community's proposed agreement has so many loopholes as to be meaningless. Prospects are dim for one we could accept unless we retreat. What the State Dept. will do we'll have to wait to see. Fortunately the U.S. Senate must ratify any agreement of this sort.

There's only one way, probably, we can get even a reasonably good farm deal: We can refuse to reduce our tariffs on the industrial goods Europe wants to sell here, unless she reduces hers on our farm stuff.

We'd better stick to it or we could be traded out of our shoes.

[From the Farm Journal, March 1967]

POKER GAME

The other day we visited the room in the Palace of Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, where the biggest poker game of recent times is about to be played—with your grain market as the chips.

It's the Kennedy Round of the GATT negotiations (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) where the nations are trading "offers"—"we'll reduce this tariff if you'll reduce that." It's a game where tough traders are determined not to give away more than they get, and not that much if possible. There's a deadline of June 30, and the traders are now "eye ball to eye ball."

While there's intense bargaining on everything, agriculture is the chief sticking point. Our Trade Act binds our negotiators not to concede more on our industrial tariffs than the Common Market concedes on agricultural tariffs. This is not just in farmers' behalf, either; it's for the sake of our trade balance. Our farm products now constitute one-fifth of all U.S. exports.

The Common Market got ready for all this by jacking up its agricultural tariffs before it got to Geneva, to put itself into a strong bargaining position.

We want those tariffs lowered, to which the Common Market replies, "No chance." So now we are resorting to an international grain agreement. We are seeking one that would (1) guarantee us "access" to at least as much of the European market as we've had, (2) provide that we share in any growth of it, (3) establish a range of world grain prices and (4) get a firm commitment from the Common Market to help us feed the hungry nations.

The Common Market offers us a loose sort of agreement that falls so far short of this as to be ridiculous. It proffers all the rest of the world, *including* us, 10% of their food market (as compared with 14% now) and there's nothing in the offer, so far, to guarantee even that.

We doubt the value to us of such an agreement in the first place. Second we doubt that we can come out with a "good" one according to our standards, although it is too early to say.

In the first place, international commodity agreements aren't meant to favor efficient producers like us who, in a competitive market, could take more of the marbles. They are meant to protect the inefficient. The idea is to parcel out the market in "shares," with everybody's share safe and secure and not exposed to competition. That's what the Europeans, most of whom are socialists in some degree, call "stabilizing" markets and making them "orderly." Actually it's a cartel.

Second, such agreements aren't kept; as soon as they get uncomfortable for somebody, they are ignored.

Third, they can be a way of legislating U.S. farm policy by way of Geneva. There's a feature in the proposed agreement—suggested by the United States—which illustrates what we mean. It is a proposal to raise the world price of wheat 40¢ a bushel. That would put it above the market.

What would that do? It would hold a price umbrella over less efficient nations encouraging them to go heavier into wheat. It would cut world demand for wheat. And when the price got so high the market couldn't decide who was to make the sale the sellers would have to decide it among themselves. We'd get a "share," and that would be it. To live within such a share we'd have to adopt "appropriate" policies, like acreage control, unless we were willing to give away unlimited amounts or store up surpluses again.

We could guarantee "access" another way, if we'd be tough enough: We could withhold tariff concessions on industrial goods until Europe got tired of it. As for food aid, we prefer President Johnson's idea of getting countries to cooperate through the World Bank, furnishing surplus grain if they had it, cash if they didn't.

The truth is, the fate of the Kennedy Round depends in considerable measure on whether there *is* a grain deal. And the danger is that we may be so anxious to see the GATT negotiations come to something substantial that we make a face-saving deal on grain, at the expense of farmers rather than in their long-range interests.

Unless we can bargain for tariff reductions, not a "share" in a cartel, we might better come home June 30 and await another day. We doubt that anything catastrophic would happen in the meantime.

NEWS RELEASE FROM UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS OF AMERICA

NEW YORK.—The United Textile Workers of America will shortly ask employers, and public officials and leaders in communities where textiles is a leading industry, to join with it in a campaign to protect the American textile industry and its workers against the threat posed by the rising flood of cheap, foreign-made textile products.

In a statement outlining the Union's position, George Baldanzi, International President, said "Five years ago, when the Long-Term Cotton Textile Advisory Arrangement (LTA) was under consideration, we said that although we believed in reciprocal trade, we wanted to be sure that American workers were not going to be asked to underwrite the exploitation of workers in other parts of the world."

"We were concerned then", he said, "that American trade policy would not be such that the poorest among us would be made to carry the heaviest burden, a burden already too great. We are just as concerned today."

"In 1962", Baldanzi said, "the United Textile Workers of America said that it would agree to the abolition of all restrictive tariffs if a world-wide system of equitable standards were established, but that under conditions then prevailing, the only way to protect the jobs of American textile workers against unfair foreign competition was through the establishment of quotas, by category, for every branch of the textile industry—cotton, synthetics, wool, etc.

"Five years ago", Baldanzi noted, "we said that the Chinese refugees who fled to freedom found only the worst kind of sweatshop exploitation in Hong Kong, while profits rolled in for entrepreneurs of all nationalities who lived in luxury in the colony.

"We also suggested, in order to protect the American textile industry and the American textile worker, the need for international agreements that would establish fair wage relationships. It is sad to re-read this five-year old statement and find that it is just as true today as it was then.

"Hong Kong is the leading supplier of cotton textile products to the United States and the average hourly wage in Hong Kong today, in equivalent American dollars, is 25 cents.

"Of the 18 countries that supply more than nine-tenths of all U.S. cotton textile imports, in 12 of them textile workers earned less than one-fifth the wages earned by American textile workers. These 12 countries accounted for more than three-fourths of the dollar value of cotton textile imports from these 18 countries. In the remaining six countries, which accounted for 13 per cent of imports into this country, wages were less than a fourth to about two-thirds of American wages."

"Theoretically," Baldanzi said, "cotton textile imports are controlled under the LTA, but it has been so poorly administered that every year it has been in effect there has been an increase in imports over the preceding year. The very nature of the Arrangement means that automatic growth is built right into its structure. In addition, the Government has negotiated new and more liberal bilateral agreements, so that cotton textile imports next year will keep on rising."

Baldanzi said that although the situation with respect to cotton textile imports is extremely serious, the potential danger in the field of synthetics is perhaps even greater. He noted that while cloth and apparel containing more than 50 per cent are to some extent covered by an international arrangement, other textile and apparel products, including those containing 50 per cent, or less, of cotton, are not covered by any arrangement.

"Since 1962," he said, "synthetic textiles imported into the United States have increased 400 per cent, and when you consider that a country like Japan is turning increasingly to the production of synthetics, it is not hard to imagine that unless the importation of man-made textiles is controlled, we can expect a flood that could engulf this segment of the textile industry.

"As a matter of fact, employment in the synthetics industry has already begun to feel the effect of uncontrolled imports."

"The same threatening situation holds true in the woolen industry, where for years we have been trying to get an international agreement," Baldanzi said, "but Japan, the United Kingdom and Italy, the chief exporters of wool products to this country, have thus far successfully resisted such efforts."

"Workers and management," he said, "are the first and immediate victims when an industry shrinks or is destroyed, but the effect on the community follows close behind and is equally devastating. There must be a three-pronged attack on this problem—by labor, management and the community—with strong representations to our Government, so that we may not be further victimized by the kind of reciprocity that exchanges American industry and the jobs of its workers for cheap, foreign-made goods produced under substandard conditions and at substandard wages.

"We must also insist that no segment of American society be sacrificed in the naive, unproven belief that such sacrifice furthers the nation's foreign policy. It does nothing of the kind, but causes only irreparable harm to its victims."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ROYBAL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HELSTOSKI (at the request of Mr. GALIFIANAKIS), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), 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:

Mr. RYAN, for 1 hour, Wednesday, March 1, 1967.

Mr. POFF, for 15 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLE (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 1 hour, on April 3, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY), for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DENT.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. TENZER.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. KEE.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, and other laws relating to housing and urban development, to correct certain obsolete references; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 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:

403. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

404. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

405. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1967, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

406. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

407. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of final evaluations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to the provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

408. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on civilian positions in the Defense Department allocated or placed in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, during the calendar year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 1581, title 10, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 168. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; with amendments (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 25). 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. ABBITT:

H.R. 5864. A bill to authorize the lease of burley tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 5865. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land and for the acquisition of outdoor and indoor recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 5866. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain densified wood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 5867. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5868. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual American education programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 5869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5870. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5871. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5872. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 5873. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5874. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States for the purposes of establishing and operating treatment, rehabilitation, and post-hospital-care services for narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5875. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to authorize quality grants for schools of veterinary medicine and scholarships for students of veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 5876. A bill to amend titles 5, 14, and 37, United States Code, to codify recent law, and to improve the code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 5877. A bill to increase the efficiency of, and eliminate political activity in, the Post Office Department by revising the terms of office of the Postmaster General and other top officers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5878. A bill to increase the efficiency of, and eliminate political activity in, the Post Office Department by revising the terms of office of the Postmaster General and other top officers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 5879. A bill to increase the efficiency of, and eliminate political activity in, the Post Office Department by revising the terms of office of the Postmaster General and other top officers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 5880. A bill to increase the efficiency of, and eliminate political activity in, the Post Office Department by revising the terms of office of the Postmaster General and other top officers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 5881. A bill to increase the efficiency of, and eliminate political activity in, the Post Office Department by revising the terms of office of the Postmaster General and other top officers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5882. A bill to increase the efficiency of, and eliminate political activity in, the Post Office Department by revising the terms of office of the Postmaster General and other top officers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 5883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers, and individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 5884. A bill to amend section 101 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the definition of a parent contained therein; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5885. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for optometrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 5886. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Constellation National Historic Site, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5887. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 5888. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1915, relating to the requirements, qualifications, and regulations as to crews of certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5889. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for optometrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5890. A bill to provide for the payment of expenses incurred by members of the uniformed services in traveling home

under emergency leave or prior to shipment outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 5891. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish in the Veterans' Administration a national veterans' cemetery system consisting of all cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5893. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 5894. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5895. A bill to establish the Sandy Hook National Seashore in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5896. A bill to provide additional authority to the Secretary of the Interior for land acquisition in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5897. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5898. A bill to provide for the redesigning of the 5-cent George Washington regular postage stamp so as to incorporate George Washington's immortal words, "To bigotry no sanction"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5900. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 5901. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5902. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to expand and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 5903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 5904. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 5905. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 5906. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to make it a crime to fail to make required contributions to employee pension benefit plans and to permit the Secretary of Labor to bring civil actions to recover such contributions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5907. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 5908. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5909. A bill to authorize the State of Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for schools and other public institutions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 5910. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 5911. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit certain additional income earned by relatives with whom dependent children are living to be disregarded in determining the family's need for aid under a State plan approved thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5912. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to increase (to the level of the other federally aided public assistance programs) the amount of the Federal payments to States thereunder for aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 5913. A bill to repeal the Naval Stores Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 5914. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5915. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5916. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 5917. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5918. A bill to amend section 25 of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 5919. A bill to extend the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act and to increase the annual authorization for such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 5920. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 5921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a family's homestead shall be exempt from levy for Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 5922. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5923. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 5924. A bill for the general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 5925. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 5926. A bill to authorize the Legislative Reference Service to make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 5927. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5928. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5929. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5930. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement of all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits sufficient, in the absence of any other resource, to assure elderly persons freedom from poverty and also to assure elderly persons generally full participation in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for physically, mentally, or vocationally disabled persons aged 18 and over, to provide benefits for certain full-time students aged 18 to 25, to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children, and to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5931. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5932. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 5933. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of Jefferson Davis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 5934. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Secretary of Transportation authority with respect to railroad safety similar to that which he has with respect to motor carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5935. A bill to provide more adequate and realistic penalties for violations of certain safety statutes administered by the Secretary of Transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5936. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Dr. William C. Menninger for his pioneering work in the field of mental health; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5937. A bill to provide for the naturalization of the alien widow of a U.S. citizen when the death of the citizen spouse occurs during a period of honorable service in an active duty status with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5938. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5939. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5940. A bill to place the social security coverage of minsters on a revised basis by providing that the performance of service by an individual as a minister shall constitute covered self-employment for social security purposes unless such individual elects to be exempt from such coverage on grounds of conscientious opposition to public insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5941. A bill to authorize the Legislative Reference Service to make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 5942. A bill to amend section 6 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 5943. A bill 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; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.J. Res. 327. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.J. Res. 328. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 329. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.J. Res. 330. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 331. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.J. Res. 332. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.J. Res. 333. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Federal judges be reconfirmed by the Senate every 6 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.J. Res. 334. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide a voting franchise for 18-year-olds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 338. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.J. Res. 339. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.J. Res. 341. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.J. Res. 342. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 344. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Con. Res. 226. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 227. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDADE:

H. Con. Res. 228. 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 Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Res. 271. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H. Res. 272. Resolution to authorize employment of summer congressional interns; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 273. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McDADE:

H. Res. 274. Resolution establishing a Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Res. 275. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the procedures of committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

26. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to Federal assistance to domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

27. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring Phoebe

Apperson Hearst; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

28. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to urging the Congress to proceed to enact legislation to appropriate full authorization of $170 million for financing of primary national forest conservation roads from the general funds of the U.S. Treasury; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 5944. A bill for the relief of Renzo Grassini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5945. A bill for the relief of Vittorino Brunelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 5946. A bill for the relief of Ettore Perovichi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 5947. A bill for the relief of Florencia H. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5948. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Yannakakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5949. A bill for the relief of Efigenia Agbayani Quitasol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5950. A bill for the relief of Helen and George Andreakos (Mr. and Mrs.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5951. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Dimitropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5952. A bill for the relief of Grigorios Tsioros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 5953. A bill for the relief of Francesco Genova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5954. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara H. Jefferson, her son, Stephen Hillary Jefferson, and her daughters, Anesta Helen and Yolande Hyacinth Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 5955. A bill for the relief of Barry C. Abella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5956. A bill for the relief of Stella Dourou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5957. A bill for the relief of Iphegenia A. Kalogeraki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 5958. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonino Fazzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5959. A bill for the relief of Amalia P. Montero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5960. A bill for the relief of Constantin Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5961. A bill for the relief of Henrique Orang Fernandes Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 5962. A bill for the relief of the Ruberoid Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5963. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Minutolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 5964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lea Beatus and her child Tauba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hani Auspitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 5966. A bill for the relief of Francesco Arsena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 5967. A bill for the relief of Albert P. Morell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5968. A bill for the relief of Gail Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 5969. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virgie M. Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 5970. A bill for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5971. A bill for the relief of Nikola Filipidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 5972. A bill for the relief of Anita Roberta Facey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tran Kim Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

34. Mr. GOODLING presented a resolution of the American Society of Highway Engineers, which was laid on the Clerk's desk, relative to the implications resulting from a curtailment of funds under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1967

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the need for increasing social security payments. On January 18, 1967, I introduced legislation in this body to establish a minimum primary benefit of $100 per month. If any Member of this House would like to hear eloquent testimony as to why this increase is needed now, I urge him to listen to this letter which I received today from a lady in Union City, N.J. The letter reads as follows:

Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS.

DEAR SIR: I agree Social Security benefits should be increased to $100 a month. I am 83 years old, live alone, what can I do with a widow's pension. Yes, it helps, but with rents and living costs so high, I must live economically or the little money I have will soon be gone. What do I see ahead. All I can say, I am glad I am as old as I am, there is nothing to look forward to. Hope this bill will go through fast.

Respectfully,

———— ————.

Mr. Speaker, is this the best that rich, affluent America can do for its senior citizens? Something is sick deep inside this abundant Nation when millions of elderly Americans can gain only consolation from the fact that the years they have remaining are few. I have taken this floor to argue in behalf of the forgotten Americans who are ekeing out a living on the tiniest kind of pensions. Once again, I raise my voice to correct this situation now.

Arizona—Past and Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1967

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we Arizonans are equally proud of our past and our present. There is one man on Capitol Hill who represents them both to us with honor and with dignity. Of course, I refer to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, a most distinguished member of the U.S. Senate.

Senator HAYDEN represents the past because he served as our first U.S. Congressman when our State was admitted to the Union. Throughout the 55 years since he took his oath of office on February 19, his actions and words have made Arizona proud of his service.

I have been especially pleased to serve with him as a member of the Arizona delegation since 1952. His leadership, knowledge and integrity are standards any Congressman would be proud to have as his guides. I wish him the best of luck and thank him for his tireless service, and his personal friendship.

Dr. Stanley Wagner Delivers Opening Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to act as host Congressman today to Dr. Stanley Wagner, rabbi of Baldwin, N.Y., who delivered the opening prayer in the House.

Dr. Stanley M. Wagner has served as rabbi of the Baldwin Jewish Centre, Baldwin, N.Y., for the past 6 years, and currently occupies some of the most important positions within the Long Island Jewish community. He is president of the Long Island Commission of Orthodox