

hold down the cost of living. Is it not time we found out? An authoritative study on trading stamps once remarked that to assume that anyone, but the consumer, paid for the cost of stamps, just like she pays for everything else associated with a business, was patently ridiculous. Is it not?

Just how much business are the trading stamp companies doing a year? We just do not know. And by not knowing, how can we protect the consumer from any irregularities there might be? After all, one stamp company is already issuing more stamps a year than the U.S. Post Office. Stamps are becoming legal tender, they are already a medium of exchange. Are we not obligated to supervise all such items and their extension? In 1961 about 15 percent of total U.S. retail sales were made by stores offering trading stamps. The figures are even more impressive today. Over 43 percent of all food sold each year goes through stores that use stamps—well over a third of all sales of service stations and 15 percent of all drugstore sales, tie in with stamps.

By their very nature, the operations of some trading stamp plans create certain questions. For instance, if we take the figures given by one source on trading stamp sales for 1964—some \$950 million—over \$38 billion in retail sales are tied in to trading stamps. Allowing the companies the 95-percent redemption they claim for tax purposes means that almost \$1 million in unredeemed stamps is distributed each week—\$50 million in sales each week are tied to stamps never to be redeemed. What happens to this money? What are the companies doing with the pool of interest-free tax-free money reserved ad infinitum against stamps that may never be redeemed? What are the redemption rates anyway? Is it true that stamp companies have reserved about one billion tax-free dollars since 1950? Many have questioned the 95-percent figure allowable by the Internal Revenue Service. Does this figure have any basis in reality at all? Stamp companies are more than reticent about releasing their actual figures.

And the questions continue: Are stamps really time purchases? Are they installment buying? It would appear that trading stamp companies have a very low ratio of invested capital to total assets. Thus, they are in the main operating with other people's money just like a savings or commercial bank. Should not they also be regulated in some way as holding a public trust? Is the consumer getting interest for his money? What happens when a stamp company goes out of business—and they have—to these time payments? What right does the stamp company have to change the number of books necessary for an item—a bank cannot change the interest rate in midstream while you are paying back a loan. And are we not already concerned with the great boom in installment buying of which this is a contributing factor?

What about the redemptions themselves? Are the consumers getting items or just value? If there are price rises

attendant on the addition of stamp plans, would it be cheaper for a consumer to go out and buy one of these items in a discount store, or a department store? What is the premium market itself doing to the neighborhood hardware store? Stamp companies are already the largest purchasers of appliances. What is this doing to small business throughout the Nation? Is this unfair competition?

And what about the small man? Can he afford a truly competitive stamp plan? Is the stamp industry running the small retailer out of business? Our whole system of fair trade laws was built up to preserve the small business firm—are we allowing circumvention of the law and its intent to void past legislative decisions?

And what about the intangible effects? What about the old specials, the weekend leaders—that benefited both the consumer and the retailer?

The greatest price rises in foods today are in perishable items—fruits, vegetables, and meats. The drought and shortages account for some of these price increases. It is interesting to note in the last Department of Agriculture study—now 8 years old—these same items were indicated as those in which there was the greatest differential between stamp and nonstamp stores—over 6-percent difference in prices to the consumer. What about the gas stations that offer the consumer the choice between a price discount and trading stamps? Are not they admitting a price rise with stamps?

Are stamps a tie-in sale? What about the question of competitive advantage held by stores which are large enough to own their own stamp companies? Are there instances here of exclusive dealings and price discrimination? What about the practice of proximity selling in the gas station field?

I throw out all of these questions, because I just don't know the answers. But we should. We should as legislators, we should as protectors of the small business man, we should as protectors of the consumer. The questions must be asked and answered. In its own balliwick, the Federal Trade Commission has in the past conducted investigations and fulfilled its statutory authority in this regard—but the paths along which it may tread are narrow, the trees separating it from the other governmental agencies are thick, and the undergrowth plentiful and entangling. The Justice Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business administration, and other governmental agencies and representatives have all, at one time or another, entered the picture. But each was interested in only a segment of the problem, each investigation was rather short lived and confined in scope.

I am asking today that each of these agencies of Government begin anew their studies, coordinating them this time perhaps under the aegis of the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs recently appointed to represent Mrs. Housewife amidst the tangle of Government. But because the machin-

ery of Government is often ponderous and ungainly, in the interim I shall hold an informal factfinding study of my own. Meetings will be held in Washington and New York—companies will be invited to discuss with us their problems and their causes—individuals will be given a chance to air their gripes and present their grievances. You, as Members of Congress, are invited to participate in all phases of these meetings. They will be open and frank.

Some of these questions have been asked before. We never received the full answers. Many of them are new—born of an age when trading stamps have filtered into, and supersaturated, many sectors of the economy.

The American family deserves greater attention to this problem. I ask the Members of this body to find the answers and act accordingly.

Mr. RESNICK. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RESNICK. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this subject up, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks. He did an outstanding job in bringing this to the attention of the Congress and the American people.

Madam Speaker, I share the concern of the gentleman from New York that many of these questions be raised about trading stamps and, for once, be conclusively answered. Studies we do have—and most of them belong to the decade of the fifties—are conflicting; they are the product of either special interest or emotionalism. At this point in our economic development, when we are concerned over the extent of credit buying and rising prices, especially in the food sector, it is important that we know to what extent stamps have contributed to this rise; that we know whether stamps are time purchases, and if so, what happens to the interest charged, or the interest-free capital the stamp company gets. It is important that we learn the workings of a billion-dollar industry. What are the actual redemption rates? What rights does the consumer have if not one of the reputable, but a fly-by-night stamp company goes out of business?

Now we have had extensive experience in our daily lives with stamps—now whole areas of our Nation are blanketed with these little gummed pieces of paper. Can all the stores that carry stamps increase their volume enough to pay for stamps without having to pass this cost on to the consumer? Are the stamp companies exercising enough self-restraint that we could consider them regulating themselves?

What about the complaints of disgruntled merchants—both those who have and who do not have stamps? What about the neighborhood hardware stores? The neighborhood grocery store? What about the owner who is in a constant price squeeze?

In short, I think the gentleman from New York has raised questions which should be answered. We as legislators

must ask questions, we must know something about as massive an industry as one that affects \$42 billion in retail sales. Let us hope the answers will be forthcoming shortly; we have already waited too long for them.

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing the important question of the relationship between trading stamps and food prices before the House today.

This is a problem of deep concern to me. I feel strongly that consumers should be aware of the facts surrounding these stamp plans that so sharply affect the cost of living. Various studies and investigations have been made by Federal agencies in past years, and I recently requested the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Agriculture for data on their inquiries.

I have also recommended to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Consumers Affairs Subcommittee, upon which it is my privilege to serve, the advisability of hearings on trading stamp operations. Under our able chairman, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, this subcommittee has been a highly effective champion of consumer rights. It would be most worthwhile to focus full attention upon this problem that so directly affects American families. The National Commission on Food Marketing held a 3-day hearing on the subject in May, and the testimony developed then should provide most valuable information.

I have further been in communication with Mrs. Esther Peterson, the Special Assistant to the President for Consumers Affairs, as to the need for an educational campaign in stamp plan practices. The undeniable appeal of trading stamps cloaks the additional price paid for essential commodities that their usage necessarily entails—money that could well be used for other purposes if the customer had real freedom of choice. In essence, collecting stamps amounts to buying merchandise on a prepayment plan. Indications are that the higher grocery prices required by the food market to cover the stamp premium exceeds the price the consumer would have to pay were he to shop for his gift with cash.

American families spent 18.5 percent of their disposable income on food products in 1964. With more than 43 percent of food purchases going to stores that use stamps, it is important that we determine the relationship between stamp plans and food prices. As our colleague from New York has observed, stamp companies today are making more money on the sale of food than the food merchant himself.

Apart from protecting consumer rights, a major element in the problem is the burden upon small business firms that are compelled to participate for competitive reasons that in the end are damaging to all but the stamp company. Take, for example, gasoline retailers who are the second largest users of stamps ranking only behind food markets.

Originally, a beginning stamp program can be a boon to a gas station owner. The station's volume increases and the cost of the program is more than offset by increased gallonage. Then, the station across the street sees his business going to his stamp-giving competitor. Out of self defense he too initiates a stamp program. Soon a situation is very likely to arise such as we saw on our own Georgia Avenue here in Washington last November. Ten out of thirteen stations in a 26-block stretch on that street were issuing the same trading stamp.

These retailers were obviously paying for something they were not receiving; that is, a competitive advantage. And the consumer—how many stamps wind up crammed into glove compartments? Who can really believe that the consumer will not pay for these stamps eventually through higher prices that could otherwise be reduced?

The Greater Washington Service Station Association recently polled its membership on the question of using stamps as merchandising tools. Seventy-nine percent of those who responded directed that the association not only be opposed to stamps in any and all forms but take positive, aggressive action to eliminate the existing problem. The association has undertaken a campaign to make consumers aware of the fact that a penny per gallon price savings is a far greater value to the customer than trading stamps.

Trading stamp plans constitute a billion dollar a year industry, with hundreds of companies operating programs. A premium of at least 6 percent is earned by these companies as approximately that percentage of stamps are not redeemed. Incidentally, it should be pointed out that the expense of the stamps is borne by the customers who do not use them, as well as by the users, since the higher prices are paid by all. Those who do not save stamps are charged for merchandise they will never care to claim.

It is time that we took a fresh look, in the light of current circumstances, at the operations and methods of trading stamp companies. There is no thought or desire on my part to inhibit legitimate business activities, but I do feel strongly that there is need for a thorough inquiry into stamp practices and their impact upon the consumer and the retailer.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York [Mr. WOLFF] for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and for raising a series of important and relevant questions about trading stamps and their economic effect.

Stamps have infiltrated merchandising ranks; the price of food has risen. We should be vitally interested, as the gentleman from New York pointed out just a few minutes ago, in any connection that may exist. This issue must be explored in a dispassionate, comprehensive way.

Consumers are concerned about this problem. Who is paying for trading stamps? Is it not the housewife every-

time she goes shopping? Whose money is filling up the multimillion dollar reserves of the companies against stamps that may never be redeemed? Is it ours?

How can we forget studies like the one done by the Agriculture Department in 1957 which showed a 6-percent price differential between stamp and nonstamp stores in the price of fruit and vegetables?

If the price of an evening meal contains part of a new toaster, we should know about it. I want to know about it as a consumer. I want to know about it because the hardware store down the block where I used to buy my toaster is having a hard time. I want to know if the neighborhood grocery store is being squeezed out of the market. I have fought to protect small business.

How many toasters are being bought each year along with our tomatoes and cantaloupe and how many of those toasters are really obtained? Are our consumers getting what they paid for?

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the appropriate Federal agencies conduct a full investigation into the various questions which have been raised. Without proper regulation the distribution of trading stamps is subject to many possible abuses. Action is required before it is too late.

Fe. On Gubser
LOPSIDED ESCALATION OF THE
WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GREEN of Oregon). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, it is my obligation to speak out when I believe we are making serious military mistakes.

President Johnson's policy in Vietnam to the present has received my enthusiastic support. I still support the principle that this Nation has a moral obligation to assist the people of South Vietnam to resist the terrorist tactics of the Communist Vietcong. Americans cannot accept the murdering of civilians including women and children, the pillaging, the torturing, and the cruelty which characterizes Vietcong tactics.

In addition to its moral justification, President Johnson's strong military commitment in southeast Asia is correct on legal grounds and is in our national self-interest. The President and Secretary of State have clearly stated our legal right to be there. Furthermore, our homeland, our system, and our freedom are in jeopardy if we do not take a stand against communism in Asia and if we allow free government to disappear.

My concern is not whether we should be committed to defeating communism in Asia, but whether we are presently going about it in the right way. I believe we are now making two serious mistakes.

First, present administration policy is one of lopsided escalation which accepts the liabilities of escalation and claims few of the benefits.

Present administration policy seems to be one of escalating the ground war and curbing other military action which complements the ground effort.

For many weeks it has been well known that ground-to-air missile installations—SAM sites—have been under construction in the vicinity of Hanoi. The press reports at least two of these sites in an operational condition except for the actual installation of the missiles themselves. Not to have destroyed these sites prior to their completion is indefensible and unforgivable. It cannot be written off as a necessary political decision which follows the tired line that such installations are defensive and to destroy them would be provocative. This is the "Yalu River policy" all over again. In Korea political decisions resulted in men sacrificing their lives without a fair chance to defeat an enemy. This is a mistake which should not be repeated.

No knowledgeable sports fan would tolerate a baseball team without an outfield or a one-armed heavyweight boxer. Why then should a military operation be denied the use of every reasonable strategy which could contribute to victory?

Admittedly, political decisions must influence military policy. But how the destruction of missile sites built for the purpose of shooting down our pilots can be any more provocative than the destruction of a military barracks a few miles away completely evades logical explanation.

It is well known that the docks at Haiphong contain tremendous military fuel storage facilities and that material essential to the Communist war effort flows freely to and from those docks. Numerous courses of action are possible, yet I have seen no published report of any strike against this vital military target. Could it be that political considerations prevent us from denying the use of these docks to England, France, Russia, and other countries which deal freely with the Hanoi Communist Government?

To allow such targets to go unharmed on the basis of arbitrary political decisions and to escalate the ground war at the same time is lopsided escalation and military folly. As the French proved conclusively at Dienbienphu, it commits to fighting a type of war we cannot win. Since the French debacle in 1953, the skills of the Vietcong in terrorist and guerrilla warfare have been increased so markedly that we have even less of a chance of winning a ground war than the French had. I must, therefore, join with other critics of the present policy of lopsided escalation.

A second serious mistake of the present administration is the jealous manner in which it guards decisionmaking. From Washington it controls the selection of both large and small targets and also the method to be used in destroying them. The most serious need in Vietnam today is "on deck" command of the naval forces and on the scene command of ground and air forces.

From conversations with those who have actually seen action in Vietnam, I have learned that targets and the type of armament to be used in their destruc-

tion are assigned from Washington on a mission to mission basis. Frequently enlisted men aboard our carriers have changed the type of weapons loaded on an aircraft two or three times to comply with orders from Washington. A repeat strike against a partially damaged target is not permitted except on specific orders from Washington. If bad weather prevents a photo reconnaissance pilot from photographing his objective on one day, he cannot photograph it the next day while enroute to another objective.

Certainly there must be decisionmaking and target selection from Washington, but it is apparently being carried on to a ridiculous and absurd extent. An ondeck or on-the-scene commander should be assigned a mission and allowed to complete it with techniques, weaponry, and tactics which his experience dictates are the most feasible. As an experienced military man, he should exercise on-the-spot judgment as to whether bombs, rockets, napalm, or other armament would be most suitable for destroying the assigned target. If a second strike within an hour at the same target is required, he should have the power to order it.

Thanks to Washington decisionmaking by remote control, we are deploying sophisticated equipment against relatively unimportant targets while our aircraft overfly meaningful and strategic military targets. We have risked planes costing millions of dollars to destroy individual trucks and vehicles and we have sent B-52's to raid sectors of jungle. Such deployment is wasteful and about as effective as bombing an insect when a flyswatter would do.

The administration has shown great courage in this difficult situation in southeast Asia. By and large our materiel is excellent and our manpower is well trained. What is needed is a reasonable balance between political and military considerations and more on the scene decisionmaking.

THE NAACP IS RIGHTFULLY CONCERNED WITH RELOCATION PROBLEMS OF PEOPLE DISPLACED BY URBAN RENEWAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Madam Speaker, the NAACP is rightfully concerned with relocation problems, since approximately 63 percent of the persons displaced by urban renewal projects are nonwhite. The testimony given to the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations on July 13 by Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP, is particularly worth noting in light of the passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, H.R. 7984, by the House on June 30, 1965. This act contains a title IV which was adapted by the House Special Housing Subcommittee from the suggestions for full compensation by condemnees offered by the Republican minority members in their own housing legislation, H.R. 6501 and its companion measures.

Mr. Mitchell notes in his testimony on S. 1201 that the provisions of this bill are discretionary rather than mandatory. Mr. Mitchell declares that:

In each of these vital sections the word "should" appears instead of "shall." We suggest that if should has the same meaning as shall in the statute then the latter word would be better because then there would be no doubt that these safeguards are binding on an administrative official. Anything less than a clear mandatory requirement will undoubtedly open the door for abuse of the rights of those who are being displaced.

The provisions of S. 1201 are based on a report by the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition. Its provisions for setting fair procedural standards in the housing and urban renewal program were part of the Republican housing bill, H.R. 6501, and were included in the omnibus housing bill, H.R. 7984, passed by the House. The Republicans made the change from "should" to "shall" and from discretionary to mandatory legislation, which Mr. Mitchell has now asked the Senate to provide in all Federal and federally assisted real property acquisition programs.

Mr. Mitchell also touches on the adequacy of relocation procedures and states:

There is a strong suspicion that a careful analysis of the housing now occupied by displaced persons would show that far too many have moved into areas with greater overcrowding and worse slum conditions than the places that they left.

Mr. Mitchell concludes by stating that even the provisions of S. 1201 and S. 1681 being considered by the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations "will not do the whole job." I have been in full agreement with this analysis of the matter for some time, and I believe my own statement to the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations outlines fully and completely the provisions of the just compensation program for condemnees which I am seeking to establish.

I include as part of my remarks the excellent statement by Clarence Mitchell, as well as my own statement to the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations:

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE MITCHELL, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON BUREAU, NAACP, ON FEDERAL RELOCATION ASSISTANCE, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, JULY 13, 1965

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, I am Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Today I am present to express support for the purposes of S. 1681, introduced by Senator MUSKIE, and S. 1201, introduced by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN. Approximately 63 percent of the persons displaced by urban renewal projects are nonwhite. It is almost inevitable when an old or dilapidated area of a community is marked for demolition, improvement, or a change of use, one will find that the largest burden of displacement is borne by those least able to move to another locality without serious financial loss and inconvenience.

The intent of the proposed legislation is to give uniformity and also some administrative flexibility in compensating persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs. The Advisory Com-

July 14, 1965

mission on Intergovernmental Relations in its January 1965 report makes this statement on page 114:

"The Commission concludes that in the interest of (a) expeditious handling of relocation claims, (b) effective provision of an overall system of relocation assistance, including advice as well as compensation, and (c) the needs of those most urgently requiring relocation help, responsibility for determining relocation payments should be vested in administrative agencies subject to maximums established by statute."

From a practical standpoint, it is imperative that those vested with the administrative discretion be given very little room to act in a way that will put the displaced person at a disadvantage.

For example, section 101(a)(3) of the Sparkman bill states that the offering price to the person whose property is being taken "should (not) be less than the appraised fair value." Section 101(a)(6) states:

"The construction or development of public improvements should be so scheduled that no person lawfully occupying real property will be required to move from a dwelling or to move his business or farm operation without at least 180 days' written notice from the head of the Federal agency concerned, of the date by which such move is required."

In each of these vital sections the word "should" appears instead of "shall." We suggest that if should has the same meaning as shall in the statute then the latter word would be better because then there would be no doubt that these safeguards are binding on an administrative official. Anything less than a clear mandatory requirement will undoubtedly open the door for abuse of the rights of those who are being displaced.

Usually, at the community level the pressures to get the job done may outweigh the human considerations. Unless he is certain that the property owner can get redress under the statute, an official dealing face to face with the owner may give lipservice only to permissive regulations. While it is important to get on with roadbuilding, public improvements, and slum clearance, it is equally important to make certain that overzealous officials do not put material results ahead of the rights of people who must move from their homes, their places of business or their farms.

In closing I would like to call attention to pages 114 and 116 of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations report.

The important statements are as follows:

"The Commission recommends that the Congress require that State and local governments administering Federal grant-in-aid programs assure the availability of standard housing before proceeding with any property acquisition that displaces people. This requirement should be at least comparable to that in existing Federal urban renewal legislation, assuring that (a) there is a feasible method for temporary relocation of displaced families and individuals, and that (b) there are or are being provided standard housing units at least as great in number as the number of such displaced families and individuals, available to them, within their financial means, reasonably accessible to their places of employment, and in areas that are not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities than the areas from which they are displaced.

"The Commission recommends that the States enact legislation requiring State and local agencies to assure the availability of standard housing before proceeding with any property acquisition that displaces people. This requirement should assure (a) that there is a feasible method for temporary relocation of displaced families and individ-

uals, and (b) that there are or are being provided standard housing units at least as great in number as the number of such displaced families and individuals, available to them, within their financial means, reasonably accessible to their places of employment and in areas that are not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities than the areas from which they are displaced."

Although it is stated by housing officials that the record of finding homes for displaced persons and families is improving, the figures given do not seem to give the complete story. For example, the Commissioner of Urban Renewal in his 1963 report states that about 46 percent of relocated families whose housing conditions were known went into standard private rental housing, 21 percent into standard sales housing, 25 percent into public housing. About 8 percent went into housing which did not meet the requirements of the locally approved relocation plan. One might well ask what is the significance of the words "whose housing conditions were known?" There is a strong suspicion that a careful analysis of the housing now occupied by displaced persons would show that far too many have moved into areas with greater overcrowding and worse slum conditions than the places that they left.

To the extent that the proposed legislation will correct some of the problems experienced by displaced persons under the present system, it will be most welcome. However, it should be remembered that even these proposals will not do the whole job.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL OF NEW JERSEY BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTER-GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, JULY 13, 1965

I am pleased to appear before your subcommittee on the issue of full and just compensation. In an able speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1965, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE showed how important a matter this is, for he pointed out that Federal and federally assisted programs, particularly housing and urban renewal programs, highway programs, and so on, will annually displace in the next 4 to 8 years 111,000 families and individuals, 18,000 businesses, and 4,000 farm operators.

Senator MUSKIE's bill, S. 1681, would bring the highway and Federal real property acquisition programs up to the compensation standards prevailing in the urban renewal and housing programs. Senator SPARKMAN's bill, S. 1201, which is based on the work of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee, would set procedural standards for all Federal and federally assisted property acquisition programs.

As the ranking minority member of the House Special Subcommittee on Housing, I have been concerned for some time over the inadequacy of compensation received by those forced to give up their property as a result of an eminent domain taking. In January of 1964 I introduced a comprehensive housing bill containing a title devoted solely to the problem of compensation for condemnees. Again, on March 18 of this year, I introduced a comprehensive housing bill, H.R. 6501, containing a similar title which had been expanded to include a revised version of the procedural recommendations made by the House Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee staff report. This was in line with the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee recommendation that the appropriate committee having jurisdiction over a Federal or federally assisted property acquisition program should act within its particular jurisdiction, on the problem.

In arriving at a consensus on what form the suggestions in H.R. 6501 and identical bills introduced by the other Republican members of the House Special Subcommittee on Housing could be included immediately in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, Chairman WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of the Housing Subcommittee, and I consulted with the top officials of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The result is the new title IV of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, H.R. 7984, which the House has since adopted without controversy—on June 30—as part of the total housing package.

In taking this step we also had in mind the statement, in the Senate report on the Housing Act of 1964, that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee would take the matter of just compensation and property acquisition up this year following the completion of the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee study.

In view of the solid progress made by the House, first in the study by the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, and second, by the House Special Subcommittee on Housing in developing title IV of H.R. 7984, it is the hope of those of us in the House who worked on this problem, that the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, when it is signed into law by the President, will contain the just compensation title IV as passed by the House. Nor should it come as any surprise to find the housing and urban renewal laws again setting the pace as far as compensation and property acquisition standards are concerned. These programs involve the displacement of more people, and the failure of more displaced small businesses, than any other federally assisted program.

Title IV of H.R. 7984 covers the full range of Federal programs in the housing and urban renewal fields. It provides the procedural safeguards recommended by the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition and incorporated in H.R. 1201, except that these safeguards are made mandatory rather than suggestive procedures before any funds for acquisition are committed by the Federal Government. In addition, the bill contains a requirement I have been suggesting for some time; namely, that the property owner receive 75 percent of the Government-appraised value of his property immediately, rather than being forced to wait for funds should he decide to contest the full award in court. We expect this to cut down heavily on business failures because of lack of capital for relocation, or the heavy borrowing which homeowners now find necessary in order to buy a new home when the award is being contested and funds are held up.

H.R. 7984 also contains an increase in relocation payments for small businesses from \$1,500 to \$2,500, and the payment of costs for the transfer of real property. In the committee report on H.R. 7984 the administrators of the program are directed to consider insurance and storage fees, and the cost of reinstallation of relocated fixtures as part of the definition of moving costs.

In light of these significant House actions, if the objective of the two bills before your subcommittee, S. 1201 and S. 1681, is to bring the standards of the other Federal and federally assisted programs of property acquisition up to the standards prevailing now in the housing and urban renewal programs, the Senate bills will be incomplete without further amendment. The subcommittee, in effect, will have to run in order to stand still. And I would go further to suggest that even this new effort in the housing and urban renewal field represents only an increase in the minimum equitable treatment that our citizens can rightfully expect from their Government. For example, if

moving expenses can be defined to include reinstallation of fixtures, there is no reason why it cannot be defined to include reinstallation of equipment as well. It had been my understanding that this would be included in the House committee report, but a late-hour objection by the HHFA, on totally specious grounds, prevailed. Similarly, the entire arbitrary limitation of \$25,000 on business moving expenses, administratively determined, deserves reexamination. This arbitrary figure, in its lack of sufficient reimbursement for some, and its potential for abuse through overreimbursement for others, points up the need to consider a more useful approach for arriving at just compensation awards.

If this subcommittee seeks the opportunity to make a significant breakthrough in this field, rather than continue the more routine approach to the problem, I would suggest that it examine the possibility of substituting a replacement cost concept for the present actual value concept used to determine compensation for property taken. It is the only way I know of to avoid the pitfalls of arbitrary awards and ad hoc solutions and yet still reflect in the award such items as business reopening expenses, loss of rents or profits on a temporary basis, and the increase in price for suitable replacement homes as a result of a decreased supply and an increased demand occasioned by clearance and relocation. By accepting this new concept for Federal and federally assisted acquisition programs, Congress would set a persuasive example for the States to follow, which could then be applied without question to all Federal and federally assisted property acquisition programs.

I would urge the careful consideration by this subcommittee of the replacement cost concept, particularly as contained in my bill, H.R. 6501. In order to take up no further time of the subcommittee, I would simply like to request your permission to include for the record at this point a copy of title IV of H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 as passed by the House; that section of the House Banking and Currency Committee report dealing with title IV; a copy of that title of my bill, H.R. 6501, dealing with compensation for condemnees; and a section-by-section analysis of my compensation suggestions. None of these items are particularly long, but I do believe that they will be useful to the subcommittee in determining what action to take in this highly important field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. DULSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL TEACHERS CORPS

(Mr. PERKINS (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Madam Speaker, on Friday, July 2, in his address before the National Education Association in New York, President Johnson announced that he would propose a National Teachers Corps.

In his speech he said, and I quote him: I will propose a National Teachers Corps to enlist thousands of dedicated teachers to work alongside of local teachers in city slums and in areas of rural poverty, where they can serve their Nation. They will be young

people, preparing for teaching careers. They will be experienced teachers willing to give a year to the places in their country that need them the most.

Today, I am introducing a bill which puts the President's proposals into form and places those proposals before us here in Congress. This proposal is particularly appropriate at this time as the General Subcommittee on Education is conducting hearings on legislation to strengthen the quality of elementary and secondary education by a program of fellowships for teacher graduate study.

The bill I am introducing will enlist thousands of dedicated teachers to serve their country and their fellow citizens; a bill which will offer thousands of young people the opportunity to channel the boundless energies of youth into learning, teaching, and serving; a bill which will make it possible for teachers whose dedication has long been acknowledged as a source of national strength to share their valuable experience and training with those who—although equally dedicated—have not had the opportunity to gain experience and training. Today, I am proposing that we establish a National Teachers Corps which will offer to children in the Nation's schools the same opportunity which we offered to the people around the world when we established the Peace Corps.

When the Peace Corps was established, it was deluged with offers of service from thousands of people who were eager to share experience and training with others. Thousands of people willing to work—not for money—but for mankind. We tapped a reservoir of talent just waiting to be used. This reservoir is still full—full of energy, talent, and willingness to serve.

The National Teachers Corps will further tap the reservoir. It will serve as another means to channel dreams, energy, and talent into reality, work, and purpose.

The dedication in the measure the President called for is no stranger to the American character. It has been demonstrated in peace and war, in youth and age, at home and abroad. It is an element essential to the success of the National Teachers Corps and one about which our minds may be at rest. The American teacher will respond to this challenge with all the strong sense of mission, all the good and purposeful energy, that this exciting opportunity affords. And this opportunity to serve will appeal most to the teachers with the greatest sense of mission—those best suited to the tasks at hand.

The National Teachers Corps would be designed to bring able and spirited teachers to our most disadvantaged rural and urban schools and to attract into the teaching profession highly qualified young Americans like those who have made the Peace Corps such a brilliant success.

The Teachers Corps will recruit experienced teachers who are able—through their experience and training—to work and teach effectively in areas where poverty has placed children at a disadvantaged—where poverty has deprived them of the educational opportunities which

are available to other children. The Teachers Corps will also recruit talented college graduates—though they are not experienced teachers—who are qualified to serve as teacher-interns among young people—setting an example of what education can do as well as imparting knowledge.

In the proposal I am introducing, all members of the Teachers Corps would join for up to 2 years of service. For the teacher-interns this would be 2 years of service and professional training. Training would be provided by colleges and universities on a contract basis. After 3 months of intensive training at a university, teaching teams, made up of teacher-interns and led by experienced teachers, would work in schools providing the services and skills which are needed at that school.

The interns would continue to receive professional training while teaching through seminars in curriculum, teaching methods, and other teacher training subjects.

The teachers and teacher-interns would be made available to schools in areas with high concentrations of low-income families. Their salaries would be the same as the salaries of other teachers in those schools with similar experience, education, and duties.

The bill I am introducing has guarantees against Federal control of the corpsmen after they are selected by the schools. Local schools will retain complete control of their curriculums and administrations. Teacher corpsmen will be subject to the same regulations which the school places on its regular staff.

I am sure that I need not detail the need for a program to assist schools with high concentrations of low-income families.

Congress has now studied this problem intensely for 2 years. We have already, in this session, passed a major education bill to develop programs for the education of disadvantaged children. We passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which contains more than a billion dollars for the education of educationally deprived children.

Some of the difficulties of poverty-stricken school districts will be solved as a result of grants available to them under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They will be able to expand programs to take in remedial and special teaching. They will be able to upgrade teacher's salaries when necessary to retain and secure qualified personnel in schools serving concentrations of low-income students.

Schools all across the country are now developing programs as a result of this legislation. Most of the programs being developed require the hiring of new personnel—new teachers who are qualified to teach in the programs that are planned.

With the funds these schools are now receiving, they will be in a position to recruit experienced, talented teachers—the teachers which the new programs require—but this takes time—more time than is available. Moreover, they will be recruiting in a field which is already lacking in qualified teachers.

July 14, 1965

According to the National Education Association the national supply of new teachers fell more than 100,000 teachers short of the 248,000 new teachers needed.

The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act makes this shortage even more acute.

The Office of Education now estimates that the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has created a demand for almost 30,000 teachers this fall—teachers who are qualified to teach in programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children. Two years from now this demand will be 65,000; 65,000 teachers which must be trained now but are not now in training.

The shortage of qualified teachers is most acute in rural areas of poverty. Children in rural areas, in some ways are even more disadvantaged than those in the slums of the big cities. Rural school districts simply have not had the funds to pay their teachers adequate salaries. Rural children have not had access to the public facilities—such as libraries and museums—which are located in the cities.

I am personally most familiar with the teacher shortage in our rural areas and small communities.

More prosperous areas of the country have been able to attract new highly qualified teachers with the result that communities which have limited resources are losing young teachers and are not attracting new teachers. We have reached the point that we now have to rely on dedication to duty to hold our teachers. We know and appreciate this dedication and service—we also know that dedication is not limited to teachers in our own areas.

There are dedicated teachers and young people in every community in the Nation—who want to serve for the sake of service.

We, who have received and appreciated the benefits of dedicated service, would like to offer dedicated individuals across the Nation the opportunity to show their dedication to us in our schools. Teacher corpsmen with experience, talent, training, and duty would be welcomed in these communities throughout America.

Fe Ows Evans
VIETNAM REPORT BY SMALLTOWN
NEWSPAPER EDITOR

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. William "Bill" Dyer, U.S. Army Reserve, former editor of the Smithville, Tenn., Review, was invited by the Department of the Army as a rural editor to visit Vietnam and give a firsthand report on the conditions as he saw them in southeast Asia.

Mr. Dyer, a resourceful reporter and an experienced news analyst, recently in an address to the National Editorial Association and Texas Press Association meeting in Dallas, Tex., gave a firsthand report on the situation in southeast Asia. I believe that my colleagues, the press,

and others will find his speech in the general interest.

Under unanimous consent, I include this speech in the body of the Record.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN TO THE NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AND TEXAS PRESS ASSOCIATION MEETING IN DALLAS, TEX., JUNE 19, 1965, BY BILL DYER, FORMER EDITOR OF THE SMITHVILLE REVIEW, SMITHVILLE, TENN.

Ladies and gentlemen, there was once a time when a reporter returning from the field of battle with bad news was beheaded.

I, therefore, fear the worst from you, for I, too, returning from a 2-week tour of South Vietnam have news that is anything but heartening.

I ask your indulgence, however, and pray that you will forego the beheading until I have finished. At that time you may cut me down at your leisure with your questions.

To be very blunt about it, and I think that is what you want, the war in southeast Asia is not going so good. Actually we hold less ground than we did at this time last year, in spite of the fact that the number of troops we have in Vietnam has spiraled up and up and up.

And before this summer is gone—a summer that will be long and hot in places other than Selma, Ala., and Detroit, Mich.—yes; before the leaves fall from the trees this winter, we will have in excess of 70,000 troops in South Vietnam.

However, I can express the belief of the people to whom I talked—and that runs the gamut from a two-star general of marines to a West Virginia lance corporal—these people say, "We will win this war if the people back home stick by us."

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen of the press, could they ask anything else?

Although a half world removed from continental United States, Vietnam has become a household word in America as world attention focuses on events shaping the destiny of southeast Asia.

In Vietnam a massive effort is being waged to combat Communist insurgents to allow the 14 million people of this young Asian Republic to live in freedom and peace.

The Republic of Vietnam is about the size of the State of Washington. It stretches in a 700-mile arc. For the most part it is 50 to 150 miles wide and lies next to Laos and Cambodia, and borders on the South China Sea. The country has a spine of dense jungle-covered mountains extending from north to south, almost reaching Saigon, its capital. South of the densely populated capital city area, the flat, fertile, canal-laced "rice bowl" or Mekong Delta extends to the Gulf of Thailand.

Because of its strategic coastal location, Vietnam has for centuries been an important factor in southeastern Asian affairs. Today its richness in natural resources, particularly food and rubber, makes South Vietnam a coveted prize by food-short North Vietnam and Communist China.

Rice production in the rich Mekong Delta alone has the yet untapped potential of feeding the combined populations of South and North Vietnam and still having a surplus for export.

The Republic of Vietnam is a vivid manifestation of a nation determined, with assistance from other free world nations, to check the spread of Communist oppression. In addition to United States aid, assistance is being provided by 16 countries including the Republics of Korea and China, the Philippines, New Zealand, Thailand, and Australia. However, it is South Vietnam itself that carries the brunt of the anti-Communist battle with nearly half a million men and women serving in the Armed Forces.

Although the Communist movement in South Vietnam dates from the early 1930's, the present Vietcong (Vietnamese Commu-

nists) structure traces from the signing of the Geneva accords in 1954 that presumably ended the Indochina War. As 80,000 Viet Minh (Communist) troops allegedly withdrew to North Vietnam following expulsion of French Forces in Indochina, a cleverly concealed nucleus remained behind to prey on the New Republic of South Vietnam.

From 1954, the Vietcong in South Vietnam concentrated on establishing rural political cadres and on exploitive propaganda.

In 1960, Ho Chi Minh, the Communist leader in Hanoi, realized that political and propaganda actions alone could not subvert the government in Saigon which was already receiving substantial U.S. aid. Plans were made in North Vietnam to include military operations in the Communist formula by infiltrating large numbers of reinforcements to the underground Vietcong Forces in South Vietnam during the rainy season of 1961. Thereafter Vietcong violence broke out almost everywhere, necessitating much greater effort by South Vietnam with increased support from the United States to contain it.

The current struggle in South Vietnam cannot be classified as an internal conflict between dissident guerrillas and a weak government.

The magnitude of the conflict is revealed by the fact that Vietcong main and local force units number more than 30,000 full-time soldiers. Also there are perhaps 80,000 or more irregulars who work as farmers by day and often undertake guerrilla actions by night. These forces are supplied with leaders, technicians, replacements, modern weapons and logistic support from North Vietnam. Their obvious intent is the replacement of the South Vietnamese government by a pawn of the Communist regime in North Vietnam.

The Vietcong, though active throughout most of the countryside, have a few regions in which they are particularly strong. These areas, known as secret bases or war zones, are located in remote difficult terrain and serve as the rear base for Communist activity in South Vietnam. Five of the strongest Vietcong bases are: the U. Minh Forest in the delta; the Plain of Reeds, an inundated area west of Saigon near Cambodia; War Zone C in Tay Ninh Province northwest of Saigon; War Zone D in Phuoc Thanh Province, northeast of Saigon; and the Do Xa area in the mountains far north of Saigon.

The large Vietcong force, supported in varying degrees by perhaps one-quarter of the rural people and established in some areas for more than 20 years, represents a formidable enemy. The military aspects of battle involve separating the VC from their base of popular and logistic support and eliminating the VC themselves as organized military forces responsive to political direction.

The enemy is highly elusive since, except for his secret bases, he has no territory to defend. He operates mostly during hours of darkness; he withdraws and disperses into the countryside when opposed by superior forces; he attacks without warning when the situation is most favorable; and he stands and fights only when he chooses to do so. The Vietcong are known to plan attacks in meticulous detail, often training for and practicing an operation for weeks or even months using sandtable drills and, at times, fullscale mockups of the target.

The battle is further complicated by the difficulty of distinguishing friend from foe since both sides are primarily Vietnamese.

I saw one engagement by troops of the 7th Division (ARVN) in which the soldiers identified themselves by placing large red scarves around their necks.

The Vietcong are able to conceal their weapons and blend easily with the population. As a result, the battlefield has neither front nor rear. This is a war with no conventional battlelines.

Ethnic minorities such as the Chinese, Cambodians, mountain tribesmen and religious sects play important roles in the struggle, thereby emphasizing the political aspects of the counterinsurgency battle.

Activity waxes and wanes as the Vietcong shift areas or emphasis and tactics. Likewise, the government has the ability to concentrate its resources in various regions and on different activities. Recognizing that it is not necessary to kill all the Communists in South Vietnam in order to establish law and order throughout the country, the Government of Vietnam devotes the bulk of its resources in an effort to pacify the rural countryside.

Simply stated, pacification is the sum total of integrated military-economic-political-psychological-sociological efforts to win the support of the people by providing security and meeting their aspirations for social and economic justice.

The present pacification program to restore government control is based upon the oil spot concept of extending control by gradual expansion from a secure to a less secure area in the manner of an oil droplet spreading over a surface. As seen in many pictures from Vietnam, U.S. forces do such things as distribute clothing to children. It is hoped that through friendly gestures the people will learn to feel secure and safe in the hands of the Government.

In order to expand the size of an already secure area or base, the region around it is first cleared by destroying or displacing Vietcong military units and driving the Vietcong political structure out or underground. When the balance in the so-called contested zone has tipped in favor of the Government, securing operations can be started to provide protection for the population, to reinstitute and strengthen the Government structure and to develop a better social and political life in the area.

Once an area is secure and becomes part of the expanded oil spot, pacification activities can reach out to the next area and repeat the process of clearing and securing. Meanwhile efforts continue inside the oil spot to develop the area economically, politically, and socially in order to demonstrate that life under Government auspices is to be preferred.

The most extensive pacification operation began in September 1964 in the area surrounding Saigon. Called Hop Tac, which means cooperation in Vietnamese, the operation involves the integration of military and civilian elements, both Vietnamese and United States.

The project is supported and assisted by the major U.S. agencies in Vietnam with the military assistance command exercising coordination responsibility.

Traditionally, wars are fought because of political differences, and the Republic of Vietnam's battle against Communist-inspired insurgency is no exception. The Communists want to rule the country. Their aggression, founded on political and social grounds, cannot be defeated by military action alone. Economic, political and social measures designed to prove that the Government's programs are superior to Communist promises are equally important. This is what pacification seeks to accomplish. Fitted against the Vietcong are the sizable and capable Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam.

Army, Navy, and Air Force units, operating under a single high commander, are daily involved in thousands of separate but related actions ranging in size from a squad ambush to a regimental combat team, supported by air and naval units, in an attack against an enemy reinforced battalion. The capabilities of the individual Vietnamese fighting man are highly regarded by the courage and endurance he constantly displays.

South Vietnam's Army (ARVN) of over 300,000 men consists of 9 divisions and 4 corps. Plans are underway to increase

it further. With modern equipment selected for the character of operations it undertakes, the ARVN organization is tailored to the type of terrain and enemy it faces.

In addition to the regular forces, the Nation has paramilitary forces numbering approximately 200,000 divided almost equally between regional and popular forces.

The regional forces, assigned to the provinces, augment the regular forces and are particularly active in pacification. Their availability frees more powerfully equipped army units for operations against major Vietcong units and base areas.

Popular (or people's) forces, who are natives of the area, provide village level protection to the rural population living in hamlets. These forces are not purely defensive since they must carry out, by day and by night, small unit offensive actions to search out Vietcong guerrillas who seek to interrupt pacification by harassing and terrorizing the people.

The scope of the military effort is indicated by the average of about 2,400 monthly incidents of Vietcong attacks, assassinations, terrorism, kidnappings and sabotage. More than 550 South Vietnamese soldiers are killed monthly as a result of insurgent activities, while some 1,800 Communists are killed, captured or defect each month.

Objectives of the U.S. assistance in Vietnam are to assist the South Vietnamese Government to achieve peace and stability. This requires considerable aid and advice in developing a viable economy, instituting a sound system of social and economic justice, building a stable, popular government, and developing armed forces that can provide defense for the country.

Responsibility for achieving these objectives is the U.S. mission to Vietnam, headed by the U.S. Ambassador. Agencies responsive to the Ambassador, which assist in the various aspects of countering the insurgents and building a nation, are the U.S. Embassy, the U.S. Operations Mission (USOM), the U.S. Information Service (USIS) and the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV). The Embassy deals with political and social stabilization; USOM is involved with social and economic development; USIS is concerned with information and psychological operations; and MACV is charged with military security matters.

The U.S. Armed Forces through the personnel and equipment of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV) are playing a significant role in helping the Republic of Vietnam maintain a free and independent government. With the mission of advising the Republic of Vietnam armed forces, members of MACV continue to perform their vital task with zeal and skill. By performing their jobs persuasively and skillfully, they are progressively working themselves out of jobs. The nature of the assignment requires the presence of advisory personnel only until the battle is won and a fully capable defense force is developed—no longer.

Professionalism is the cornerstone of advisory activities and associations in Vietnam. A highly select body of American service personnel are accomplishing their assistance mission in a thoroughly professional manner, despite the myriad challenges of service in a strange land engaged in a life and death encounter with tyranny.

Since I am on the subject of advisers, there is one group of which I cannot say enough. If it is possible to fall in love with a group of men, without being called an ugly word, I fear I am guilty. For I believe one of the finest aggregates of men I ever knew is in the 5th Special Forces Group in Vietnam. These skilled men are located throughout the republic in isolated locales training and working with the indigenous personnel to establish protective security. Organizing the populace into integrated

teams, the Special Forces soldier is proving his mettle.

Ladies and gentlemen of the NEA and TPA, I will be frank to say that I went to Vietnam with a cynic's view. I had mixed emotions, but my concern was for the lives of men being lost in this struggle. I wondered, and maybe some of you have, if the struggle is worth the cost. After all, Vietnam is a small country with a small population, so why spend millions of dollars daily to help save it from communism?

After being there, I feel differently. I feel now that we should save this country at all costs.

As one editorial writer put it, "The question of whether we should be in Vietnam at all has long since become academic. It is like the man who was in jail for something for which he could not be put in jail. He was there. And so are we."

The issue as I see it now is that our mission in Vietnam is to help the Vietnamese people attain peace and stability. The issue at stake is all—and I repeat, all—of southeast Asia. And the word I got there to bring back to you is help us in the fight. Support us with everything you have. Be critical if you must, but justly criticize.

America and South Vietnam can win this struggle. It will be long, and it will be hard. But it can be won.

And in the words of another editorialist, "We have finally gone to war in Vietnam. And now we must win."

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE HUDSON RIVER EAST BANK SUPERHIGHWAY

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would direct the Secretary of Commerce not to make Federal aid funds available for the proposed superhighway along the east bank of the Hudson River, which was authorized by the New York State Legislature in its recent session and approved by Governor Rockefeller.

The proposed superhighway would not only threaten the program for preserving the scenic beauty and recreational potential of the Hudson River, but it would also necessarily cut across the community of Riverdale and Van Cortlandt Park in Bronx County.

At the very least no such drastic decision affecting the future of the area should be made without extensive public hearings and consultation with the communities involved. I join with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], who has today introduced an identical bill, in expressing the hope that the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee will hold such hearings in the area affected in the near future.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Riverdale Press of July 8, 1965, a weekly newspaper which has deservedly won many awards for excellence and for service to the community:

[From the Riverdale (N.Y.) Press, July 8, 1965]

WE OPPOSE THE HUDSON EXPRESSWAY
More than 350 years have passed since Hendrik Hudson anchored the *Half Moon*

off Spuyten Duyvil. Many controversies have raged over the Hudson River since then. No year in the past, however, has matched 1965 for the amount of attention given to this majestic waterway. Riverdale is especially concerned, since the Hudson forms our western boundary.

A Riverdalian, George Perkins, was chiefly instrumental in preserving the Palisades along the New Jersey shore for the permanent enjoyment of generations to come. But the Riverdale shoreline has suffered.

In one corner, below Kappock Street, apartments have been crowded together so that narrow streets are all but impassable. What should have been a beautiful residential area has been permitted to become an unplanned, uncomfortable jumble of unprepossessing buildings.

Our park along the river has never been developed. Erosion has taken a heavy toll. What's left has been torn up during the construction of new sewers so that the river edge looks like an Appalachian strip mining operation. We doubt that it will be restored to beauty for years to come.

Riverdale is far from alone in its concern over the future of the Hudson. At Cornwall, conservationists are fighting a vigorous battle against a proposed Con Edison development. They fear its effect both on scenic beauty and the spawning of fish. The current drought has turned the attention of the city toward the possibility of using the Hudson as a source of water supply. And there is increased concern over the preservation of waterfront areas from continued pollution.

Hearings to be held tomorrow and Saturday at Hawthorne Junior High School, in Yonkers, will discuss the scenic Hudson Riverway bill, cosponsored by Congressman BINGHAM. The measure was introduced to enable the Secretary of the Interior to preserve the river's scenic and recreational values. Uncertain, as yet, are the steps to be taken to extend the Secretary's authority to New York City.

Meanwhile the State legislature has passed, and Governor Rockefeller has signed into law, another bill to establish a Hudson Scenic Expressway along the river bank. This would transform Route 9 into a superhighway, extending from Beacon to New York City.

Of special concern to Riverdale is a proposal to link this highway with the Major Deegan Expressway via an extension at some point in the Bronx. The only possible road of this type would have to cut across Riverdale.

State officials have said they will do everything possible to retain the river's scenic beauty. Information concerning plans for the highway has been limited, but a series of hearings for communities to be affected has been proposed. We hope Riverdale will be considered among those areas entitled to be heard.

The Henry Hudson Parkway now splits Riverdale in half. Access roads to the heavily traveled Major Deegan Expressway now create bottlenecks and add to traffic hazards. We believe another superhighway cutting across Riverdale would cause irreparable damage to the community.

First of all, what's left of Riverdale's waterfront would be lost forever. No matter how hard he tries, the highway commissioner cannot preserve scenic beauty by substituting a ribbon of concrete for a stretch of greenery and woodlands. Secondly, what we least need is the noise, confusion, and air pollution of thousands of cars on a main artery cut through our residential sections.

The new expressway will entail tremendous expense as well as dislocation. An easier solution to the mass transportation problem is so obvious, that we wonder why it has been bypassed. That solution lies in implementing rail commuter service.

The proposed new highway parallels the tracks of the New York Central. Fast, comfortable transportation could be provided for thousands of riders by modernizing the rail system. Legislation enabling such a move has already been passed. Precedents have been established. Other cities have fast, modern commuter service. Why not offer this convenience to Hudson Valley communities?

There is an obvious inconsistency between Federal efforts to preserve scenic and recreational values and the State's plan to build an expressway. We cannot have both. Of the two proposals, we favor the measure introduced in Congress. We see no necessity for an expressway that will mean the permanent destruction of a riverfront that has been despoiled already, almost beyond the hope of preservation and restoration.

A WELCOME TO THE 91ST ANNUAL SHRINERS CONVENTION

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome all the many thousands of members of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine of North America who have arrived this week in our Nation's Capital for their 91st annual convention.

As an organization, the Shriners are an outstanding example of a group dedicated to a living, vital Christianity and to the great democratic ideals which have built and strengthened America. The 838,000 members of this organization are men who believe in the united, humanitarian action of free men in accepting the responsibilities that come with citizenship in the world's greatest democracy. Through their sponsorship of the amazingly successful Shriners' hospitals for crippled children, they are demonstrating the best concepts of community and national service.

Founded in New York in 1872, Shrinedom has spread across our Nation. And as the late Hubert N. Poteat, a Past Imperial Potentate wrote:

If there is one thing our harassed world needs more than another today, it is brotherly love.

As a group the Shriners are men of reverent mind, merry heart, and a distinct humanitarian vein. Back in 1888, Jacksonville, Fla., was almost laid waste by a tragic epidemic of yellow fever. Five thousand were affected before cold weather could destroy the virus. To their great credit, the members of the Shrine organized themselves into a relief corps and through their donations of personal labor and more than \$10,000 initiated the order's first major charity.

In the years that followed, every imperial potentate urged Shriners everywhere to carry on the works of charity, with the results of these pleas culminating in today's multimillion-dollar annual program for the Shriners' hospitals for crippled children.

These hospitals have been the soul of the Shriners. The first cornerstone was laid in 1922 in Shreveport, La. Today this program has expanded to a total of

17. These hospitals are among the Nation's most modern, progressive, and well equipped, and are offering free care and love to thousands of young children who so badly need it. One of these very excellent hospitals is located in my home city of Massachusetts in Springfield. It has been offering hope and health to the children of the area since 1925.

An extremely significant new program has recently been added to the already heavy obligations of the Shriners. Young burn patients, long the most neglected of the pediatric wards, have gained a new friend. The Shriners have now put both feet forward in a mighty attempt to alleviate the crucial problems in this area.

In November of 1963 the first Shriners' Burns Institute was opened in Galveston, Tex. Two others followed in Cincinnati and Boston. These are interim operations being carried out in rented space in already existing hospitals. But in these three locations, two new and modern Shriners' Burns Institutes are now under construction and the third will be by next fall. It is a mighty undertaking in an area of serious need.

The Shriners of America like parades and they like good fun, but they are also seriously in pursuit of a better life for the unfortunate young children of our Nation, children who with help and love can become productive, vital citizens of this Nation.

And the next time those of us who are sports fans enjoy the excitement of the annual Shriners' East-West football game, maybe we should pause a moment and remember that it is more than a football game.

It is a classic of love and sacrifice for a goal that transcends the yards gained, the passes thrown, or the runners stopped. This is a game played that Joe, with two clubfeet, may walk and even run and play like other children. It is played for little Mary, who lies in a plaster cast as the curve is removed from her spine. It is played for Ralph and Ruth, Nancy and Bill, Sue and Dick—white, black, yellow, Protestant, Jew, and Catholic—who lie in the Shriners' hospitals, and for the others who are waiting to reach that mansion of mercy.

We are proud to have the Shriners in Washington.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR FUNERAL EXPENSES

(Mr. WHITE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, death to a member of an economically less fortunate family or a family of moderate means strikes a blow that is doubly cruel to that family. The grief from the loss of a loved one is coupled with the financial hardship incurred by the payment of funeral expenses of that loved one. An equitable method exists for the Congress to minimize this terrible financial hardship—an income tax deduction to the members of the decedent's family

for the expenses surrounding the funeral of the loved one.

Present law makes a deduction available to wealthier members of our society through the computation of the Federal estate tax which may be due on the estate of the deceased. But this existing deduction is meaningless to people of moderate means. The conscience of the Nation in recent years has been directed toward the hardships of the less-advantaged citizen and it is appropriate at this time to make some reasonable deduction available to this group of Americans.

I am today introducing legislation to make available a modest income tax deduction to those family members who actually pay the funeral expenses of one of their loved ones. The bill would, in the usual case, allow the widow or other family member to deduct a total of up to \$500 for funeral expenses paid with respect to the deceased. If family members are entitled to receive lump-sum death payment or a funeral or burial expense allowance—generally \$250—under the Social Security Act, veteran's benefit legislation, or other Federal law, the total deduction made available by the bill would be reduced to \$250.

In recognition of the fact that several family members may contribute to the payment of the total amount of funeral expenses, the bill provides that the allowable deduction is to be allocated to each contributing individual in proportion to the amount of funeral expenses he paid, reduced by the amount of the lump-sum payment he received.

To avoid misuse of this new deduction, the bill also provides that any amount allowable to a family member as an income tax deduction shall not also be allowable to the decedent's estate in computing its Federal estate tax liability, making only one deduction for the funeral expense allowable. This is consonant with present law.

This income tax deduction while allowable to each American taxpayer, will be most significant to the citizen of modest means who is stricken by the loss of a loved one.

THE "BREAD TAX" ARGUMENT IS FALSE

(Mr. PURCELL (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of the House to published reports that the giants of the baking industry have hired a Washington lobbyist to work for the defeat of the Johnson administration's farm bill.

I pointed out to my colleagues of the House that this insidious attack on the farm bill is being carried out under the smokescreen of a "bread tax" propaganda smear.

I want to keep reminding my colleagues of this cunning, deceitful campaign by the big baking companies, and I want to emphasize the fallacy of the fraudulent argument they are putting up.

We heard this same argument last year when the voluntary wheat certificate program was before Congress. It was a false argument then, and it has proven to be false.

Opponents of the program last year made dire predictions that its passage would surely result in higher bread prices to the consumer, but it didn't.

Consumer prices for wheat products have remained stable. Bread prices in the the past 12 months have averaged around 21 cents a loaf or less, virtually unchanged from the period before the certificate program went into effect.

And yet the wheat certificate program has meant about \$450 million more in farm income to the wheatgrowers than they would have received without the program. And wheat program costs to the taxpayer were \$300 million lower than the year before.

Publicly owned wheat stocks have been reduced by about 150 million bushels below the previous marketing year.

And yet profits to wheat users thus far in 1965, according to recent Standard & Poor's surveys, are higher in nearly every case than for the same period in 1964.

The bakers are a lot better off financially than the farmers who grow the wheat, and they get a lot more than the farmer does for the loaf of bread they sell.

The bakers, however, do not seem to want to give the farmer parity of income with his city brethren. And they do not seem to want to reduce the costs of Government farm programs.

The immediate goals of this administration's farm program now before Congress are these:

First. To raise farm income by \$250 million a year.

Second. To reduce farm program costs by \$200 million a year.

Third. To cut back Government-held stocks of farm commodities and reduce storage and handling costs.

The extension of the voluntary wheat certificate program in the bill before Congress is a key feature of the legislation.

Yet we hear it attacked and smeared by its opponents as "bread tax" legislation.

Well, now, let us just see how much money the farmer gets for the wheat in a loaf of bread compared to what the bakers and wholesalers and the retailers get.

In the years from 1947 through 1949 when the retail price of bread averaged 12.7 cents, the farmer's share of that loaf of bread was only 2.7 cents for the wheat in that bread.

By February of this year the average retail price of a loaf of bread had risen to just under 21 cents, but the farmer was still getting only 2.7 cents for the wheat in that loaf of bread.

Now, the Secretary of Agriculture has stated repeatedly that the bill now before Congress will provide the wheat farmer an increase of seven-tenths of a cent for the wheat used in a loaf of bread by domestic bakers.

This would be the first time in 15 years that the wheat farmer has had an

increase in his share of the returns from a loaf of bread.

And yet the wheat-users are threatening that if the share of the farmer is increased by seven-tenths of a cent, the price of bread will be increased 2 cents a loaf.

Why, Mr. Speaker, would this be so? Who would be imposing a bread tax on the consumer? It would not be the farmer. It would not be this administration. It would be the bakers and the wholesalers and the retailers.

The farmer today actually receives 15 percent less for the food he produces than he did in 1947-49, while prices paid by consumers for food have risen by 31 percent.

Since 1947-49 the cost of farm-grown food has risen only 14 percent, but the processing and marketing costs have risen 42 percent.

Expenditures per person for food in the United States increased by \$105 from 1950 to 1964. But of this \$105 a year increase in the cost of food, the farmer got only \$1 and the processing and marketing firms got \$104.

Mr. Speaker, let us be done with all this nonsense about the administration's wheat program constituting a "bread tax" on the consumer.

We need to enact this program, Mr. Speaker, to raise farm income, to reduce Government costs to the taxpayer, and to cut back surplus grain stocks.

Let us not be fooled by any fraudulent "bread tax" arguments against it.

HEAD START

(Mr. WAGGONER (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker an editorial concerning the administration of the "Head Start" program appeared in the July 5 issue of the Shreveport Journal which deserves the attention of every Member.

It makes a single point and it is one to which I wholly subscribe: That the program has, in the headlong rush to pour out the funds appropriated, granted funds to just about everyone except those who are qualified to administer the program. There are some exceptions, I am sure, but they are few and far between.

I commend this editorial to the attention of the House and congratulate the editor of the Journal for a forthright and clear insight into the mistakes that have been made in this program so far.

HEAD START PROGRAM RUSHED

Operation Head Start officially gets underway this week with projects in some 2,300 communities hastily set up to prepare preschool-age children from culturally deprived homes for entering the first grade next fall. It was conceived as a \$17 million program to offer assistance to 100,000 children this summer, but the antipoverty planners became so enthusiastic about it that the program has reached \$84 million proportions, extending help to 560,000 children.

Ten Head Start projects have been approved for Caddo and Bossier Parishes. Negro churches, nurseries, day-care centers, and a PTA group are sponsoring these units.

Although school boards in some cities are acting as sponsors of projects, the Office of Economic Opportunity does not require units to be under the supervision of school systems.

Since children for whom the program is planned have individual problems which handicap their learning, one would expect the projects to be staffed with teachers who are specialists in the field. But that is not the case. Teachers having had only 1 week of training in kindergarten techniques will be conducting classes. Few experts regard this training as adequate, the Wall Street Journal observes.

In most projects over the country teachers will receive the same rate of pay as regular elementary public school teachers earn. The national average comes to about \$3 an hour. However, in New York City, Head Start teachers will be paid from \$8 to \$9.20 an hour. They refused to work for any less, and Head Start was determined to get going regardless of the cost. When the school nurses discovered how the teachers had succeeded they, in turn, demanded and got \$6 an hour. Their regular scale was \$2.65. Directors of the New York projects are to be paid \$1,000 a month.

During these coming 8 weeks of Head Start about 40,000 teachers will be employed. There will be some 8,000 additional paid workers. The Federal Government bears 90 percent or more of the cost of the program. By far the greater part of the funds will go for salaries.

Certain experts who are in complete sympathy with the aim of Head Start doubt that it can accomplish its objectives if help is not continued after these children are enrolled in public school. Among them is Dr. Martin Deutsch, of New York Medical College. He said, as quoted by the Wall Street Journal: "There is some evidence that children who do get a head start which has no followup momentum will return to their original failure levels."

The administration has asked Congress to appropriate \$150 million to carry on Head Start after this fall. In justice to the children, their families, and the taxpayers, too, the program should be placed on a firmer educational basis before more funds are lavished on it. Good intentions and plenty of money cannot substitute for adequately trained teachers and competent direction.

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OTTINGER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRASER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CARGO PREFERENCE LAW, MERCHANT MARINE ACT

(Mr. GILBERT (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my fellow Members of the House a statement by Mr.

Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers' International Union of North America, which appeared in the July 9, 1965 edition of the "Seafarers' Log." The statement discusses the Cargo Preference Law and the proposed amendment by Congressman PAUL G. ROGERS of Florida.

INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT'S REPORT

(By Paul Hall)

A truly constructive proposal that would require a minimum of 75 percent of U.S. Government-generated cargo be carried on American-flag vessels has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman PAUL ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida. Representative ROGERS' bill is an example of the kind of recommendations that are needed to reverse the dismal decline of the American-flag merchant fleet.

Representative ROGERS' proposal is more than just another idea of how to save the U.S. merchant marine from vanishing from the oceans of the world. The significance of the bill lies in the fact that the Nation's present cargo preference statutes are not doing the job for which they were passed. Congressman ROGERS is obviously aware of this fact. In introducing his bill he declared, "The present requirement of 50 percent has proved insufficient, if this Nation is to maintain a strong merchant marine."

The SIU has long maintained that the lackadaisical enforcement of the existing cargo preference statutes is a shocking example of bureaucratic negligence, to say nothing of governmental indifference to the plight of the U.S. shipping industry. Our lengthy list of grievances against the Government departments that have ignored the spirit and intent of this legislation tells the sordid story of how ineffectively the present statutes have been administered.

If one were to take a cynical attitude toward the Nation's present cargo preference laws, an argument might be made that Representative ROGERS' Bill calling for a 75 percent Government cargo requirement is the best way to actually get the presently required 50 percent on American bottoms. However, we can rightfully expect that the statutes will be obeyed.

We in the SIU do not think it is too much to ask that the departments of the Federal Government adhere to the cargo preference statutes duly enacted by the representatives of the people. If these departments continue their practice of ignoring these laws, a law calling for no less than a 100-percent cargo preference requirement would not be worth the paper it was written upon.

Our objections to the present cargo preference setup is twofold in nature. The first objection deals with the all-too-frequent granting of waivers to evade the requirements of the law. Our second point is that even if there were complete compliance with the present 50-percent minimum, our country's merchant marine would still need additional assistance if it is to take its rightful place among the fleets of the world.

Thus, we regard increasing the legal requirement that American bottoms carry 75, instead of the minimum 50 percent, of Government-generated cargoes, as an important step in restoring the Nation's merchant fleet to a healthier state of strength. Certainly, our shipping industry will not find itself taxed beyond its resources in finding the space for the cargoes guaranteed to it by such a law.

The sad truth of the matter is our Nation's merchant marine is carrying well under 10 percent of the country's foreign trade. The rapidly dwindling part played by the U.S. maritime industry in its own country's foreign trade can only spell tragedy for the future place of the American flag on the world's oceans. The flow of Government cargoes which keeps a portion of our fleet alive today

obviously cannot be depended upon to do this lifesaving job at the rate at which they are currently available.

As the strength of our merchant fleet continues to ebb away, our Nation is confronted with repeated reports of a strong and steadily growing Russian shipping industry. Representative ROGERS recognized this threat when he said, "It is clear the Communists are engaged in an all-out effort to dominate the world's sea lanes by 1970."

In his speech before the House in support of his 75-percent cargo preference bill, ROGERS pointed to statistics showing that Russia is building 15 times as many ships as this country. We think facts such as these indicate the damage of the country's national security through governmental lack of concern about our own merchant fleet. Representative ROGERS was correct when he said his proposed law would be an important first step in rebuilding the U.S.-flag fleet.

The Florida Congressman also hit the nail on the head when he said passage of his bill would have a substantially beneficial effect on our Nation's dangerous balance-of-payments problem. His statement that the cost of moving foreign aid cargoes on foreign-flag vessels worsens the outflow of U.S. dollars is unfortunately, all too true.

The country is generally aware that our Government program to help the less-fortunate nations of the world with U.S. assistance is one of the chief reasons why we are plagued by balance-of-payment problems. Faced with this problem, we find it hard to understand why the goods which are part of this assistance do not move in U.S.-flag vessels, thus saving a good many valuable dollars. To continue the present practice of ignoring the availability of American shipping to handle these cargoes, only compounds the international deficit in payments faced by the United States. The passage of Representative ROGERS' bill, increasing the maritime industry's share of Government-generated cargoes, will be a great aid in bolstering the U.S. merchant marine, providing that the Government agencies involved obey the letter of the law.

Fe An Multer
REALISTIC THINKING ON VIETNAM

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has said repeatedly that this country would not desert South Vietnam in their fight to prevent the Communist from taking control of that country. As a result of this pledge this country should come to grips with the fact that this could be a very long and costly struggle.

Jerry Greene in the New York Daily News wrote:

President Johnson is geared for a 10-year war in South Vietnam, if that's what it takes to stop the Communist drive southward from Red China.

Americans should also get geared for this long struggle, and be realistic in their thoughts toward the Vietnam conflict.

We all know President Johnson has tried almost every possible way to bring Hanoi to the peace table, but they have refused, thinking that they can win a military victory. This is what we must show them they cannot do, and this is what may take so long.

Mr. Greene's column of July 6, 1965 follows:

CAPITOL STUFF
(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, July 5.—President Johnson is geared for a 10-year war in South Vietnam, if that's what it takes to stop the Communist drive southward from Red China.

A close associate of the President told the News that some White House advisers have become concerned that Johnson's deluge of invitations for peace negotiations may have hurtfully obscured the recognition by most top officials that extended conflict is possible.

Some Presidential consultants are convinced that Johnson has by this time made the U.S. willing, unconditional, position sufficiently clear before the rest of the world, and that prime attention should now be given to laying the facts before the American people.

The willingness to negotiate seemingly flies in the face of official acceptance of the grim prospects. It has brought a troublesome confusion in the minds of the people.

The American spectaculars, like the use of the B-52 bombers this weekend for the second strike against suspected Vietcong positions, and the commitment of paratroops and marines—with more to come—have not been calculated to produce immediate, decisive results.

The war still must be fought by the Vietnamese, most military chiefs believe, with the United States providing such assistance as is required. There is little doubt that the assistance, already of major proportions, will be increased substantially as the months pass.

But this assistance is not and has not been of the crash variety. Rather, it has been the development of long-term planning. The intent is to stave off the expected rainy season attacks of the Vietcong and to apply mounting pressure against the Reds—north and south—without going so far as to bring on wholesale war with Red China or Russia.

L.B.J. HAS WARNED US OVER AND OVER

This is the ticklish key issue, a matter of political decisions that a couple of generals said today the military men are more than willing to leave to the White House.

Johnson and practically all his top officials have broadcast repeated warnings that the Viet war could be long, but such admonitions have received little attention—far less than the noisy blatherings of a minority demanding that we quit.

There was, for example, the appearance of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara before a House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, when he was asked about negotiations.

"There is very little to negotiate at the present time," McNamara said. "The negotiations were held in 1954 and led to a division of the country. I do not understand what we would negotiate today that would be different from the agreement of 1954."

Gen. H. K. Johnson, the Army Chief of Staff, laid it on the line before the same Congressmen:

"I believe it would take as long as 10 years. I believe that one of the—I would not want to term it a mistake—but one of our errors has been looking forward to success in the course of the next year, or 2 years.

"I think that we have to raise our sights materially, plan for the long term, and if it occurs sooner, fine. That will be just wonderful."

BUT IS PATIENCE AN AMERICAN TRAIT?

Representative GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, the subcommittee chairman, said, "We Americans are not noted for our patience," and said the patience of the people "is more or less threadbare" regarding Vietnam.

Three years ago, after spending a couple of months in South Vietnam and attempting to digest the conclusions of American ad-

visers there, we wrote that what would be required was "patience—plus lots of sweat, some blood, some tears and a thumping amount of hard cash."

A few months later, Ho Chi Minh, the Red boss of North Vietnam, said in an interview published in an American magazine that the United States did not possess the patience to compete with the Viet Communists, that we would tire of the bloody game in a few years and quit.

It's a cinch that the American public won't develop that essential patience very fast while under the impression that there could be a negotiation, an end to killings, and a peace almost at any moment.

This is why some of Johnson's friends think the time has come to lift the illusion that a fast peace is around the corner, that the President might pull some big stunt and run a dire risk of major war to get the shooting stopped before the 1966 or certainly the 1968 elections.

THE TROOP ESTIMATES VARY WIDELY

Certainly the military men charged with conduct of their part of the war, keeping in mind that the Viet generals must remain in the forefront as leaders in their own country, are proceeding on no crash basis.

How many Americans troops may eventually be required, what kinds of supporting force are unknowns and the situation can change from day to day. Defense Secretary McNamara has announced the troop total is in the process of swelling from 53,000 to 75,000. You can make a couple of phone calls to high officials here and get estimates any size you want, 100,000 to 150,000 to 350,000 and more.

But these changes, the switch in tactics, come as no quickie, shoot-from-the-hip decision. The B-52's based at Guam and used as desired over South Vietnam were prepared a year ago.

Now it is expected that the new 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) just formed at Fort Benning, Ga., may start moving this month toward South Vietnam—with its 15,787 men supported by 428 helicopters—to give the Communists a taste of something new in warfare. And, of course, to see how it works.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—
PART CXXVIII

(Mr. MULTER, at the request of Mr. McCARTHY was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the May 19, 1965 edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The article concerns the proposed police review board and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis":

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—OPPOSED BY THE PBA—COUNCIL BACKING FOR POLICE REVIEW BOARD

"This report * * * will meet the need for a full and open review of substantive cases of police brutality while at the same time protecting the good reputation of the thousands of men on our police force who serve with dedication and honor." (City council committee's majority report.)

"Nothing could be more detrimental to the police department, the morale of the men or the efficient protection for the people of the city * * * the cops * * * will be the target of every cop-hater in the city * * * A cop would be looking down the throat of a review board." (Police Benevolent Association statement.)

(By James Lynn)

A special city council subcommittee recommended yesterday that the council establish its own version of a civilian review board to look into complaints of police brutality.

The body suggested in the subcommittee's majority report would be a permanent committee of the council itself, empowered to review the findings of the police department's own Civilian Complaint Review Board.

As soon as the subcommittee report was out it was condemned by the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, which opposes external review of police procedures in any form.

"Today it's made up of councilmen," a PBA spokesman said, "and tomorrow who knows? It opens the door to unlimited investigation of the police department by outside people."

PROTEST

There was an even more vivid protest outside city hall, where more than 30 pickets paced yesterday afternoon, carrying signs that read "The Police Are Our Last Defense Against Communism" and "Policemen Protect Us—Please Don't Tie Their Hands."

The pickets were passing out petitions drawn up by Citizens for Law and Order, whose chairman was listed as Thaddeus S. Dabrowski. The petitions said "any attempt, in any manner, to form a civilian review board * * * will only hinder" the police.

On the other hand, Councilman Theodore S. Weiss, a member of the subcommittee, dissented from its report because he didn't think it went far enough. And another subcommittee member, Councilman Richard S. Aldrich, went most of the way with the majority but parted company with it on making the review body an arm of the council.

The chairman of the subcommittee, Brooklyn Democratic Councilman Dominick Corso, said he had no assurances of support for the recommendations from Mayor Wagner or Council Majority Leader David Ross, but the mayor has voiced his approval of the bill's broad outlines.

Besides recommending a council committee to check up on decisions of the police department's civilian complaint review board, the subcommittee report called for some changes in police handling of civilian complaints.

Specifically, it said all complaints should be submitted in writing and acknowledged by a written receipt; attorneys should have the right to cross-examine and transcripts should be taken at preliminary hearings, and both the complaint and the police should have the right to subpoena witnesses for hearings before departmental trial.

The recommended permanent council committee on police affairs would be authorized "to review police department administrative findings in respect to allegations of brutality," with complete access to police records, and would make regular spot checks on the handling of complaints by the police.

Mr. Aldrich, a Manhattan member of the council's Republican minority, agreed with the subcommittee majority that civilian review is desirable but argued that Deputy Mayor Edward F. Cavannagh, Jr., is now authorized to provide it and should merely be given by law the power he already holds at the mayor's order.

ALL ASPECTS

In fact, Mr. Aldrich said, the deputy mayor's review power should be widened "to include all aspects of civilian-police relations," not just charges of brutality. A council committee should not be given the job, he added, because most councilmen are part-time public servants.

Perhaps more important Mr. Aldrich said, "Great pressures could be brought to bear

July 14, 1965

on the individual councilman by his constituents and pressure groups from his community." The deputy mayor, he reasoned, would be above "partiality, prejudice, and professional courtesy."

Mr. Weiss' minority report took issue with practically all of the subcommittee majority's recommendations. He filed a bill more than a year ago that would establish a nine-man civilian complaint review board whose members would be appointed by the mayor from the citizenry at large.

Yesterday's subcommittee report recommended that Mr. Weiss' bill be shunted aside. Mr. Weiss retorted that a council committee "would give substance to the arguments of those who fear a politically oriented external board without satisfying those who seek a truly impartial board."

"To be perfectly blunt," the Manhattan reform Democrat believe that the council has not the political independence to discharge this responsibility. And even if it did, no group of councilmen * * * could long escape the charge, unfounded though it might be, that they were deciding complaints on the basis of political considerations."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART CXXXIX

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the following article is New York's housing crisis and its part of the series on "New York City in Crisis." The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 20, 1965, and follows:

NEW POLICE HEAD TOO BUSY EVEN TO ASK
WHAT JOB PAYS

(By Maurice C. Carroll)

It was a rare Tuesday for the six Broderick children: Their father came home at noon so he could watch 10-year-old Ellen be confirmed in St. Catherine's Roman Catholic Church.

Usually he didn't get home from the U.S. Attorney's office in Foley Square to the gray stone and stucco house at 215 Highbrook Avenue, Pelham, much before suppertime. But on Tuesday the children got a good chance to visit with him.

It is the kind of opportunity they won't expect much from now on because in mid-evening the telephone rang and, Vincent L. Broderick said yesterday, "it was Mike Murphy. He said he had submitted his resignation as Police Commissioner and recommended me as his successor."

From that moment until he sat yesterday afternoon in city hall, shoulder to shoulder with what seemed an endless series of television interviewers who repeated, one by one, the same set of questions, Mr. Broderick was so busy he never even got around to finding out how much he was going to be paid in his new job.

He walked out the city hall front door at 2:15 for lunch with Mr. Murphy, former Commissioner Francis Adams and his current boss, U.S. Attorney Robert Morgenthau, and someone asked, "Will your salary be the same \$85,000 that Murphy gets?"

The tall, slim Mr. Broderick looked surprised. His right hand strayed to his out-thrust chin. "Why, I assume it is," he said slowly. "We never did discuss it." He smiled. "Maybe we should have."

He and his new boss, the mayor, had a brief Gracie Mansion chat before Mr. Broderick headed briefly back to his office, then down to city hall to meet the press.

That telephone call from Mr. Murphy stirred in him, he said, "shock and chagrin.

I've known Mike 11 years and I regard him as a great police officer, a great attorney, a great man." After they talked, he called Mr. Adams, under whom he had served when he was deputy police commissioner in charge of legal matters from 1954 to 1956. They chatted briefly. At about 10 p.m. he called Mr. Morgenthau.

At 9:30 a.m. yesterday he was at Gracie Mansion for a meeting with Mr. Murphy, Mr. Wagner and Mr. Adams. He was offered the job. He took it. By mid-morning he was making ready to take over as police commissioner.

The city gains 3 inches of commissioner and loses 25 pounds in the transition from the heavy-set Mr. Murphy to the slender 6-foot-1, 175-pound, graying Mr. Broderick.

It loses several decibels in vocal volume. Mr. Murphy has a big voice. Mr. Broderick's is soft, almost apologetic. But those who know him say the soft tones cloak a firm character. He is, they say, a calm and accomplished administrator.

He was born in New York 45 years ago, son of the late Joseph Broderick, a former Federal Reserve Board governor, and Mary Lyons Broderick. He had two brothers, the Reverend Joseph Broderick, a Dominican priest who teaches law at Catholic University, and Francis, director of the Peace Corps in Ghana.

Educated at All Hallows, Barnard School for Boys, Phillips Andover Academy Princeton (class of 1941) and Harvard Law (1948), he joined the law firm of Hatch, Root and Barrett, 26 Broadway, after graduation. In college he was editor of the Daily Princetonian, a Quadrangle Club member, and on the swimming, JV soccer and rugby teams. After his term as deputy police commissioner, during which he conducted departmental hearings against policemen accused of misconduct, he served from 1956 to 1961 as general counsel of the National Association of Investment Companies (with service in 1958 and 1959 as special hearings officer for the waterfront commission) and from 1961 until now as chief assistant U.S. attorney for the southern district.

He spent 4 wartime years in the Army Corps of Engineers.

He has, he said, no special hobbies. "I'm a situation golfer. If there's a course there and nobody on it, I might play." Mostly, he said, "I just like to spend time with my children and tossing a ball back and forth."

Mr. Broderick's hazel eyes gaze downward when he answers questions and he folds his slim hands contemplatively. But his words proclaim self-assurance. His new job? "The second toughest job in New York. But I am honored by the confidence the mayor has expressed in me—and I have a certain degree of confidence in myself."

The Broderick children heard schoolyard gossip about their father's new job but it was only as they drifted home in mid-afternoon that they learned for certain—Kathleen, 14, from Pelham High; Vincent, 12, from junior high; Mary, 11, Ellen, 10, and Joan, 7, from Colonial Public School. Only 2-year-old Justin was home all day with his mother, the former Sally Brine.

Their home is near the city line but Mr. Broderick said they would now probably move closer to the center of things. Where? When? He threw out his hands. "That's one of the things. I just don't know. It's been so sudden."

Mrs. Broderick said she was "delighted" with the appointment even though she knew the job would make many demands on her husband's time. He said, "I'm blessed with a very understanding wife."

Yes, he said supper was usually at 7:30, "although Mr. Morgenthau runs a pretty busy office, too. And I don't always make it now."

When he's Commissioner?

"Sally is probably still going to have dinner at 7:30—with the six children."

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BINGHAM'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mrs. KELLY (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. KELLY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

RABBI BLOOM

(Mr. SCHEUER (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to record here my profound shock and grief at the death of Rabbi Maurice J. Bloom, one of the outstanding moral and spiritual leaders in my district. Rabbi Bloom, leader of the Tremont Temple, lived a life modeled after that which he outlined for his congregation as "the good life." He was truly a living example as well as a spiritual inspiration to his followers. Believing in service to his country as well as to his God, he acted for a period as Jewish chaplain at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He also spent many hours in service to the community as part-time chaplain at Kingsbridge Veterans' Hospital, president of the Association of Reform Rabbis of New York City and vicinity, as a member of the executive board of the Synagogue Council of America and as a member of the board of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

What Rabbi Bloom has left behind him is difficult to document here for in large part it is in the hearts of his congregation and the people whose lives he touched in an intangible way.

On behalf of my constituents in the 21st Congressional District in New York, I would like to express here publicly our grief at the passing from our midst of this outstanding human being. As a private person, I would like to extend my heartfelt condolences to the rabbi's family and to assure them that we shall never forget this great man's teachings. What he has left behind will never fade away.

THE MEXICAN IMMIGRANT

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that the great contributions to the growth and development of the United States made by the Mexican immigrant ought to be formally recognized by the Federal Government, that such recognition should be in concrete form in the nature of a permanent mon-

ument, and that the ideal location would be the city of San Antonio, Tex. San Antonio has been a gateway to and from Mexico for centuries. Today it is perhaps the largest bilingual city in the Nation and a confluence of the Anglo and Latin American cultures.

In 1968 San Antonio will celebrate the 250th anniversary of its founding. Also in that year an international exposition, HemisFair 1968, will open in San Antonio. This exposition will be a "Fair of the Americas," emphasizing the contributions that each of the cultures and countries have made to civilization in North and South America. This will be the first fair of its kind in the Western Hemisphere.

On June 21, I made a speech in this House in which I served notice that I would initiate action to call the attention of the Nation to the contributions made by the immigrants from across our southern border. On the same day I introduced the HemisFair bill, H.R. 9247, providing for a planning study to be set up in the Department of Commerce to determine the extent to which the United States shall participate at the exposition. This study, which I hope will be authorized this year, can include an inquiry into a monument dedicated to the Mexican immigrant. Possibly, the U.S. pavilion may be built so that it can serve the dual purpose of the Federal HemisFair exhibit and the immigration monument. If it is determined that additional legislation is needed, I will introduce it.

The full story of the Mexican immigrant has never been told. The total for 145 years of Mexican immigration, from 1820 to 1964, is 1,326,370. This figure does not include the tens of thousands of persons of Mexican birth or ancestry who were living in the southwest territories at the time they were admitted into the Union as States.

Today, the total numbers of persons of Spanish surname in the five Southwest States—Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas—comprises a significant portion of the population in this area. Of the 29.3 million persons in the five Southwest States, 3.4 million have Spanish surnames, according to the U.S. census of 1960. Of the 9.5 million persons in Texas, 1.4 million are of Mexican ancestry.

Of course, the numbers alone cannot fairly indicate the contributions that these persons have made to the Southwest and to the Nation. I am neither a sociologist, an historian, nor an economist. It would take a team of persons in these and other fields to compile the record of the achievements and of the significance of the Mexican immigrant and his offspring to the American experience. But anyone who has traveled or lived in the great Southwest can grasp some idea of the meaning and the importance of the waves of hardy, industrious immigrants who have come across the Mexican border. Undeniably, our culture and our economy would be immeasurably poorer had this immigration not occurred.

It is time for this Government to recognize what those of us who live in the Southwest have known: that the Mexican immigrant has enriched our heritage

and helped build our country. It would be a fine and worthwhile tribute for the U.S. Government to establish a monument to the Mexican immigrant. And it would be fitting and proper for such a monument to be located in San Antonio, Tex.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting into the Record three tables relating to Mexican immigration into the United States. Table 1 shows the Mexican immigration by decades beginning in 1820, and for the years since the last census in 1960. Table 2 shows the populations of persons with Spanish surnames in the five Southwestern States for 1950 and 1960. Table 3 shows the total population for each of the five Southwestern States.

The tables follow:

Mexican immigration by decades

Year:	
1820-----	1
1821-30-----	4,817
1831-40-----	6,599
1841-50-----	3,271
1851-60-----	3,078
1861-70-----	2,191
1871-80-----	5,162
1881-90-----	1,913
1886-93-----	No record of immigration
1891-1900-----	971
1901-10-----	49,642
1911-20-----	219,004
1921-30-----	459,287
1931-40-----	22,319
1941-50-----	60,589
1951-60-----	299,811
1961-----	41,476
1962-----	55,805
1963-----	55,986
1964-----	34,448

Total for 145 years of immigration, 1820 to 1964-- 1,326,370

Spanish surname population in five Southwestern States

	1950	1960
Arizona-----	128,580	194,356
California-----	758,400	1,426,538
Colorado-----	118,715	157,173
New Mexico-----	248,560	269,122
Texas-----	1,027,455	1,417,810
Totals-----	2,281,710	3,464,999

1960 Census population of the five Southwestern States

Arizona-----	1,302,161
California-----	15,717,204
Colorado-----	1,753,947
New Mexico-----	951,023
Texas-----	9,579,677
Total population-----	29,304,012

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. McCARRY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

For Mr. Cohelan
OUR GOAL: TO PROTECT THE INDEPENDENCE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GREEN of Oregon). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week the distinguished minority

leader [Mr. Ford] suggested that the United States should increase its military pressures on North Vietnam by bombing four Russian ground to air missile sites at Hanoi.

The very able majority leader of the Senate [Mr. MANSFIELD] has responded that this would not be a "war shortener" or an "American casualty reducer." It would to the contrary, he has suggested, be more likely to "raise the level of the conflict another notch, to bring on larger American casualties and a much broader and deeper U.S. involvement in Asia."

Mr. Speaker, I agree and agree strongly with the Senator from Montana. To bring the Soviet Union fully into the Vietnam conflict; to provoke even greater troop commitments from North Vietnam; to encourage a still larger role for Communist China; and to kill thousands of Vietnamese civilians—this should not be our goal in Vietnam. It is a perversion of our right and proper purpose.

Our goal should be to help in every reasonable way we can to protect the independence of South Vietnam from outside aggression and interference. If independence is as precious and as vital as this country has maintained for nearly 200 years, then it should be available to all who are willing to work for it and not just to the few who are capable of defending it.

At the same time, there can be no military solution to this problem. Our arms must be used, as they are needed, to convince Hanoi and Peiping, and Moscow as well, that wars of national liberation based on terror and intimidation and naked force will not succeed.

Our arms should be used to persuade the adversaries of open societies that Saigon cannot be crushed. They should be used to help secure sound negotiations and a just settlement. They should be available as long as necessary, but they should be restricted to this time and to this purpose.

It is perfectly true that the Communists, whether they be in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, or Communist China, have been deaf to every offer of discussion, negotiation and settlement that has been made to date. On at least 14 different recent occasions they have rejected proposals which could bring this matter to the international conference table and to a position where the United Nations might be able to take a more active and helpful role.

But we must not let this solid record of intransigence deter us in our efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement. We must not let continued belligerence provoke us into any unwise action. Rather, we must keep our powder dry and bear in mind at all times our objective.

We must be prepared to persist and persevere. We must continue our willingness to join in the defense of independence where it is threatened and where our help is asked. And we must continue to press our adversaries and pursue every opportunity for negotiations, for a ceasefire and for a settlement that will guarantee the people of South Vietnam freedom to determine their own future without fear or coercion.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 15, 1965, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. ASPINALL, from 5 o'clock p.m., July 15, for balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. McCARTHY, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY), for 30 minutes, on July 15 and July 19; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO in two instances.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. BELCHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 8926 and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRADEMAs to revise and extend his remarks following those of Mr. YATES in his special order today.

Mr. PHILBIN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) to extend his remarks following Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. MINISH (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY) to follow the remarks of Mr. RYAN in connection with Mr. WOLFF's special order.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. BATES.

Mr. NELSEN in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. MOORE in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. McCARTHY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. BANDSTRA.

Mr. WELTNER.

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

Mr. DORN.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. WHITENER in four instances.

Mr. RACE.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. REDLIN.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4185. An act to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5041. An act to provide for safety regulations of common carriers by pipeline under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5246. An act to amend sections 20a and 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 559. An act to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes;

S. 571. An act for the relief of Denise Hojebane Barrood; and

J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 15, 1965, 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:

1338. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to complement the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1339. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a request for the withdrawal and return of the case of Tom Leong Doo, also known as William Doo Tom, A-11662187, previously transmitted on April 1, 1965, involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 470. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 9075, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 471. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 8469, a bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 6790. A bill to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 496. A bill to designate lock and dam 3 on the Cape Fear River, N.C., as the William O. Huske lock and dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 790. A bill to rename a lock of the cross-Florida barge canal the E. N. Bert Dosh lock; without amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 7475. A bill to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry; without amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 9460. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 473. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 9026, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 474. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8856, a bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 9567. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; with amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.