

Comparative basic pay increases—Average increase in basic pay for persons with over 2 years service—Continued

H.R. 9075 (HOUSE)

Pay grade	Number	Increased active duty cost	Percent increase	Average dollar increase		Pay grade	Number	Increased active duty cost	Percent increase	Average dollar increase	
				Annual	Monthly					Annual	Monthly
5 star	2					W-1 warrant officer	1,984	\$1,053,000	11.2	\$532	\$44.38
Chief of Staff	5	\$7,000	6.0	\$1,451	\$120.90	Total, officers	201,049	145,688,000	6.4	500	41.60
O-10 general	31	61,000	8.9	1,951	162.60	E-9 sergeant major	13,720	8,753,000	10.4	638	53.16
O-9 lieutenant general	118	224,000	9.8	1,897	158.10	E-8 master sergeant	35,613	16,382,000	8.8	460	38.33
O-8 major general	488	1,006,000	11.8	2,059	171.60	E-7 sergeant, 1st class	113,754	78,158,000	15.3	657	57.26
O-7 brigadier general	642	1,199,000	12.3	1,808	155.70	E-6 staff sergeant	228,369	107,458,000	12.8	471	39.21
O-6 colonel	15,147	17,035,000	8.9	1,125	93.72	E-5 sergeant	394,979	156,672,000	12.4	394	32.84
O-5 lieutenant colonel	36,982	26,114,000	6.8	706	58.84	E-4 corporal	405,297	88,169,000	8.7	213	17.72
O-4 major	56,217	32,439,000	6.8	577	48.09	E-3 private, 1st class	274,953	40,449,000	7.9	147	12.26
O-3 captain	105,970	37,827,000	5.0	358	29.83	E-2 private	44,449	5,120,000	7.8	115	9.60
O-2 1st lieutenant	50,202	13,437,000	5.0	268	22.31	E-1 recruit	7,101	760,000	8.1	108	9.00
O-1 2d lieutenant	9,419	3,054,000	7.3	325	27.06	Total, enlisted	1,518,235	498,927,000	11.1	320	27.38
W-4 warrant officer	3,621	4,380,000	15.1	1,209	100.79	Grand total	1,809,284	644,515,000	9.5	350	29.69
W-3 warrant officer	4,113	4,321,000	15.8	1,051	87.66						
W-2 warrant officer	6,108	3,331,000	9.9	845	45.42						

H.R. 9075 (SENATE REVISION)

Pay grade	Number	Increased active duty cost	Average percent increase	Average dollar increase		Pay grade	Number	Increased active duty cost	Average percent increase	Average dollar increase	
				Annual	Monthly					Annual	Monthly
5 star	2					W-1 warrant officer	1,984	\$563,000	6.0	\$284	\$23.66
Chief of Staff	5	\$7,000	6.0	\$1,451	\$120.90	Total, officers	291,049	136,600,000	6.0	469	39.11
O-10 general	31	41,000	6.0	1,318	109.80	E-9 sergeant major	13,720	9,286,000	11.0	677	56.40
O-9 lieutenant general	118	137,000	6.0	1,163	96.90	E-8 master sergeant	35,613	20,578,000	11.0	575	48.15
O-8 major general	488	511,000	6.0	1,048	87.30	E-7 sergeant, 1st class	113,754	56,322,000	11.0	495	41.26
O-7 brigadier general	642	585,000	6.0	911	75.90	E-6 staff sergeant	228,369	95,747,000	11.0	419	34.94
O-6 colonel	15,147	11,492,000	6.0	750	63.23	E-5 sergeant	394,979	138,548,000	11.0	351	29.23
O-5 lieutenant colonel	36,982	23,702,000	6.0	643	53.54	E-4 corporal	405,297	108,509,000	11.0	268	22.31
O-4 major	56,217	20,660,000	6.0	528	43.97	E-3 private, 1st class	274,953	55,912,000	10.9	203	16.95
O-3 captain	105,970	45,744,000	6.0	432	35.07	E-2 private	44,449	7,201,000	11.0	162	13.60
O-2 1st lieutenant	50,202	16,197,000	6.0	323	26.89	E-1 recruit	7,101	1,048,000	10.9	148	12.30
O-1 2d lieutenant	9,419	2,494,000	6.0	265	22.06	Total, enlisted	1,518,235	493,149,000	11.0	325	27.07
W-4 warrant officer	3,621	1,739,000	6.0	480	40.03	Grand total	1,809,284	629,749,000	9.3	348	29.01
W-3 warrant officer	4,113	1,646,000	6.0	400	33.35						
W-2 warrant officer	6,108	2,022,000	6.0	381	27.59						

AVERAGE MONTHLY BASIC PAY

Pay grade	Number	Present	DOD proposal	H.R. 9075	Senate revision	Pay grade	Number	Present	DOD proposal	H.R. 9075	Senate revision
5 star	2					W-1 warrant officer	1,984	\$406	\$426	\$452	\$430
Chief of Staff	5	\$2,019	\$2,120	\$2,140	\$2,139	Total, officers	291,049	654	687	690	693
O-10 general	31	1,830	1,921	1,992	1,940	E-9 sergeant major	13,720	505	530	557	561
O-9 lieutenant general	118	1,614	1,695	1,772	1,711	E-8 master sergeant	35,613	433	455	471	481
O-8 major general	488	1,456	1,528	1,627	1,543	E-7 sergeant, 1st class	113,754	372	391	429	413
O-7 brigadier general	642	1,266	1,329	1,422	1,342	E-6 staff sergeant	228,369	318	334	358	353
O-6 colonel	15,147	1,042	1,094	1,135	1,105	E-5 sergeant	394,979	266	280	299	295
O-5 lieutenant colonel	36,982	886	930	944	940	E-4 corporal	405,297	205	215	223	227
O-4 major	56,217	746	782	794	789	E-3 private, 1st class	274,953	155	162	167	172
O-3 captain	105,970	607	637	657	643	E-2 private	44,449	123	129	133	137
O-2 1st lieutenant	50,202	457	480	490	488	E-1 recruit	7,101	113	118	122	125
O-1 2d lieutenant	9,419	366	384	392	388	Total, enlisted	1,518,235	242	254	260	269
W-4 warrant officer	3,621	666	699	706	706	Grand total	1,809,284	306	322	335	337
W-3 warrant officer	4,113	550	584	644	644						
W-2 warrant officer	6,108	471	494	517	499						

AVERAGE MONTHLY PAY AND ALLOWANCES¹

Pay grade	Number	Present	DOD proposal	H.R. 9075	Senate revision	Pay grade	Number	Present	DOD proposal	H.R. 9075	Senate revision
5 star	2					W-1 warrant officer	1,984	\$564	\$584	\$609	\$588
Chief of Staff	5	\$2,602	\$2,703	\$2,722	\$2,722	Total, officers	291,049	861	895	905	901
O-10 general	31	2,262	2,363	2,425	2,372	E-9 sergeant major	13,720	661	686	713	717
O-9 lieutenant general	118	1,905	1,986	2,063	2,062	E-8 master sergeant	35,613	588	611	627	636
O-8 major general	488	1,704	1,777	1,876	1,781	E-7 sergeant, 1st class	113,754	623	642	680	564
O-7 brigadier general	642	1,514	1,678	1,670	1,590	E-6 staff sergeant	228,369	464	481	504	499
O-6 colonel	15,147	1,260	1,312	1,352	1,323	E-5 sergeant	394,979	406	420	439	435
O-5 lieutenant colonel	36,982	1,090	1,135	1,149	1,144	E-4 corporal	405,297	338	360	368	360
O-4 major	56,217	936	974	985	980	E-3 private, 1st class	274,953	264	272	277	281
O-3 captain	105,970	783	813	813	810	E-2 private	44,449	227	235	238	241
O-2 1st lieutenant	50,202	623	643	646	650	E-1 recruit	7,101	215	222	225	227
O-1 2d lieutenant	9,419	522	540	548	544	Total, enlisted	1,518,235	421	436	457	452
W-4 warrant officer	3,621	858	891	958	898	Grand total	1,809,284	608	627	645	641
W-3 warrant officer	4,113	733	761	821	788						
W-2 warrant officer	6,108	638	662	684	666						

Footnotes at end of table.

Comparative basic pay increases—Average increase in basic pay for persons with over 2 years service—Continued

ANNUAL COST OF SEVERAL PAY ALTERNATIVES¹

	DOD	House	Senate revision
Officers under 2 years, percent and cost.....	5 (\$6.5).....	22 (\$28.8).....	22 (\$28.8).....
Enlisted under 2 years, percent and cost.....	2.7 (average) (\$3.7).....	17.3 (average) (\$141.2).....	17.3 (\$151.2).....
Officers over 2 years, percent and cost.....	5 (\$113.8).....	6.4 (average) (\$145.5).....	6 (\$136.6).....
Enlisted over 2 years, percent and cost.....	5 (\$224.9).....	11.1 (average) (\$498.9).....	11 (\$493.5).....
Grand total cost (12 months).....	\$447,686,000 (\$37,299,000 monthly).....	\$997,085,000 (\$83,090,000 monthly).....	\$991,208,000 (\$82,606,000 monthly).....
Fiscal year 1966 cost, beginning Sept. 1, 1965.....	\$372,988,000.....	\$830,905,000.....	\$820,978,000.....

¹ For personnel receiving quarters and subsistence allowances.
² The costs indicated by each of the percentage increases include only active duty costs. The grand total cost includes the various related items which must be added to active duty costs. This total is, therefore, greater than the sum of the active duty costs.
 The related items include reenlistment bonus, terminal leave pay, severance pay, Reserve readjustment, social security, death gratuity, Reserves (with drill pay), retired pay for retirements after effective date, Coast Guard, PHIS, and C. & G. S.

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include tables.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I should like to say that I concur generally with the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Nevertheless, I feel constrained to say with reference to the warrant officers, especially the W-3's and W-4's, that I do wish we had accepted the House version. Nevertheless, the overall bill is within one-half of a percent of our bill, so in the interests of comity and saving time I think we ought to adopt the conference report.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if we accept this amended bill now, we may get it on the books and a part of the law by the first of September. If we do so, \$83 million plus will go into the pockets of these paupers in uniform for the month of September. They need this money and need it now. If we do not pass it today, we may not get it to them for September and they require this increase immediately.

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because this bill is in the national interest and is also a tribute to the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, I would like to ask a question of the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the cost of living increase which was included in the other body for military retirees, it has been said or we have served notice that the principle of recomputation which prevailed in military retired pay for more than 100 years would be considered in the future on its merits.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if this 3.5 percent increase on a cost of living basis in any way prejudices an independent future consideration of the question of restoring the principle of recomputation to military retired pay.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I may say this to the distinguished gentleman from California: Not only does it not prejudice a fair and impartial hearing in the future, which may come next year, but other benefits to the retirees, such as the historic space available hospital

rights. All of these areas will be explored with a view toward resolving them for the future. They will have a fair and impartial hearing and will have their day in court with the view that we can restore these much needed, and at present temporary, benefits to these men of another generation who also served their country ably and well.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. How did the other body do with respect to the pay schedules? Did they make any serious changes?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Two-tenths of 1 percent is the only difference between the two bills or about \$5 million across the board.

Mr. GROSS. They did not increase the brass and braid?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. On the contrary, they reduced the brass about which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to hear the emphasis still remains on the enlisted men's pay increase.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This is an enlisted man's bill.

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

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

There was no objection. The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENALTIES FOR ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6097) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 16, strike out "preclude" and insert "suspend".

Page 3, line 17, strike out all after "law," down to and including "direct." in line 19 and insert "until Federal action is terminated."

Page 3, after line 19, insert:

"(1) Violations of this section shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Assistance may be requested

from any Federal, State, or local agency, including the Army, Navy, and Air Force, any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding."

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Colorado to point out to the House the improvements which the Senate has made in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 2 make clear that there is no final preclusion of State or local jurisdiction under this act, but only a suspension thereof. The amendments also make clear that the suspension of State or local jurisdiction will terminate when Federal investigative or prosecutive jurisdiction is terminated.

Senate amendment No. 3 adds a new subsection (i) to the bill and makes clear that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has jurisdiction over the investigation of violations of this act. This amendment does not diminish the existing authority and responsibility of the Secret Service for the protection of the President or Vice President or for making arrests for violations of this act. The Senate amendment also authorizes the Bureau to request cooperation from any State or local agency, and thus recognizes that subsection (h) is broad enough to permit State cooperation. In addition, the Senate amendment expressly authorizes the cooperation of the armed services, and overcomes the effect of section 1385 of title 18, United States Code, which prohibits, except as authorized by Congress, the use of the Army or Air Force, to apprehend felons.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments do not weaken the bill as it passed the House on June 21 of this year. They serve the purpose of clarifying Federal preemption and explicitly provide the agency which will exercise investigative jurisdiction over violations of the act.

This House should concur in these amendments.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LITERACY WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 4) designating the 6-day period beginning September 13, 1965, as "National Literacy Week," and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 4

Whereas the month of September marks the return to school for millions of American children and illustrates our commitment to the goals of an educated and enlightened society; and

Whereas the total eradication of illiteracy is a matter of grave concern since in the United States there are two million adult Americans who cannot read or write; eight million three hundred thousand persons twenty-five years or over who have had less than five years of schooling; and twenty-two million individuals of working age who have had less than eight years of education; and

Whereas these individuals are committed to a future of minimum earnings, recurrent or persistent joblessness, social dependency, and personal deprivation and represent a staggering cost to the United States in public assistance and welfare programs; and

Whereas it is recognized that the learning tools of reading, writing, and arithmetic open the doors of opportunity not only to occupational training and productive work, but also to the larger life of mind and spirit; and

Whereas the illiterate or near illiterate person, while employed, may be shut off from unlimited personal growth opportunities, as well as from occupational advancement opportunities; and

Whereas adult basic education is a fundamental approach to independent learning, to adjustment of manpower to changing occupational requirements, to elimination of poverty, and to the larger satisfaction in personal growth made possible through acquisition of the basic learning tools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the six-day period beginning September 13, 1965, and ending September 18, 1965, both dates inclusive, is hereby designated as "National Literacy Week" in recognition and appreciation of the private and public organizations which are working to reduce illiteracy in the United States. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

REPUDIATION DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 401) requesting the

President to designate November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 401

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is requested to issue a proclamation designating November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day in recognition of the historic significance of the action of the Frederick County Court on November 23, 1765, in repudiating the Stamp Act, as a preamble to the American Revolution, and to bear witness to the importance that this Nation still places on a judiciary that has the courage to be independent and the wisdom and strength to protect the liberties of the people against every sort of tyranny, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

CRUSADE FOR SAFETY DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 448).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 448

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to reduce traffic accidents.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], for bringing by resolution before the House for action.

This House Concurrent Resolution 448 authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as "Crusade for Safety Day." The reason we have specified September 3, 1965, is that on that day the Postmaster General will join other Maryland officials in issuing a special traffic safety stamp in Baltimore to call to the attention of the public the need for safe driving to stop the tragic slaughter on our Nation's streets and highways.

Baltimore has been selected as the site for the issuance of this special traffic safety stamp because the members of the Safety First Club of Maryland originally suggested that such a stamp be issued as a means of reminding the driving public that "Safety is everybody's business." For more than 6 years we have been campaigning for this stamp and we are gratified that it has now been approved by

the Postmaster General and will be issued just before the Labor Day weekend.

Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to note that during the year 1964, 48,000 Americans were killed in traffic accidents. Another 3,840,000 Americans were injured and there were 285,000 pedestrian casualties. We must make an all-out effort to stop this slaughter by automobile.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution as one means of calling to the attention of the public the need for safe driving. Should the President comply with our request to issue a proclamation designating September 3 as Crusade for Safety Day I think he will urge drivers and pedestrians to be especially careful during the Labor Day weekend, but to drive carefully at all times to save lives.

I also urge all citizens in every State of the Union to join the Safety First Club of Maryland in the celebration for the special traffic safety stamp and the "crusade of safety" to protect their own lives, the lives of their dear ones, their neighbors, and their fellow Americans.

The President has indicated that he will issue such a proclamation if requested to do so by the Congress. Again I urge my colleagues to support my resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1648, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it was agreed that title I of the committee substitute, ending on line 8, page 68, be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to title I?
 AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SISK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sisk: On page 67, strike out line 20 and all that follows down through and including line 8 on page 68 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 102. (a) In addition to the assistance otherwise authorized, the Secretary is authorized to make grants in accordance with the provisions of this title to those areas which the Secretary of Labor determines, on the basis of average annual available un-

August 12, 1965

employment statistics, were areas of substantial unemployment during the preceding calendar year.

"(b) Areas designated under the authority of this section shall be subject to an annual review of eligibility in accordance with section 402, and to all of the rules, regulations, and procedures applicable to redevelopment areas except as the Secretary may otherwise prescribe by regulation.

"Sec. 103. Not more than 15 per centum of the appropriations made pursuant to this title may be expended in any one State.

"Sec. 104. No part of any appropriations made pursuant to this title may be expended for any project in any area which is within the 'Appalachian region' (as that term is defined in section 403 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965) which is approved for assistance under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

"Sec. 105. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title not to exceed \$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have introduced, first, would modify the present title so as to make the so-called labor areas, or areas of substantial unemployment, eligible for grants under the public works title of this bill. Second, it would increase the present authorization of title I from \$400 million to \$500 million annually. Third, it would reduce the duration of the program of title I from 5 years to 4 years, so as not to increase the total amount of funds which would be authorized by this bill. No other change in this title has been made or is intended.

The effect of my amendment would be to restore for the purposes of this title those areas which have severe current unemployment on the basis of Labor Department statistics for the preceding calendar year. This is a slightly more rigid standard than the criteria of the Accelerated Public Works Act, which depended upon monthly statistics, but it is more in conformity with the long-range purposes of the present bill and would include approximately the same number of areas.

The reason for my amendment, in my view, is a matter of simple fairness and justice, since the proposed program we are considering today was presented to us as an extension and continuation of both the Accelerated Public Works Act and Area Redevelopment Act programs, and was intended to combine the best features of both. It is impossible to understand how it can combine the best features of both if it completely disregards the areas which were originally designated under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

In addition, while Members like myself who represent large urban areas, see the need to support, and do support, numerous special programs to help the unemployed in the so-called depressed areas of our country, we fail to understand why metropolitan areas with equally serious problems should be totally excluded—particularly when it was the substantial labor surpluses in our areas which largely gave rise to the accelerated public works program in the first place. We want to help these other

areas, but we do not want to completely exclude our areas in order to do so.

The reason that this amendment takes the form of an amendment to title I, rather than simply a new eligibility provision under title IV, is, first, that we are not asking for anything other than what we already had under accelerated public works. Second, we have agreed with the leadership that if this amendment is to be adopted, additional funds must be provided. And, third, we do not want to increase the cost of the bill. We originally considered increasing the \$400 million annual authorization up to \$600 million, but the \$500 million figure was arrived at as a compromise. Therefore, this substitute title should be considered in toto, rather than as three separate provisions.

I am sure that every Member of this House will agree with the reasonableness and fairness of this amendment, since it will not increase the total cost of the program and since we have all been told that the bill we are considering is intended to replace the Accelerated Public Works Act as well as the Area Redevelopment Act.

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

Mr. SISK. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I do not mean to interrupt the gentleman until he completes his statement, but if I understand the gentleman's amendment it would make eligible for assistance only under title I which deals with grants to public facilities, those areas which have before met and do now yet meet the standards which were set forth in our previous accelerated public works program but which have subsequently been dropped from this new version of the current legislation; is that not correct?

Mr. SISK. That is exactly right and that of course, was my sole intent, to put back the main criteria that was available under that program.

Mr. BLATNIK. In changing the annual authorization from \$400 million to \$500 million, you are also reducing the 5-year period now provided in the proposed version under consideration to 4 years, so the total sum authorized would still be \$2 billion; is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is right. We made certain that the total amount would be retained in the bill in the way of an authorization. We realize, of course, we are dependent on the Appropriations Committee and for the Department to justify such amount as may be appropriated.

Mr. BLATNIK. While I cannot speak officially for the committee, and do not speak officially for the committee, but speaking for myself as the manager of the bill, and in view of the unanimous conference on this side, we believe this is a justifiable amendment. It sets no new precedent. These are areas that were included in the public works bill before. They are still eligible under the same criteria now, and they would only be included in title I of this bill. So we would be willing to accept the amendment. We have no objection to it.

Mr. SISK. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Minnesota. We have been conferring with various members of the committee and, as I indicated yesterday, we placed in the Record a statement of intent to offer such amendment, and also outlined the areas that would be affected by that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a copy of a letter from Governor Brown in support of the legislation, and also in support of the amendment which I have offered here.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
August 6, 1965.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BERNIE: As you know, I supported S. 1648, the proposed Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, before both House and Senate Committees as being important to the people and the economy of California and the Nation.

Now that the bill is approaching a House vote I want to reiterate and reinforce this support. I know the record already shows that our California Members worked diligently in efforts to perfect the measure in the House Public Works Committee.

Both the Area Redevelopment Act and the Accelerated Public Works Act—measures this new legislation is designed to supersede—have proven in California that this type of incentive stimulates local endeavor in promoting badly needed development programs in areas that are lagging behind the economy as a whole.

I am told that the measure as reported from committee would make 20 California areas eligible for assistance, to the extent of an estimated \$22.6 million annually over the 5 years of the act, or over \$100 million for our State.

These areas are: Del Norte, El Dorado, Lassen, Madera, Mendocino, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Sierra, Siskiyou, Stanislaus, Sutter, Trinity, Tuolumne, Yuba, Oakland City, and San Diego City.

The efforts of you and other Members of the Congress to amend the legislation to extend its benefits to additional areas by changing the eligibility requirements to include all areas with a 6-percent unemployment rate are commendable. I offer you my full support.

I am told that 15 additional areas in California would benefit by this amendment, adding as much as \$10 million annually to the State share of the program. All these counties have shown a need and most have evidenced a willingness to participate. They are: Glenn, Yolo, Lake, Humboldt, Sonoma, Mariposa, Shasta, Merced, Fresno, Kern, Santa Clara, San Diego, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Tulare.

In addition to the grant and loan provisions of title I the eligible areas would benefit from the development facilities and business loan provisions of title II, the technical assistance and administrative planning grants-in-aid of title II and the additional training assistance for redevelopment areas provided by the Manpower and Development Training Act.

Under the Area Redevelopment Act, enacted in 1961, California has certified 47 applications representing loans and grants totaling over \$18 million for our State.

The Accelerated Public Works Act, enacted in 1963, has generated 265 projects in California with a total investment of \$59 million and Federal assistance of \$31 million.

In order to qualify, all of these programs have had to be immediately needed in the community and because of the lack of local