I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, but I had to agree with the lawyers. It is, indeed, strange that the Library should have to help a gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. Well, the gentleman raises a rather difficult question for me to answer. I think that would be a question for the Senate to answer.

Mr. COLLIER. There are some political problems attending some problems created by what has transpired here.

Mr. COLMER. Quoting the gentleman from Minnesota who just addressed the House, I say that the Senate has passed this bill 72 to 15, there would be considerable interest in it, and I would think they would follow it through.

Mr. COLLIER. I would think so too if it were not late in the session.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), for his diligence in trying to arrive at a solution to this problem. When the bill came over from the other body he called a meeting of the committee, and he brought about a bill. We spent a whole day with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Assistant Secretary of State in trying to work out the basis for a bill that would meet the needs of the industry, take care of the rights and the needs of the Government. I want to say that the gentleman from Arkansas has been most helpful. He has given us assurances that the bill will be brought back for House action, and I hope the Members will send it to conference so that a satisfactory bill can be worked out. The beef producing industry is in trouble. Legislation is essential in this session to assure dairy sources of credit for cattlemen and to bolster a badly sagging market. With the assurances we have received, the best chance we have to get a bill enacted into law is to send this bill to conference.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I share the views expressed by the gentleman who has just addressed the House. I have every confidence that the conference will be able to eliminate the ambiguity to which the gentleman has referred in the Senate version of this bill, and likewise report back an acceptable bill with respect to that section. The matter can be suitably reported, so that the concern that has been expressed by consumers may be cleared up.

I might point out that there has been an unprecedented increase of imports, mutton, lamb, and beef, during the past 6 years into this country. During this unprecedented increase, literally a dumping operation, there has been no reduction in the beef in this country.

So this bill, which appears to be a very reasonable and moderate one from the standpoint of inspection, still permits more than 1 billion pounds of beef and veal to be imported, more than was admitted in 1957, only 6 years ago. But there is still going to be a tremendous amount of imports. Certainly the consumer is not going to feel it one bit if he has not felt the increase in the last 6 years. So I think the conference will have to clear up an ambiguity here and I think that is very essential in order to make it workable and meaningful. I have every confidence our conference will do the best they can to work out an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, some have opposed this legislation because they say they represent consumers. So do I. So does every Member of this body. Each of us represents approximately the same number of consumers, who consume about the same amount of meat. In that respect we all have a common interest.

It is in the public interest, and it is in the interest of consumers, that we maintain a fairly healthy, reasonably prosperous cattle industry in this country. We are talking about those who raise cattle, operate on slim profit margins, take all kinds of chances, and often come out on the short end of the horn. We are talking about those growers and feeders who have given the American people the finest quality to be commended among any Committee in the world. Every consumer owes a debt of gratitude to the American cattle raisers and the feeders. To do otherwise would be to bite the hand that is feeding them.

Moreover, as I have pointed out, there is little relationship between the amount of meat imports and the price the consumer pays for meat in the butchershops. From 1957 to 1964 imports of lamb into this country increased by 860 pounds last year. From 1957 to 1964 imports of lamb increased by 11 percent. Yet there was little effect on the consumer price. Although I do not oppose the imports, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that it is much better for the consumer that the foreign production be reduced.

It is, indeed, strange that the Library should help a gentleman from Texas.
Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that some of the legislation that will be sent to conference and I am opposed to that. I am opposed to the many amendments that are being proposed. It is very important to us that the amendment as it is presently considered be passed.

The beef that is imported into this country is mainly lower grade and lower priced beef that is used in hamburger, meatballs, hot dogs, sausage, and other processed meat products. Not all of our people can afford to eat these all the time, Mr. Speaker, but we can afford to buy lower priced meats.

The beef industry in the United States I am sure understands this and would not want to jeopardize the consumers of the country. The consumers of our country have troubles enough without adding this to their burdens. It should be noted, too, that it is by no means clear that importing of lower grade beef has the effect of depressing the price of domestic, high grade beef. In other words, the consumers could be hurt and the beef industry helped.

It would be one thing, Mr. Speaker, if the bill had been well considered, but it has not been. This is an improved way to legislate and the bill ought to go to conference. A bill of the possible consequences of this bill should have this additional consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has another defect, just as important. The legislation runs directly counter to our efforts to open more channels of foreign trade on a reciprocal basis. It is a protectionist bill. If there is anything we have learned from the history of the last 50 years it is that protectionism feeds on itself, stifles trade and induces stagnation and unemployment.

Our Government is now engaged in delicate trade negotiations at Geneva, seeking to lower trade barriers abroad to many of our exports, agricultural and industrial alike. This is no time to jeopardize those negotiations and hurt our consumers in a great many other areas.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill could also be disastrous for our present agricultural export program which is running at a record high of more than $6 billion a year. Last year, our farmers and our transportation industries at home and greatly benefiting our balance of payments in world trade.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the resolution to send this bill to conference will be adopted.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, as I predicted just a few days ago, the question of whether or not we should curtail the importation of beef in order to protect the prices for producers throughout the Nation is before this House for consideration today.

We find it before the House, as I said at that time, in spite of the fact that on March 10, 1960, the President authorized an expenditure of over $43 million to stabilize beef prices, we are looking upon this bill as a result of the increased production of beef by irrigating lands to produce feed grains and hay.

There are many ironies in legislation being before us today. It is not too long ago that we had a similar parliamentary situation relating to the wheat-cotton bill, and more recently, a bill that was introduced in the 82nd Congress by the late Mr. Dingley which was defeated. I think it's an irony now that we have, in the last year because of the enormous amounts of beef imported, we are now told that this is the only course we can follow.

In view of the fact that we have reached this point with the legislation before us, it seems that we have no alternative but to support the resolution. I do so reluctantly, however, recognizing the great risks that are involved that could prevent, delay, or curtail most essential and needed action during this session.

May I humbly suggest to those who may be selected as conferees on the part of the House the urgency that prevails that some constructive action ought to be taken during the few remaining days of the session. I sincerely hope that the encouraging promises that we have heard today may become a reality.

I do find, however, some consolation and encouragement in the fact that we do have the matter before us today. I have been told recently by a little more than 5 years ago, I first made a point of the extent to which our entire agricultural economy was being adversely affected because of imports of agricultural commodities. While it has taken a long time to achieve even this very minor consideration of a most important subject, it does hold promise that this Congress is and will be more cognizant of the relations of imports to the entire agricultural problem.

There were few listeners 5 years ago, and I sincerely hope that the interest and support that has been voiced and on display here today will develop to new more constructive and rewarding considerations. The provisions of the amendments being sent to conference are truly the very minimum action that ought to be taken. There have already been sufficient compromises made, and so the report of the conference committee surely should offer nothing less than the provisions of the amendment presently constituted and before the House.

It is hoped that with such action, the respective State and Agriculture Departments might also see fit to express their interest and support, as compared to the sales that are presently registering, in order that the future health of farm income might not be encouraged.

The economic plight of farm people throughout the Nation has reached levels entirely comparable to the 1930s, and surely can go unrecognized no longer without serious repercussions to the total national economy.

The American farmer is deserving of his rightful share of our own national consumers' market. At least he ought to be held in equal regard with our concerns for the producers in foreign countries. This has surely not been the case in recent years.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I came to the House today to support House Resolution 814. Adoption of the Senate amendment establishing new quotas upon the importation of beef, beef products, lamb and mutton to H.R. 1839 represents a final opportunity for the Congress in this session to come to the assistance of the ailing domestic livestock industry.

Those of us in the House representing cattle-producing areas have tried for the past several months to obtain consideration from the House of Government and from appropriate committees of the Congress to limit foreign imports of beef. We have long felt that such limitations are necessary to stabilize farm income. In view of assurances of the House on H.R. 1839, and others I am willing for this bill to go to conference.

The livestock sector of our farm economy is extremely important. In my own State of Kansas, livestock accounts for more than half of all farm income. For more than a year I have received mail from farmers, packers, milk producers, packinghouse workers, and others expressing great concern over the impact of foreign imports upon this vital domestic industry.

The importance of cattle is universal and substantial over the country. They are about 40% of the total volume of harvested crops. Any impairment of the cattle industry affects the feed grain farmer, who is already beset with more than his share of troubles. It means loss, too, to the retail merchants, services engaged in supply dealers, banks, the transportation industry, the meatpacking payrolls and all the jobs they produce.

Mr. Speaker, the domestic cattle industry is economically sick. Actions to date by the administration have provided little assistance. No subsidies are asked or given by this legislation. All that is provided is a more realistic ceiling on foreign imports. It is time for the Congress to act.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, as it has been clearly pointed out in the discussions here today on this resolution, there is something to be desired in this procedure. I would like to vote immediately on the direct issue of limiting beef imports and place this matter before the President for his approval or disapproval.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are indications that the other body of this Congress may not have expected the House
of Representatives to accept in full the measure they recently passed by a considerable margin of vote. The Senate passed a good bill and one which would meet the needs of the section of the cattlemen of this country.

As I understand the situation at the moment, imports are down for the very significant reason that cattle prices in this country will not enable this profitable business for imports. Imports are a major factor in causing these conditions, although I would not contend, nor do I know of anyone else who does who has not been in the cattle business, that this accounts for all the difficulties. Be this as it may, I repeat that, in my opinion, imports certainly contributed to the situation to a degree much greater than that attributed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

By sending this measure to conference, this House of Representatives does accept the challenge of the U.S. Senate to do something about this situation, as it is surely going to affect us in the future, if not considerably at the present; but as has been expressed here by several, it could result in an exercise in futility unless all of us, who feel strongly the justification for a remedy to the situation which is causing severe hardship on producers of beefstuffs in the United States, are determined to press this matter every possible effort to a satisfactory conclusion.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that on March 11, I introduced a bill which would accomplish the same thing that is provided in the measure recently passed by the Senate and on which a conference is authorized by the pending resolution. I am, of course, gratified and encouraged that we have gotten this far in meeting this problem but due to the time element and the urgency involved in this matter, immediate action is justified.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the position of those who contend that retail meat prices will advance to the consumer, let it be pointed out that past history does not indicate this to be the case. As you know, there is now in existence an inquiring mind in this country that between the number of live cattle sold by the producer and the price of meat over the counter to the consumer. The situation in this regard is not peculiar or limited to meats, but rather is common to all agricultural products of which I know anything about. This has been the reason for parity in basic agricultural commodities but, of course, has never been applied to the beef industry and, in fact, has been vigorously opposed by cattle raisers. There is nothing unique about meat prices as compared to other products, and it has been shown in some instances the raw product could almost be given away and it would not make an appreciable difference in the retail price. So, when we may finally get this report back from the conference, authorized by this resolution on which we are about to vote, it is likely this will enter into the debate.

But, I say it is a specious argument and one which will be weak in its import when all facts are considered objectively.

The choice of those of us who would like to see something done immediately about meat imports is to vote for this resolution and send this measure to conference with the Senate. At the same time, I join with those who have already expressed themselves in insisting that the conferrees of this body bring back the strongest possible language which would prevent the importation of beef imports and which will guarantee the survival of the cattle industry insofar as the factor of imports is having upon a depressed cattle industry.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, after hearing comments made here today, it may come as a surprise to many that Prime and Choice steers broke through the $26.50 price level in Chicago yesterday. In fact, three loads of Prime steers sold for $26.50 per hundredweight. The average for Choice steers was $25.12 and exceeded the average price of a year ago.

Prices of feed cattle, at $25 to $26, are quite a contrast to that of $20.50 in early June. They clearly reflect the impact and significance of the vigorous programs developed by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman. All cattlemen should be thankful for the dynamic manner in which the President and the Secretary have moved and are continuing to move to help them out of this situation with which they were and are confronted.

In the face of a beef supply situation which has been 13 percent greater the first 6 months of the year than a year ago, the Secretary first announced a beef purchase program in early March, which up to this time has moved 164 million pounds of beef from the surplus market and distributed it to people who needed it in their diets; second, established a National Cattle Industry Advisory Committee to guide him in the development of short- and long-range programs for the cattle industry; third, stimulated the most vigorous and far-reaching merchandising programs for beef ever undertaken in this country; fourth, spearheaded the development of a voluntary import agreement with the major beef importing countries to the United States; fifth, has underway at the present time a program aimed at stepping up our beef exports worldwide but particularly to Europe and exports have already increased 1 percent of our total production; and sixth, has forcefully and intelligently attempted to tell to cattlemen and the public the true story as to why cattle prices have been under pressure; namely, that our problem has become even better as the market is where they reached record highs. Further, we are proposing that subsequent increases in demand be accompanied by corresponding increases in the import quotas.

In short, we are assuring the exporting nations that: First, their business will not be less than it was during a record high, and second, their business may become even better as the market increases.

Viewed in this light, the bill does not become as restrictive as some people would have us believe. It does, however, indicate that the American producers are going to compete in price and quality but that they will not be confronted by importation of huge volumes of price-plunging low-grade meats.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution sending H.R. 1839 to conference. I would prefer a resolution agreeing to the Senate amendments to this bill, but since this is not possible I am anxious to see the bill go to conference.

I have been urging quotas on imports of beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and other meat products for some time. I have introduced several bills providing for the establishment of such quotas. I feel that the rapid increase in these imports is a serious threat to our domestic producers and has materially contributed to the heavy losses they have sustained in recent years.

As my colleagues, the cattle industry of the United States is in a distressed condition today. I do not claim that this is due entirely to foreign imports of beef. However, beef imports have more than
trebled in the last 5 years, and it is ob-
vious imports have had an adverse effect on
cattle prices. I have been receiving le-
tering from my district for several years com-
plaining over these im-
ports, and urging Congress to act.

The cattle industry is very important
to our economy in Colorado, which ranks
12th in the United States for cattle pro-
cattle. Colorado is recognized as one of
the major cattle feeding areas in the
country. Cattle feeders in Colorado took
a heavy loss last year due to the rapid de-
cline in cattle prices. I am encour-
gaged over the remarks of the chairman
of the Ways and Means Committee, the
gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills),
concerning the effort he will make to bring
a resolution to the floor at the earliest possi-
ble date. In my opinion this House will vote
to establish these quotas if given the op-
portunity to vote on this issue. I hope
that this vote can be taken without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolu-
tion will be passed by a unanimous vote of
the House, so that the bill providing for
quotas on foreign imports can go to con-
ference without delay. I am encour-
gaged over the remarks of the chairman
of the Ways and Means Committee, the
gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills),
concerning the effort he will make to bring
a resolution to the floor at the earliest possi-
ble date. In my opinion this House will vote
to establish these quotas if given the op-
portunity to vote on this issue. I hope
that this vote can be taken without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolu-
tion will be passed by a unanimous vote of
the House, so that the bill providing for
quotas on foreign imports can go to con-
ference without delay. I am encour-
gaged over the remarks of the chairman
of the Ways and Means Committee, the
gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills),
concerning the effort he will make to bring
a resolution to the floor at the earliest possi-
ble date. In my opinion this House will vote
to establish these quotas if given the op-
portunity to vote on this issue. I hope
that this vote can be taken without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolu-
tion will be passed by a unanimous vote of
the House, so that the bill providing for
quotas on foreign imports can go to con-
ference without delay. I am encour-
gaged over the remarks of the chairman
of the Ways and Means Committee, the
gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills),
concerning the effort he will make to bring
a resolution to the floor at the earliest possi-
ble date. In my opinion this House will vote
to establish these quotas if given the op-
portunity to vote on this issue. I hope
that this vote can be taken without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolu-
tion will be passed by a unanimous vote of
the House, so that the bill providing for
quotas on foreign imports can go to con-
ference without delay. I am encour-
gaged over the remarks of the chairman
of the Ways and Means Committee, the
gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills),
concerning the effort he will make to bring
a resolution to the floor at the earliest possi-
ble date. In my opinion this House will vote
to establish these quotas if given the op-
portunity to vote on this issue. I hope
that this vote can be taken without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolu-
tion will be passed by a unanimous vote of
the House, so that the bill providing for
quotas on foreign imports can go to con-
ference without delay. I am encour-
gaged over the remarks of the chairman
of the Ways and Means Committee, the
gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Mills),
concerning the effort he will make to bring
a resolution to the floor at the earliest possi-
ble date. In my opinion this House will vote
to establish these quotas if given the op-
portunity to vote on this issue. I hope
that this vote can be taken without delay.
Mr. Speaker, I have heard that the Republican Party has suggested that it might be a good thing if the east coast were severed from the rest of the Nation and shipped out to sea. Now, it would seem that the leadership of that party intends to go a step further. They intend to have the whole eastern seaboard, the coast and cold cuts to such an extent that we will not be able to afford a box lunch as we become driftaways.

I implore the conferees of the House to eschew, after all, to impose this unwholesome, unwarranted and impossible attempt at the plundering of the consumer's pocketbook for the benefit of the "special interests on the hoof." No one would oppose a study of the apportioning of the meat dollar to determine the proper share that is to go to the cattle grower, the feeder and the marketer. Such a study would serve a most useful purpose. However, without such a study, to enact this type of amendment is to assure a wonderful business for the sign painters who will be at Nathan's Famous and every butcher shop and roadside stand, painting price changes to advertise $1 hamburgers and 50-cent hotdogs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the action of the House today in conference with the Senate on H.R. 1839 will not result in approval of the Senate amendments. In my judgment, this amendment would be one of the most severe blows that can be dealt to the consumer at a time when the rising cost of living already plague the average housewife in planning meals for her family.

Although it is true that imports of beef have increased in recent years, the supply of this beef has actually declined on a per capita basis. The result is clear: If we had not had access to these imports, prices of inexpensive meat products, such as frankfurters, luncheon meats and hamburger would have skyrocketed.

If we approve the Senate amendment, the burden of higher prices will fall most heavily on the low-income consumer—the very people we voted to help with antipoverty legislation last week.

This amendment is wrong both in its assumptions and in its design. Overproduction of domestic grain-fed beef is the cause of pricing problems, not imports. The effect of this legislation would be to invite retaliation by our trading partners on other items and undermine the U.S. negotiating position at Geneva. In addition, it would result in our violation of international agreements concluded with the four principal suppliers of fresh, chilled, and frozen meat: Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, and Australia.

Mr. Speaker, economic commonsense and international honor demand that we reject this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on this matter with some question as to the proper course of action. We know what we want to achieve on behalf of the cattle industry, but we are in some doubt as to which of two legislative courses of action is most appropriate for us to support.

On the one hand, it is quite clear that our domestic beef has recently been in serious economic difficulty because of falling prices per hundredweight of cattle. Even though cattle are central to our agricultural economy—constituting 85 percent of the value and 70 percent of the harvested value in this country—livestock prices have dropped nearly $2 billion in the last 22 months. There are nearly 500,000 head of cattle in my congressional district alone.

Much of this economic difficulty can be attributed to the rise in cattle imports, for as we all know, a small additional increase in the amount of beef on the market can mean sharp reductions in the wholesale price. Just a cursory glance at the record will show that imports in 1963 were 100 times greater than they were in 1954 and 10 times as high as they were in 1957. In 1960 we imported 284 million pounds of boneless, fresh, chilled, or frozen beef. In 1963, the figure had risen nearly threefold to a total of 940 million pounds, or 11 percent of all U.S. beef sales.

The Congress has a clear responsibility to protect this vital segment of our economy from the additional foreign inroads on the market. Before the industry has recovered enough to allow gradual increases in imports.

We know full well that there are those who are opposed to our attempts to protect the welfare of our cattlemen. We recognize that there is some merit in their arguments, but we would stress the pressing nature of the emergency in the cattle industry in answer to them.

Those legislators who are concerned about possible increases in the retail price of beef should recall that most price increases have been the result of increasing the share to the middleman. They should wait for the results of investigations by the new Food Marketing Commission before pressing hastily for action.

Those Members who are concerned about our image in the free world of trade, and our bargaining position in the "Kennedy round" of GATT negotiations need not vote against the main measure. They have options to make suitable amendments without scuttling our cattlemen in the process. Surely at some level—either committee or conference—they can devise statutory wording permitting us to reduce trade barriers after this immediate crisis has passed.

Those Members who are representing importers of cheap, low-grade beef have no choice but to oppose us on the measure.

For our part, we have tried to be helpful and informative to all of our constituents who are interested in this problem and by our vote in the Congress we intend to do the very best we can to do justice to the interests of our farmers and cattlemen who make their livelihood by production and feeding of beef.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker—coming back to our original problem—we wonder whether it is better to support the resolution before us by sending the Senate beef bill to conference, or to encourage hearings on a new House bill before the Ways and Means Committee.

We are now late in the session. Whether or not the Congress returns a bill before the remaining Convention is problematical and if it is decided to adjourn sine die before the Convention, we have little more than a week remaining in which to perfect a bill.

For instance, whether by lack of care or through a mistake in the drafting of the amendment, an exception was inserted into the number of pounds of cattle meat listed as a limitation, providing that the Senators' provisions "shall be suspended" during any period the President declares to be a period of "national emergency." Yet the Members all know that the Congress might be at large late in the year if it were not for the legal fiction that we are now in a period of "national emergency."

Those of us with a serious desire to see such a useful purpose in such legislation as the Senate amendments, can hope for in light of the late date of this session are confronted with a difficult dilemma in deciding whether to send the Senate version of H.R. 1839 to conference. The Senate bill now before us contains some provisions that are not only objectionable, but one provision that may make the Senate-passed version inoperative because of the use of the words "national emergency."

There are dangers in letting such a bill go to conference without detailed hearings and debate. But on the other hand, if the House were to start over and write its own bill, the Senate might not act on such an improved measure. Thus the effect of an attempt to improve the bill in committee where it belongs might in actuality kill it for this session of Congress.

For any worthwhile or effective legislation limiting the quantities of imports of beef must be based on our trust and faith in the integrity and steadfastness of purpose of the conferees appointed on the part of the House. We must rely at this late date on the ability of the Members in conference with managers on the part of the Senate to write good legislation in the conference committee that will be reported back to both bodies of Congress. We are hopeful and optimistic that these conferees will write provisions that can be acted upon with the strong support of both bodies and then be approved, rather than defeated, by the President.

Here, then, is the choice. On the one hand, we can vote against sending the
The amendment was introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

One of three actions could have been taken. First of all, the Committee on Rules could have reported either one of these resolutions. By the close vote of 8 to 7, it reported the Mills resolution which is now before us, House Resolution 814, to send the bill to conference.

Frankly, those who supported the proposal that the Olsen resolution be adopted and that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table, and the Senate amendments agreed to, expressed the fear that if the House amendment were to remain pending, the conference committee would never see the light of day; or that sending it to conference would mean the end of the bill.

However, the Committee on Rules felt it best, in judgment, as I say by a vote of 8 to 7, to report the Bills resolution which adoption would send it to conference.

It is my understanding, and I want to find out if may as long as I am on my feet, that the livestock industry has agreed to some sort of an arrangement whereby they will support this resolution to send the bill to conference with the understanding that if a suitable compromise cannot be worked out by the conference committee that the matter will be returned to the House, so that the House itself may take action—if no conference report is agreed to—to either instruct the conferees further or to take the bill from the Speaker's table, as reported from the Senate, and agree to the Senate amendments.

I would like to know, if I may, from someone who speaks for the livestock industry as to whether or not such an arrangement or agreement has been made? I will yield to whoever wants to speak up and tell us what they know about that situation.

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

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

Mr. JENNINGS. Let me say first of all, I think the gentleman has described very fully and clearly and emphatically the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves.

As a livestock producer myself and one who is in sympathy with the livestock industry, and one who is in sympathy with them because of the plight that they are in today, I can say that it is my understanding, after having met and after having talked with them, that this gentleman has described at this time is exactly their position, with the emphatic understanding that the House will then have the opportunity of voting on the conference report and voting it either up or down; and then have the opportunity of passing or not passing the Senate amendment to our wildlife bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If any other spokesman for the livestock industry has any authoritative information, may I have his views?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. I do not know that I qualify as an authoritative spokesman for the livestock industry, I say to my friend from Ohio, but the president of the National Cattlemen's Association is a close personal friend of mine and I have known some other livestock people for a long time.

It is my understanding that the gentleman is correct; that they agreed that the bill should go to conference with the understanding—I hope we can emphasize this, because it is really important—the understanding just outlined by the gentleman from Virginia, that if the conference report is approved by the livestock people and to those of us who represent livestock areas in the U.S. Congress, we will have an opportunity to vote on accepting the House bill as amended by the Senate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. To save time, I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

If the resolution is adopted and the measure goes to conference, as has been discussed, is my understanding correct that every attempt will be made by the conferences on the part of the House to work out a compromise agreement, or settlement of the issue involved, to the satisfaction of the livestock industry and the Members of the House interested in this matter; and, if such a solution can be brought in as a part of the conference report, that an opportunity will be given to vote that conference report, either up or down; and if the conference report is rejected, then I believe that it will be in order to immediately adopt the Senate amendments to the bill?

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

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

Mr. MILLS. If I am a member of the House conference group, I would say we would endeavor to work out a compromise for the Senate amendment which would be acceptable to all people concerned. I have said that we would do our best in that direction. In any event I have said that we would bring back to the House a conference report. That is our intention. We are not going to leave the Members without an opportunity to vote one way or another on this subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.
With the understanding, as stated by the gentleman from Kansas— that an opportunity will be given to vote upon the conference report—and with the understanding that under the parliamentary procedure which might follow, if the conference report is voted down, another opportunity will be given to adopt the Senate amendment, I will try to bring some thing back to the House which everybody can agree.

We may be able to perform such a miracle. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Eyskar), and I have discussed this matter on many occasions, but certainly we will bring to the House something whether the House likes it or not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute additional.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I think I can report for the Kansas livestock industry to say that they are in support of this resolution.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I think I can report for the Kansas livestock industry to say that they are in support of this resolution. I want to say that the restrictions the livestock industry have been described as the Braska amendment to the wheat-cotton bill. If that language had been adopted, we would not be in the dilemma we are in today. So I do not think those of you here on the floor who represent consumers groups need to feel apprehensive that these interests will not be well protected by what might happen to this bill. However, I also think it should be said for the record here today that the livestock industry is not very happy with what is going on here, and they are not being fooled by this procedure or these gestures we are going through today. Frankly, I am not very hopeful that any effective controls will result from this exercise here today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson), a member of the committee from the wheat-cotton bill. I yield myself to the chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Mills, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Mills, will the gentleman yield?
a ruinous decline; that the United States must never become the dumping ground for world beef supplies—he ends by saying the Department of Agriculture can do nothing to help but do not bother us now.

Mr. Speaker, 72 Members of the other body said rather emphatically with their votes the other day that the time is now and not some time after the election or in the dim and misty future.

I introduced a bill along the lines of the Senate amendment last March. So did more than 40 Members of this body—Republicans and Democrats. Six members of the Ways and Means Committee introduced similar legislation. Hearings were held on this problem before that committee 2 months ago. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this matter endlessly on this floor in speeches and special orders. I know that my experience in receiving scores, if not hundreds of letters and communications outlining this whole problem in great detail is not unique by any means. Many Members have done what I have done. We have testified before the U.S. Tariff Commission and sought relief through that channel. It has not come. We have personally conferred with Mr. Christian Herter, the President's special representative on trade matters, and with officials in the Department of Agriculture and the State Department. All we have been able to accomplish is represented in a voluntary agreement negotiated some weeks ago with Australia and New Zealand. It is these two countries that, of course, are in large part responsible for the fact that in about a decade the percentage of receipts of imports to total domestic consumption has been more than five-fold. At the same time we have seen prices paid domestic livestock producers decline to an 18-year low. Our imports from 6, decided 2 years ago, two countries increased 90 percent over the already high rate of 1961. In 1963, they increased 110 percent over what they were in 1961. The cutback provided for in the voluntary agreements will not bring the level of these imports back to the 1950-63 average but will rather cut them back to the 1962-63 average when they were already at fantastically high levels. Is it any wonder then that cattlemen and the livestock industry: "On the agreement with this procedure and that he hopes that proper legislation for relief of the livestock industry may be worked out."

I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to the fact that in June—believe I introduced a bill along the lines of the finest groups and one of the finest effort to save a vital industry and thereby help to restore some measure of economic health not only to that industry alone but all of American agriculture.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Martin].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Nebraska objected to the unanimous-consent request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means last week to send this bill to conference, I want to assure the House that in view of the chairman's statements on the floor this afternoon I am in accord with sending this bill to conference at the present time.

I would like further to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the secretary of the National Livestock Feeders' Association has assured me that his association is in agreement with this procedure and that he hopes that proper legislation for relief of the livestock industry may be worked out.

I would like to call the attention of this body to the fact that in June—believe I introduced a bill along the lines of the finest groups and one of the finest effort to save a vital industry and thereby help to restore some measure of economic health not only to that industry alone but all of American agriculture.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. Hoeven].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe we will understand the parliamentary situation. Let me say that I appeared before the Committee on Rules and asked for a rule which would have permitted the House to adopt a rule to accept the Senate amendments. I think that would have been the most direct way to handle the situation and it would have given remedial relief to our cattle feeders. The Committee on Rules, however, by a mere majority vote, rejected this proposal. The question before us is whether or not we shall now send the bill to conference.

I have faith in the integrity and the honesty of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the conferees to be appointed. However, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to the fact that in June—believe I introduced a bill along the lines of the finest groups and one of the finest effort to save a vital industry and thereby help to restore some measure of economic health not only to that industry alone but all of American agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Martin].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think they will work this out in the best interests of our livestock and cattle industry in this country who so desperately need this help.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I had a telephone call from one of my ranchers in Nebraska within the last 2 days. He advised me that imports of cattle from the extremely low prices of cattle that he had lost $100,000 in the last 12 months. I think it is time that we looked after the interests of our American taxpayers rather than the interests of those in foreign countries.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, let us express the hope that the livestock producers of this country will find that their hopes are well founded.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Martin].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I believe we will understand the parliamentary situation. Let me say that I appeared before the Committee on Rules and asked for a rule which would have permitted the House to adopt a rule to accept the Senate amendments. I think that would have been the most direct way to handle the situation and it would have given remedial relief to our cattle feeders. The Committee on Rules, however, by a mere majority vote, rejected this proposal. The question before us is whether or not we shall now send the bill to conference. I have faith in the integrity and the honesty of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the conferees to be appointed. However, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to the fact that in June—believe I introduced a bill along the lines of the finest groups and one of the finest effort to save a vital industry and thereby help to restore some measure of economic health not only to that industry alone but all of American agriculture.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. Hoeven].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe we will understand the parliamentary situation. Let me say that I appeared before the Committee on Rules and asked for a rule which would have permitted the House to adopt a rule to accept the Senate amendments. I think that would have been the most direct way to handle the situation and it would have given remedial relief to our cattle feeders. The Committee on Rules, however, by a mere majority vote, rejected this proposal. The question before us is whether or not we shall now send the bill to conference. I have faith in the integrity and the honesty of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the conferees to be appointed. However, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to the fact that in June—believe I introduced a bill along the lines of the finest groups and one of the finest effort to save a vital industry and thereby help to restore some measure of economic health not only to that industry alone but all of American agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Martin].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think they will work this out in the best interests of our livestock and cattle industry in this country who so desperately need this help.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately at a time when the income in nonfarm operation is going up, farm income has been going down and at this point the parity ratio of farm income is the lowest that it has been for 25 years. It now stands at the deplorable level of 74 percent of parity.

One segment of our agricultural economy that has been hard hit is the livestock feeders. While prices were going down imports were increasing at an unprecedented level. This situation has previously been referred to in this debate.

A tremendous grassroots demand developed requesting legislative relief as far as imports are concerned.

Many of us recall when the Reciprocal Trade Act was passed we were assured that the farmers' interests would be protected feel that in view of the fact that reasonable and fair negotiations obviously did not develop, the farmers were left with only one alternative and that through the legislative process.

We all recall the Hruska proposal which would have amended the wheat-cotton bill to provide limitations on beef imports. This amendment was defeated and soon the grassroots began to speak and loudly.

Some of our farm publications and news commentators indicated that rumors prevailed that the Senate would pass a Hruska limitation bill and then the bill would be conveniently lost in the House. This procedure would take the politically embarrassed Senators off the hook.

We are now faced with a decision as to procedure and as to provisions in the Senate bill that some now declare would make the bill inoperative because of the reference to national emergencies.

I submit to Congress a request for a clarification on this point which I wish to insert at this point in the Record.

The Library of Congress
Legislative Reference Service

To: Hon. ANCHER NELSEN (Attention of Mr. Donald W. Olsen)

From: American Law Division
Subject: Viability of Korean national emergency

This will refer to your request of August 10, 1964, for information on the present effect of the national emergency proclaimed by President Truman during the Korean war. As discussed today on the telephone, we will also furnish a brief statement on the following connected question: If a law is passed now providing that certain tariff restrictions on certain imported commodities shall be suspended during periods of national emergency as proclaimed by the President, would the Korean war emergency have any effect on such law?

To recapitulate our telephone discussion, the national emergency proclaimed by President Truman on December 16, 1950 (15 Federal Register 9029; procl. No. 2914), has never been terminated or modified by the President but Congress. The emergency was proclaimed as a result of the Red Chinese intervention in the Korean war in late November 1950; in the proclamation the President speaks of the dangers of world conquest by Communist imperialism, obviously in response to the Chinese move. In the proclamation of 1950, after long negotiation, an armistice was concluded between the United Nations forces and Red China and North Korea; peace has never been concluded. One may regard the armistice as a substantial modification of the emergency proclamation, since it removes the immediate conditions which gave rise to that proclamation. In addition to the armistice, there has been a considerable lapse of time since the proclamation, a factor which also lessens its current effectiveness.

However, the decisive factor in relation to the proposed law and the Korean emergency is the fact that the President is not likely to be regarded as prospective; that is, speaking from the date of its enactment and looking to the future, any new potential legislation to the contrary, statutes will take effect from the day of their passage or enactment, Matthews v. Zane, 7 Wheat. 186; Robertson v. Bradbury, 125 U.S. 491. Retroactive legislation is less favorable because of its tendency to be unjust and oppressive, White v. U.S., 191 U.S. 182. It is possible that the President's declaration of the armistice and the political embarrassment of the Senators may well be effective to make this law inoperative.

The proposed law appears to provide that the emergency may relate to current and future national emergencies.

The emergency currently is the Korean emergency, the rules of statutory construction agree that a law should be held to look to the future only. Thus, the national emergency referred to in the proposed law is that national emergency proclaimed by the President. The courts would most likely say that if Congress had inteded the 1950 proclamation to be effective, it would have said so.

Hugh C. Keenan
Legislative Attorney.

The answer is self-explanatory and, according to this interpretation, the Senate language would be operative.

Reference to national emergencies was referred to in the debate in the Senate on July 28, page 17150, which read as follows:

In the event of national emergency or national disaster in the livestock industry, adjustments can be made in the quota base.

It seems rather strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that a bill as important as this one and that passed by the Senate by a vote of 72 to 15 should be inoperative as some now say.

Are we here in the House saying that the majority leader, the majority whip, the minority leader, and whip, as well as many other men of great repute, did not know what they were doing and can it be possible that our procedure has become so careless that we here in the House have before us a bill that is not worth the paper it is written on?

I hope the procedure here recommended does not leave the cattlemen high, dry, and broke.

The statement of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee may be prophetic and I have in mind his reference to the fact that it could well be a miracle if an acceptable bill could be worked out.

I hope the rumors I have heard prove false and that the House will have an opportunity to vote on a bill that will be effective and helpful to the farmers of America.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious what the parliamentary situation is; it is also obvious we do not know what the effect of the passage of this resolution is going to be. I think the
House wants to vote on a livestock import bill this session. We have been prevented from voting on it. The bill was introduced in Congress to reduce meat imports. The Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to my bill and to every bill introduced to reduce meat imports. Secretary Freeman and everybody knows the President has been made law long ago in order that the United States market for meat and meat products (as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture) exceeds the total average annual market during such twelve-month import period within the limitation imposed by the United States from any country during such period within the limitation imposed by the United States from any country during such period.

The full text of my bill H.R. 10099 follows:

A bill to restrict imports of meat and meat products into the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the total quantity of meat and meat products which may be imported, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during any twelve-month import period, shall be provided for in the first section of this Act shall be increased to the amount bearing the same ratio to such quantity as such market during the first twelve-month import period bears to such average annual market during such five-year period ending on December 31, 1963.

Soc. 2. As used in this Act—
(1) the term "meat and meat products" includes (A) beef, veal, lamb, mutton, pork, poultry, and any other meat to which part or all of which may be used in the preparation of any food product sold as meat, or meat products, or only so much of the value of any other meat or meat product, or part thereof, as is attributable to the meat or meat products, or part thereof, as is attributable to the meat or meat products, and (B) the term "twelve-month import period" means the twelve-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or any subsequent twelve-month period beginning on an anniversary of such date.

Sec. 3. The twelve-month import period (after the first such period), the total United States market for meat and meat products (as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture) exceeds 50 per centum of the average annual United States market for meat and meat products during the five-year period ending on December 31, 1963, the maximum quantity of meat and meat products which could otherwise be imported into the United States from any country during such period within the limitation imposed by the first section of this Act shall be increased to an amount bearing the same ratio to such quantity as such market during the twelve-month import period bears to such total average annual market during such five-year period.

Sec. 4. Each quantity referred to in the first section of this Act shall be expressed in terms of dollar value, or in terms of such other units (as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture) as will permit its magnitude to be measured, or equated or compared with other quantities in determining whether and to what extent the limitation imposed by such section is applicable, without regard to the kinds of meat and meat products or part thereof, or the proportion of meat and meat products which are included in such quantity. In the case of a product which is not prepared or preserved and whether canned, cured, dressed, or in any other form, (B) live animals imported to provide meat of any kind or in any form, and which is intended for human consumption; and

The thing that worries me is the fact that several months prior to the President threatened to veto any beef import restriction law that Congress passed. He made the statement that no "cow poke" would dictate the foreign policy of America. The State Department has been very vocal in their propaganda against any limitation on meat imports. The Secretary of Agriculture only last week, when speaking before the stockmen's representatives here in Washington, indicated that the Department of Agriculture was opposed to any import restrictions upon beef. A day or two following passage of the Senate amendment the Exporters Association, those who are importing beef from Australia and New Zealand primarily into the United States, ran full page ads in most of the daily papers of the country, arousing the consumer and stockfeeders who have worked out the details of this import restriction became a law that the prices of meat would skyrocket.

All of these things, Mr. Speaker, fill me with fear of what may happen to this meat import restriction bill. The time is short. We have only the assurance of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and insofar as that chairman is concerned, he, I know, will do everything within his power to bring back either a report, upon which the conference of the House and Senate have agreed, and put it up to the House, and if the terms are not acceptable, we as a body can then reject the conference report and by motions proceed to adopt the Senate version which will put us back into the same shape, Mr. Speaker, that we are in right now if we were to vote down the previous question and then vote on the new amendment to the motion.

Under the circumstances I shall follow the best judgment of the stockgrowers and stockfeeders who have worked out these arrangements. I shall vote to send it to conference. I hope the Senate version will be improved. I hope it can be
brought back, passed and sent to the President's desk for his signature. Failing in that, I hope we at least have the opportunity to send him the Senate version.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHOER].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to say much about this most important bill without having held hearings. We must recognize the broad support for this legislation in the U.S. Congress. It has already been said that this bill was passed in the Senate by a very substantial majority of 72 to 15. It is worth pointing out, however, that beef import legislation was introduced in the House by 72 Members. I introduced legislation in April of 1963 so there has been ample time for the Ways and Means Committee to have held hearings.

To some people who have expressed concern about the effect of this legislation on consumers, I would point out that the price of beef to the consumer has gone down very little even though beef imports are at an all-time high. The price to the producer has gone down a lot. I am a rancher myself. We sold our calves off our ranch 2 years ago for 22 cents a pound. We are probably going to sell them this year for 24 cents a pound. Western range calves are being contracted now at that price and lower. This is a price reduction of 25 percent to the cattle producer.

I just want to say a word or two about the agreement between livestock representatives and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means. As I understand it, in talking with the livestock organization representatives the people on the Committee on Ways and Means have properly pointed out some revisions that perhaps should be made in the bill passed by the Senate. If this is going to be a meaningful and effective beef import bill we want to be sure there are no loopholes or unworkable provisions.

With the assurances that have been given by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that we will have a chance to debate the Senate-passed bill if we cannot agree to the conference report when it comes back here, I think we can do no less now than accept these assurances and let this beef import legislation go to conference. If we do not agree with the conference report we will have a chance to vote on the question that I regret we are not going to be able to dispose of today. Time is running out for this session of Congress and I fear we are risking no action on beef legislation because of the limitation of time.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the producers of red meats have been given so little consideration this year. First the majority of the other body refused to add an amendment on beef imports to the wheat and cotton amendment on the record as favoring cattlemen by voting for an amendment to a zoo bill, expecting that it will die in the House. Now when it seemed possible to accept the Senate amendment immediately to the President, we find that the amendments are difficult and a conference is necessary to improve the bill.

The time is short for action. I hope the assurance given today will enable us to send an adequate bill to the President. It is for this reason that I support the rule and wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHOER], who has had a wealth of experience in the cattle business and for whom I have the greatest respect.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was brought before the Rules Committee the Senate amendment I favored the rule to adopt the Senate amendment. I did so because I am very much interested in the distressing condition of the cattle market and try to solve it from personal experience. If I felt that bill would serve purpose, I would be voting this morning to vote down the previous question and adopt the Senate bill. I am convinced, however, since we held a meeting in the Rules Committee, that if we did do that the bill by reason of this national emergency clause could very probably make the bill totally ineffective from the very beginning. That is not what any of us wants to do, I am sure.

I have come to the conclusion that the best chance we have, and it is only a chance, I think everybody ought to understand that, is to send the matter to the Ways and Means Committee for a conference with the assurances given us already by the chairman of that committee. And I am convinced because we are, I think, endeavoring to adjourn here next week, and that gives you less than 10 days to get this thing through all the machinery that it has to go through both in the House and in the Senate. I do not know whether when it gets to the Senate you are ever going to get anything back over here or whether they are ever going to do anything at all. They may or they may not accept it. But I believe the way we are pursuing is the best one, in view of the very short time we have left. As I understand the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, we are assured that this conference report will come back to the House this week, so that we can be on the way to negotiations with the Senate.

Mr. MILLS. No, I had not said it would be possible to bring it back this week. What I said was this:

If the Senate succeeds, as I understand it, it intends to bring this matter forward to have the conference the Senate and the House. I would go to conference at 2:30 tomorrow if I can have the action back to the House for consideration on Friday. I could not say, I would think it might be possible on Monday possibly. Of course, we will try.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Can the gentleman give us any definite assurance now as to the latest date that this House will have an opportunity to act on this matter?

Mr. MILLS. I could not give you any definite assurance. There are too many imponderables and matters over which I have no control. We have to file a conference report first. It would be our intention to expedite the conference. Certainly, I am not going to take a whole lot of time trying to settle this in conference.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sure that you are not.

Mr. MILLS. What I said, as the gentleman will recall, is that we will try to bring something back from conference if it will be constructive and helpful. We will bring something back that we can act on and we will do it as expeditiously as we can. I just do not want to say that we will have it back here and have a vote on it Friday.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Or on any other day?

Mr. MILLS. I cannot say it will be Friday. The gentleman asked me if it would be this week.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, now I ask the gentleman—what is the latest date?

Mr. MILLS. I told the gentleman that I thought the latest date would probably be Monday. We would be ready on Monday of next week. I do not intend to take 4 or 5 days in conference on this, I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know and I think the House ought to thoroughly understand the whole thing is not in the hands of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely, and I appreciate the gentleman pointing that out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This thing is pretty vital to the cattle people of this Nation. I think we ought to be pretty sure that we are going to get to vote on the matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

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

The question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up now the Senator's table the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "economically needy" and insert "low-income".
Page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "in economic disaster" and insert "with low incomes".
Page 2, line 20, strike out all after "(b)" down to and including line 23 and insert "The term 'food' means any food or food products, including alcoholic beverages, tobacco, those foods which are identified on the package as being imported, and meat and meat products which are imported."
Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"(b) In areas where a food stamp program is in effect, no distribution of food stamp coupons shall be made directly to needy persons. The food stamp program operates as a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving my remarks on the Senate amendments to the title of the bill, H.R. 10222, and that the amendments which are incorporated in this Act, a sum equal to the amount by which the value of any coupons issued as a result of the fraud of such coupon or the amount that was charged for such coupons under section 7(b) of this Act."

Page 17, line 10, after "'1967'" insert "; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year.

Page 18, Line 11, after "section." Insert "If in any fiscal year the Secretary finds that the requirements of participating States will exceed the amounts for which such States are identified on the package as being imported, and meat and meat products which are imported."

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks on the Senate amendments to this Act, which is designed to alleviate hunger, should operate to deprive the American people of the blessings of our agricultural abundance. The food stamp program operates as a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance. The fact that a household may have no income at all during portions of the year does not necessarily prevent that household from participating in the food stamp program. If there are circumstances in any community which would prevent many households from being eligible to participate in the stamp program for a temporary period, it seems to me that this could qualify such an area under the "emergency situation" provision of the Senate bill and that the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted by the language of the Senate bill to institute a direct distribution program of such extent and for...
such period of time as he might determine necessary to take care of these families.

I have discussed this matter with the Secretary of Agriculture and he informs me that this is the manner in which he believes the language should be construed if the bill is enacted as amended.

Mr. Speaker, as we finally conclude legislative action on this bill after so many crises in its progress, I want to thank some people by name for their efforts on behalf of this idea. First of all, I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker. Both as Speaker and as former majority leader, you worked long and hard and effectively over the years to help me to have this legislation considered and eventually enacted. The present majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOAG]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]—the only member of his party to vote for the food stamp bill the first time I called it up for a House vote back in 1957, and a strong supporter of the idea ever since—these men deserve special thanks for their leadership on this issue. Senators Humphrey, Douglas, Alton, Ellender, Symington, and Long, and the late President Kennedy when he served in the Senate, and my former colleague from Missouri, the late Senator Thomas H. Hennings, all worked hard for enactment of a food stamp method of distributing additional food to the needy.

As a result of his work in the Senate on my food stamp bill in 1958, John F. Kennedy later had a clear understanding when he became President, of the value of this kind of approach to the contradiction of vast food surpluses and many hungry Americans. His very first Executive Order, February 2, 1961, was for a substantial increase in the types and varieties of food to be distributed to the needy under the direct distribution program.

I am enclosing a copy of the report of the House Committee on Agriculture in 1959 on the surplus food distribution program as previously carried out has been heartbreaking—unsatisfactory when compared to the need and to the vast stores of food suitable and available for distribution to the needy.

Increasing the foodstuffs to be given to the needy in areas where local authorities are participating in the distribution program will be of substantial help to thousands of families. Also, where such your administration is able to take without extensive preliminary arrangements.

Distribution of food commodities in surplus through the regular grocery stores will make possible a vast expansion in the utilization of surplus food items. For instance, such items as surplus fresh eggs and milk rather than in powdered form, and such perishable foods as fresh tomatoes, green beans, and pork, fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables could all be distributed efficiently and effectively if the food stamp plan is put into effect.

Furthermore, the greatest single limiting factor in preventing the most effective distribution of surplus food items to the needy—the disproportionately high costs to local authorities in financing the storage, handling and direct distribution—would be eliminated, thus making it possible for these nutritious foods to be distributed to provably needy persons everywhere in the United States, not merely to those where chronic unemployment is of such vast proportions as to force local authorities to spend funds they often cannot afford for the direct distribution.

In my city of St. Louis, for instance, our officials recently decided they could no longer afford the high municipal cost of distribution, yet our needy—those on various forms of public assistance and those who cannot qualify technically for assistance despite the need because there are persons in the family—such family groups are very much in need of the better diets which could be made available for them by a good surplus distribution program under the food stamp law. A hungry person anywhere in America is just as hungry for not living in a depressed area, and just as much entitled to help.

I am enclosing a copy of the report of the House Committee on Agriculture in 1959 on my food stamp bill at the time it was reported out for House action. From this, you will note that all food distribution, both present and future, is under the food stamp plan. Instead of the pasta remains if the bill is enacted as amended.

In refusing to put this law into effect—or to use the same authority contained in section 32 which the Roosevelt administration used to establish a different food stamp program—the previous administration has maintained that the food stamp program we have now is the very best and only one we could have. If a food stamp plan were merely the same ones now being distributed—those in actual Government ownership. This is not correct. Until recently, as early as 1962, and as outlined in the report of the House committee which I am enclosing, the Government had not only failed to keep pace with the food industry for exchange of stocks, etc., just as it does now for processing of surplus items for direct distribution. By using the regular stores (those which wish to participate) we can distribute fresh and frozen rather than just dry or dehydrated items, and we can quickly build up nutritional standards of 7 million or more Americans now not afford a decent minimum diet, no matter where they live.

I, therefore, urge that you direct your Department of Agriculture to set in motion the necessary arrangements to bring the food stamp plan into operation. The present permissive law runs until 1963. Four years is enough.

Respectfully yours,

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of January 28 on surplus food donations and stamp plans and also to see that arrangements and suggestions were brought to the attention of Secretary Freeman. This has been done.

In his economic message to the Congress on February 2, the President reported that he had instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish pilot food stamp programs in six localities with high levels of unemployment. In line with your own sponsorship of the 1958 food stamp legislation, the purpose of the pilot operations would be to test the effectiveness of various types of stamp programs as a means of making it possible for more needy families to obtain more nearly adequate diets. The Department of Agriculture is proceeding to work out a detailed plan of operation for these pilot programs. I know that you realize the many alternatives that must be investigated in the development of such a program and the need to consult with welfare and food trade groups. We want to thank you for your most interesting and constructive suggestions in this total effort to make fuller use of our agricultural abundances.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

STRONG SUPPORT FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. Speaker, the pilot-plan approach, begun originally in six areas, was later extended to 40 counties and to the cities of Detroit, St. Louis, and Pittsburgh. On balance, it has been a tremendous success, even though, as a new program of Government, involving a great deal of Federal-State-local coordination and administration, it has run into many administrative problems which have had to be solved. But they are being solved, and those who participate in this program have strongly endorsed it in a most positive manner.
President Johnson put the full weight of his office, and of his tremendous powers of persuasion, behind this legislation, and its passage in the Congress today is largely a tribute to his powerful leadership. Secretary Freeman has never wavered in his effective support of this idea—in contrast to his predecessor who said it could not work, this Secretary of Agriculture made it work. Ken Birkhead, special assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, who recently received the Department’s top award for distinguished service, earned that award at least in part for the outstanding work he did in making sure Members of Congress had the full and correct facts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are undoubtedly many others—Members of Congress, congressional staff people such as Charles B. Holstein, John Helmburger, of the Agriculture Committee, and others—who deserve thanks and appreciation for their long and hard work on this legislation. Congresswomen Martha Griffiths, Edna Kelly, Elizabeth Keck, and Edith Green should certainly be mentioned in the help and encouragement they gave me over the years—and there are many, many others who also helped.

I am truly grateful to all who supported me on this. To all of them, I say thank you. And the people of this country will thank you, too—particularly those who will have the opportunity under this legislation to enjoy for the first time a really decent, attractive, diet in the American tradition.

Indeed sorry that the administration has prevailed and that this bill will now become law.

If any recourse were available to prevent its enactment, I can assure you I would pursue it. However, a conference with the other body would serve no useful purpose as all but one of the amendments adopted by the other body changed little of substance in the bill.

The only amendment of importance adopted by the other body establishes the prohibition on the use of food stamps for imported meat and meat products. Since the administration opposes this amendment, it would surely be lost in a conference report.

Thus the choice today is not one between a good bill and a bad bill; rather it is a choice between the lesser of two evils, and under the circumstances I am not objecting to accepting the Senate amendments.

INCREASING THE RETIREMENT SALARIES OF CERTAIN RETIRED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDGES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 12198) to amend section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the retirement salaries of certain retired judges, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

“(d) A judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals or the District of Columbia court of general sessions who has retired prior to the effective date of this Act shall receive $24,000—under this bill he would draw about $16,000.

Former Chief Judge Nathan Cayton retired after 29 years service and was drawing $18,500. He receives $18,367 retirement. Under this bill he, too, would receive about $24,000. He is also on active duty practically full time.

By the reported bill, those judges who have heretofore retired will have their salary computed under the same formula and at the new rate of compensation as will be the case with judges who may in the future retire under the 1964 Salary Act. In other words, there will be, and in the opinion of your committee there should be, no difference in the status of present retired judges and judges who may retire in the future, at least insofar as such retirement occurs under the existing law.

BACKGROUND

The Consolidation Act—Public Law 512, 77th Congress, 2d session—approved April 1, 1942, provides—in section 11—for the retirement of judges after serving 20 years or more, with compensation in equal monthly installments in the sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge on the date of such retirement that the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the total of 30 years.

Paragraph (b) of the same section provides that any judge receiving retirement salary may be called upon by the chief judge of either court to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him for periods up to 90 days in any year.

The fact of the matter is, as stated, that both the retired judges have continued to perform active service, and one of them has given full time on the bench.
for the last 9 months, due to court vacan-
cies, sickness, and vacations, and of
course neither has received the compens-
ation he's full-time justice even though
he has worked full time. The reported
bill would obviate such injustice.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that, after passage
of each District of Columbia Committee
bill today, the committee chairman
and I, or a committee chairman, may be
permitted to insert remarks in the
Record.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF CO-
LUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE
TAX ACT OF 1947 AND THE DIS-
TRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS
CORPORATION ACT WITH RES-
PECT TO CERTAIN FOREIGN
CORPORATIONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call
up the bill (H.R. 8407) to amend the
District of Columbia Income and Fran-
chise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and
the District of Columbia Business
Corporation Act, as amended, with
respect to certain foreign corporations, and ask
unanimous consent that the bill be con-
sidered in the House as in Committee of
the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of
Representatives of the United States of
America in Congress assembled, That title
VII of the District of Columbia Income and
Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended (D.C.
Code 47-1571 and the following), is amended
by adding at the end thereof the following
new section:

"Sec. 933. Corporations exempt from
income and franchise tax by foreign corporations.
A foreign corporation authorized to invest in
loans secured by real estate, which does not
maintain any office or employees in the
District of Columbia, shall not be subject to
taxation under this article if the only ac-
tivities of such foreign corporation in the
District of Columbia are one or more of the
following:

(1) The acquisition of title to property
which is the security for such a loan in the
event of default on such loan;

(2) The physical inspection and appraisal
of property in the District of Columbia
as security for mortgages or deeds of trust;

(3) The ownership, modification, renewal,
extension, transfer, or foreclosure of such
loans, or the acceptance of substitute addi-
tional obligors thereon;

(4) The making, collecting, and servicing
of such mortgages or deeds of trust;

(5) Pleading or acting with or on behalf of
any person having charge of their office,
duplicate copies of the process. The process
shall be delivered or caused to be served
by the person with whom the foreign
Corporation is dealing.

(6) The Commissioner of the District of
Columbia is authorized to make such rules
and regulations as may be necessary to carry
out the purpose of this section.

The amendment made by the first
section of this Act shall take effect with
respect to taxable years beginning on and
after December 31, 1948.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to
strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should at
least have a brief explanation of the bill.
Will the gentleman briefly explain the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall
be happy to explain the bill to the gen-
tleman from Iowa.

This bill has been before the House
on two previous occasions. It was
passed by the Senate committee and, for
some reason or other, at the end of the
session last year the Senate did not have an
opportunity to act on it.

The purpose of the bill is to give the
people in Virginia, in Maryland, and in
other States an opportunity to loan
money in the city of Washington, as the
people of the District of Columbia are
permitted to loan money, to make loans,
in those States.

Mr. GROSS. Is this to eliminate the
tax on money loaned in the District of
Columbia?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. To eliminate the tax, or
to make the transactions tax exempt?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is the case, if
they pay taxes in their own States. If
they do not, they would have to pay taxes
here.

Mr. GROSS. I note that the report
says that the District of Columbia needs
all the funds it can entice for real estate
development. That is one of the reasons
giving rise to the bill.

I noted in the newspapers the other
day that as a result of the pay increase
bill alone the District of Columbia is
going to get a windfall of a good many
millions of dollars. I cannot remember
the amount, but it seems to me it was
around $40 million. I wonder if we want
to take the bars down and permit money
to come into the District of Columbia on
a nontaxable basis. If tax revenues are
decreased I wonder if there will be de-
mands for additional money from the
Federal taxpayers in support of the Dis-
trict of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Practically every
State has a similar provision. I under-
stand from the builders in the District of
Columbia that they would like to have
some money from outside the District of
Columbia, to help them operate.

Mr. GROSS. Is this to eliminate the
bill back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on
the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the
purpose of the bill H.R. 8407 is twofold.
First, it amends the District of Columbia
an opportunity to act on the bill that the
transactions specifically enumerated—and
which are those typically involved in
making a mortgage loan by an investing
institution located outside of the District—
not constitute "doing business" in the
District; second, it amends the District of
Columbia tax laws to specify clearly that
income received by an out-of-State
Investing institution from a mortgage
loan made by the District of Columbia in
real estate is not subject to District of Colum-
bia franchise taxes.

The District of Columbia needs all the
funds it can entice into the District for
real estate development. This is particu-
The District of Columbia has never attempted to maintain that when an out-of-State investor makes a mortgage loan on District of Columbia real estate it is doing business in the District, nor has it ever attempted to tax income received by an out-of-State investor from a mortgage loan it has made on District of Columbia real estate. Since the District has never threatened to take either of these positions, the out-of-State investors on advice of their lawyers have decided to run whatever risks are involved and are making loans in the District. They are not complying with H.R. 8407 of the District of Columbia doing business laws, and they are not being taxed by the District on the income they receive from the loans. If the District ever attempted to maintain that they were doing business in the District, or ever attempted to tax them on their income from such loans, they would simply stop making mortgage loans in the District.

However, there are a number of saving institutions—particularly, the New York savings banks—who have been told by their lawyers that because of the uncertainty of the District of Columbia statutes that they would be running a very great risk if they made mortgage loans in the District, that the District would first, tax them on their income from such mortgages; and second, make them comply with the requirements for doing business. These institutions have simply decided that they will not take these risks and they do not and will not make mortgages on District of Columbia real estate. Thus, the ability of District sources to find funds to finance building projects is limited—to the detriment of the District of Columbia itself and to many projects within its boundaries.

There are a number of States which have enacted statutes containing language which specifically states that the kinds of activities listed in H.R. 8407 do not constitute doing business in that State. Among these are the following:

- Maryland: Section 84, article 23, Annotated code as amended by law of 1957, chapter 486.
- North Carolina: section 55-131, General Statutes, 1943, as enacted by chapter 32-212.
- Oklahoma: section 1,189(f), chapter A, title 18, Oklahoma Statutes.
- Oregon: section 57.655, Oregon Revised Statute.
- Texas: article 8.91, chapter 64, laws of 1957 as amended by S.B. 129, laws of 1957.
- Wisconsin: section 180.801, Wisconsin Statutes.
- West Virginia: S.B. No. 142, laws, 1957.
- There are a number of other States where the situation is uncertain but where “qualifications” requirements are simple and inexpensive and thus no further legislation has seemed necessary. Among these are: Alabama, Arizona, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Carolina, and South Dakota.

There is a further number of States where case law—not statute—is so clear that mortgages are made by out-of-State investors without much fear and thus the pressure to enact legislation has not been severe. It is difficult to secure an accurate list of these States but one authority lists among them: Arkansas, California, and Colorado. Sources: “What Constitutes Doing Business,” Corporation Trust Co., 1958, “Mortgage and Real Estate Investment Guide,” by Malcolm C. Sherman. The effect of H.R. 8407 would be to open up the District to many of the New York savings banks and other financial institutions who are now unwilling to lend money in the District.

Section 1 of H.R. 8407 amends title VII of the District of Columbia Code—Tax on Corporations—so as to make it clear that an out-of-State financial institution not having an office in the District and whose activities are limited to the type of activities specifically enumerated in the bill will not be subject to District of Columbia franchise tax on the income it receives from mortgages it makes on District of Columbia real estate. Under the District statutes—section 47-1571a—any out-of-State corporation which receives income from sources within the District is taxed at the rate of 5 percent on such income. This tax is called a franchise tax, but it is a graduated tax levied against the income from such activities. The out-of-State corporation receives from District of Columbia sources.

The kinds of activities that the foreign financial institution could carry on without being subject to tax are limited to and enumerated in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (7) of section 1. H.R. 8407 is thus intended to provide all the funds that are needed.

The enactment of H.R. 8407 is necessary because of the severe lack of financial institutions doing business in the District of Columbia itself and to make mortgages on District of Columbia real estate, whether or not he is doing business in the District. Identical bills were held to be doing business in the District of Columbia real estate, and no out-of-State investor makes a mortgage loan in the District; and no out-of-State investor will be subject to, and will not provide all the funds that are needed.

The enactment of H.R. 8407 is necessary because the kinds of activities referred to in section 1 do not constitute doing business within the State of Maryland, because Maryland has enacted the same kind of a statute as is embodied in H.R. 8407.

The laws of the State of Virginia are uncertain as to the question presented and many out-of-State investors do not lend in that State as a result, although the State of Virginia has never attempted to levy taxes on this kind of a transaction so far as can be determined.
Class 1:  
Superintendent $36,000

Class 2:  
Deputy superintendent 22,000

Class 3:  
Assistant superintendent, president, teachers college 15,240 $15,540 $15,840 $16,140 $16,440 $16,740 $17,040 $17,460 $17,480

Class 4:  
Director, curriculum, dean, teachers college 13,975 13,775 14,075 14,375 14,675 14,975 15,275 15,575 15,875

Class 5:  
Group A, bachelor's degree 11,890 12,190 12,490 12,790 13,090 13,390 13,690 13,990 14,290

Group B, master's degree 12,290 12,590 12,890 13,190 13,490 13,790 14,090 14,390 14,690

Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours 12,590 12,990 13,390 13,790 14,190 14,490 14,790 15,090 15,390

Chief examiner.

Director, food services.

Director, industrial and adult education.

Executive assistant to superintendent.

Psychiatrist.

Class 6:  
Group B, master's degree 11,950 12,250 12,550 12,850 13,150 13,450 13,750 14,050 14,350

Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours 12,150 12,450 12,750 13,050 13,350 13,650 13,950 14,250 14,550

Director, curriculum, dean, teachers college.

Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary school).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

(2) Subsection (a) of section 6 is amended by striking "(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) (1)", and by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) Any teacher who was promoted from the salary class originally designated Salary Class 18 under this Act (redesignated as Salary Class 15 by amendments effective on January 1, 1963), if such promotion occurred after June 30, 1958, and prior to January 1, 1963, and who on the effective date of this paragraph occupies the same position to which he was promoted during such period shall be assigned to the numerical service step in his class, or class and group to which he would have been assigned had he been promoted on or after January 1, 1963."

(3) Section 13 is amended by striking "evening schools" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "adult education schools", and by amending the schedule of pay rates contained in

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 15:</th>
<th>Class 14:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A, bachelor's degree</td>
<td>$6,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B, master's degree</td>
<td>$8,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 14:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A, bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B, master's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary class and position</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 15:</td>
<td>$6,475</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$11,250</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$13,750</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 14:</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary class and position</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 15:</td>
<td>$6,475</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$11,250</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$13,750</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 14:</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$15,500</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(2) The third sentence of section 9(b) of the Act entitled "An Act for the
With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 5, 1965 (89 Stat. 521, ch. 569), as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) The first section is amended by striking all after the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following salary schedules:
"Salary class and position

Class 14:

Group A, bachelor's degree................................. $6,315
Group B, master's degree................................. $6,815
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours...... $6,315

Class 15:

Group A, bachelor's degree................................. $6,315
Group B, master's degree................................. $6,815
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours...... $6,315

Attendance officer:
- Child labor inspector
- Counselor, placement
- Librarian, elementary and secondary schools
- Librarian, teachers college
- Research assistant
- School social worker
- Speech correctionist
- Coordinator of practical nursing
- Teacher, elementary and secondary schools
- Census supervisor
- Counselor, elementary and secondary schools
- Instructor, teachers college
- Instructor, laboratory school
- School psychologist

"(2) Subsection (a) of section 8 is amended by striking 'a' and inserting in lieu thereof 'a (1)', and by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) Any teacher who was promoted from the salary class originally designated Salary Class 18 under this Act (redesignated as Salary Class 15 by amendments effective on January 1, 1963), if such promotion occurred after June 30, 1956, and prior to January 1, 1963, and who on the effective date of this paragraph was in the same position to which he was promoted during such period shall be assigned to the numerical service step in his class, or class and group to which he was assigned had he been promoted on or after January 1, 1963.'"

"(3) Section 13 is amended by striking 'evening schools' wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof 'adult education schools', and by amending the schedule of pay rates contained in subsection (a) of such section to read as follows:

"Classification

VETERANS SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL CENTERS

Per diem

Teacher.................................................. $31.13

Per period

ADULT EDUCATION SCHOOLS

Teacher.................................................. $5.07
Assistant principal.................................. $8.07
Principal.............................................. $8.91

"Sec. 2. The third sentence of section 9 (b) of the Act entitled 'An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia', approved August 7, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking 'on the day after the employee dies' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the first day of the month following the teacher's death'.

"Sec. 3. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1964, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall be deemed to have been performed by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 4. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this Act.

"Sec. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1964.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 12042 is to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.
The amended bill will provide an over-
all increase of approximately 5 percent
in the salaries of all professional per-
sonnel in the District of Columbia pub-
lic school system except for the Super-
intendent and the Deputy Superintend-
ent. The salaries of those two school
officers were substantially increased re-
cently, which increased many of the
salaries in the District to a level com-
petitive with those being offered by other
school systems in large cities and the
District of Columbia metropolitan area or the quality of the
urban school systems in the top
major cities of the United States.

The provisions of the bill would make
the following amendments applicable to
the teachers and other school officers
who are included within salary class 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Master's degree plus 30 credit hours</th>
<th>Master's degree plus 40 or 41 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$9,150</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$9,680</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,050</td>
<td>$9,680</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class 15 of the teachers' and officers' salary schedule is the primary cost
control factor for the reason that it includes
approximately 90 percent of all em-
ployees covered under the Teachers' Salary
Act.

The minimum salaries cited above
would be the highest in the Washington
metropolitan area, and in fact the sal-
aries provided for District of Columbia
teachers in every step of this proposed
scale will exceed virtually all comparable
salaries in the nearby school jurisdic-
tions. Thus, the District will be in an
advantageous position in competing with
the outlying counties both as to recruit-
ment of young teachers and retention of
older, experienced teachers and related
personnel. Your committee hopes that
this will make it possible to reduce the
present 37 percent of the teachers of
the District who are on temporary status,
and also to increase the number of men
teachers in the city's school system.

These maximums compare very favor-
ably also with the salaries of classified
employees in other large cities and the
District of Columbia, when due consider-
ation is given to the fact that teachers work 184
days a year, while classified employees work 239 days a year when they enter
and 250 days after 15 years of service.

It should also be borne in mind that
many teachers work in the adult educa-
tion and summer schools, serving as
teachers and sometimes as principals.
Thus, their salaries are supplemented by
those in section 13 of the Teachers' Sal-
ary Act which also will be increased sub-
stantially by this proposed legislation.

The situation of a teacher who receives
maximum pay in the regular day schools,
and in adult education or summer school,
thus compares very favorably when his
per diem rates are projected to a work
year of equal length with other govern-
ment employees.

Your committee realizes, however, that
the necessity of competing with other
school systems in the recruitment and
retention of qualified personnel dictates
the desirability of the salary increases
proposed in this bill. As the teacher
shortage continues and even increases,
the competition among school systems
for the eligible candidates will become
even stronger. Since salary is one of the
major factors in attracting and retaining
such qualified personnel, your committee
feels that the increases that are provided
must be favorably competitive with those
being offered by school systems in other
large cities and the District of Columbia
metropolitan area or the quality of the
teachers' salaries in the top
major cities of the United States.

The proposed maximum of $9,150 for
a teacher with a bachelor's degree, for example, places the District second only
New York City among the 21 cities
with populations in excess of 500,000.

Also, the proposed maximum of $9,680
for teachers with master's degree and
the proposed maximum of $9,880 for
a teacher with a master's degree plus 30
credit hours, will place the District third
in both these categories among these
same cities, only slightly below New York
City and San Francisco.

In addition to direct comparisons of
pay, two other facts should be remem-
bered in comparing annual salaries of
various school systems. First, that the
length of the work year varies by as
much as 4 weeks among the school sys-
tems. New York, for example, has a
190-195-day work year versus 184 in
the District. The second fact is that only
two other large cities provide both health
insurance and retirement insurance; and these are not as extensive as those provided by
the District of Columbia government.

In light of the foregoing, it is the
feeling of your committee that the pro-
posed maximum salaries for the three
qualification levels are the highest that
can be justified at this time.

Sections 3 and 4 of the bill as amend-
ed by your committee are technical in
nature and are to be passed by the Dis-

tric of Columbia Board of Comission-
ers who advised your committee as fol-
ows:

These proposed amendments are substan-
tially similar to provisions of H.R. 11049, the
Public School Reform Act of 1964, passed by the Senate and House of
Representatives on August 4, 1964. Similar
provisions were included in the act entitled
"An act to increase the salaries of officers
and members of the Metropolitan Police
force and the Fire Department of the Dis-

tric of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the
White House Police, and for other purposes,"
approved September 8, 1960 (Public Law
66-351), the act to amend the Teachers' Sal-

ty Act of 1955, as amended," approved Septem-

ber 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-773), and the

Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (Pub-

cic Law 86-694).

This bill would become effective on
the first day of the first pay period begin-
ning on or after July 1, 1964, which coincides
with the effective date of the recently
enacted salary increases for classified
and other Federal and District of Colum-
bia Government.

The annual cost to the District of
Columbia which would result from the
enactment of this bill is estimated at ap-
proximately $2,924,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much inter-
ested in the school system here in the
District of Columbia and consider Mr.
Hansen, the Superintendent, one of our
leading educators.

I was successful in having Mr. Han-
sen's salary increased by adding his name
to the Federal service executive salary
increase bill. I have sponsored legisla-
tion calling for increase in the salary of
schoolteachers in Washington on numer-
ous occasions during the past 26 years.
I have also sponsored legislation increas-
ing the retirement and compensation and
numerous other inadequacies in teacher's
salaries since I have been chairman of the
House District Committee. In fact,
when I was first assigned to the House
District Committee the teachers and po-
licemen were receiving a beginning sal-
ary between $1,700 and $2,000 and pres-
ently teachers in the city of Washington
are among the highest paid teachers in
the United States and will be the high-
est paid teachers in any city in the
United States with a population between
500,000 and a million, if the present 5-percent salary increase passes.

I read an extremely unnecessary and
false statement in the Washington Post
dated Sunday, August 8, 1964, concern-
ing schoolteachers when the reporter writing this article stated that
southern Members of Congress were
against salary increase for teachers.
Nothing could be more untrue than this
statement. Personally, I would be will-
ing to give schoolteachers in Washing-
ton a much higher salary increase if I
thought that salary increase would correct
the problems confronting the schools at
the present time. I have had at least
five schoolteachers during the past few
years who have resigned from the school
system for the reason that they did not resign
because of salary and the only reason
they could not teach is the fact that they
could not properly perform their duties
as a teacher since they had no authority
to keep discipline during the time the
classes were in session. They advised me
that the majority of the teachers did not fully realize that the teachers have no au-
thority to discipline them and naturally
they could not properly carry out their
duties and responsibilities as a teacher
under these circumstances.

The House of Representatives passed
a bill introduced by my colleague, the
gentleman from North Carolina, Congress-
man Wurzmann, giving authority to the
District of Columbia's police force to
enforce discipline in the schools of the
District of Columbia; however, this bill
has had no consideration by the other
body.

The present bill certainly would not
have been called up before my commit-
tee if I had not called on the full com-
mittee to take action on the pending
teacher's pay bill, regardless of what you
may read in the Washington newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last
two words.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge favorable
action on H.R. 13042, which I introduced
July 29, as amended by the House
Committee on the District of Columbia.
The principal purpose of the bill is to provide salary increases for teachers and other professional employees of the District of Columbia. While I should prefer the provisions of the bill as introduced, which would have afforded an average increase of 8 percent, I am happy to concur with the action of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee, which reduced this to 5 percent.

The increase provided by H.R. 12042 as reported to this body will place the teachers of the District of Columbia in a quite favorable situation as compared with those in the other 20 American cities with populations in excess of 500,000. This is illustrated graphically by the following figures which will prevail if this bill is enacted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Master's degree</th>
<th>Master's degree plus 30 credit hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum salary</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum salary</td>
<td>$5,110</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—The numbers in parentheses indicate the comparative rank of the district in each category as compared with the 21 major U.S. cities.

As for the District's competitive position in regard to teachers' salaries in the Washington Metropolitan area, this will be strongly affected also by the provisions of H.R. 12042, as reported. In minimum salaries, for example, the District of Columbia will be the highest in all three teacher categories, among the surrounding communities, and highest also in maximum salaries, except for a very small difference in Montgomery County, Md., in maximum salaries for teachers with the master's and the master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Thus, the District will be in an excellent position to compete for and to retain the services of well-qualified teachers and other professional school personnel, which is so vitally important to the continued welfare of our Nation's Capital.

I wish to call attention also to the provisions of paragraph 3 of section 1 of the bill, which provides substantial increases for teachers' salaries in the adult—elevening—education courses and in summer sessions. This also is highly important as it affords the teachers and other school personnel an opportunity to augment their regular salaries.

It is difficult for me to express adequately my appreciation of and admiration for the dedicated and highly skilled teachers who serve the school system of the District of Columbia so well and appreciate the fact that their work is beset with many difficulties and problems inherent in all public service in the Nation's Capital as in all large cities; and I cannot urge too strongly the support of my colleagues in this body for this bill which will afford some measure of recognition for this wonderful group of people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear thegentleman from Virginia say that the $2 1/2 million is available in the District of Columbia to pay for this increase in salaries. We will be getting a conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill I presume tomorrow. I hope we do not find out at that time that the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia has been increased substantially because that would not square very well with this proposed increase of $2 1/2 million for teachers' salaries in the District.

In addition to the 5-percent increase, according to the report, the work period of teachers from the District of Columbia is only 184 days as compared with 190 to 195 days in New York City. And a reading of the report indicates that only two other cities in the United States irrespective of population provide teachers with health and life insurance benefits such as are provided by the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that teachers of the District of Columbia are being very well taken care of in this legislation. As a matter of fact, the report indicates they are being better taken care of in the District of Columbia than are the teachers in the adjoining jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia. In other words, the pressure will be on the States of Virginia and Maryland to increase their teachers' salaries because of the increase here.

There must be an end sometime, some place, to this business of salary increases. I hope that the Treasury of the District of Columbia is able to afford the $2 1/2 million annual increase involved in this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements of my good friend and colleague from Iowa I think there ought to be at least this explanation made. The teachers of the District of Columbia as compared with teachers in cities throughout the country with a population of 500,000 to one million are well paid. However, even with the salaries as they are now it seems that it is extremely difficult to recruit schoolteachers in the District for the District of Columbia schools. We do have some social conditions in Washington which are most unusual. Thirty-seven percent, I believe, of the teachers of the District of Columbia are not what I would call fully qualified to teach. They have a temporary status at the present time. Many of them are here because they do not have the qualifications that would enable them to teach in other systems that have higher qualifications. Recruitment of teacher personnel has been probably the most difficult problem with which the District Superintendent of Schools has been faced. Even with the good salary schedules teachers are not attracted to the District of Columbia schools. If any of my colleagues will visit the District of Columbia schools they will get an understanding of why teachers hesitate to come to Washington.

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

AMEND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1958

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], chairman of Subcommittee No. 6 of the Committee on the District of Columbia, to call up a bill from his subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 12196) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignments, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

**Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 491), as amended, is amended to read as follows:**

**"Sec. 101. The annual rates of basic compensation of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary class and title</th>
<th>Service step 1</th>
<th>Service step 2</th>
<th>Service step 3</th>
<th>Service step 4</th>
<th>Service step 5</th>
<th>Service step 6</th>
<th>Longevity step 7</th>
<th>Longevity step 8</th>
<th>Longevity step 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire private</td>
<td>$6,010</td>
<td>$6,330</td>
<td>$6,550</td>
<td>$6,970</td>
<td>$7,290</td>
<td>$7,610</td>
<td>$7,930</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>$8,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private assigned as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>$6,300</td>
<td>$6,620</td>
<td>$6,940</td>
<td>$7,260</td>
<td>$7,580</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>$8,220</td>
<td>$8,540</td>
<td>$8,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Service as such for over 60 consecutive calendar days.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary class and title</th>
<th>Service step 1</th>
<th>Service step 2</th>
<th>Service step 3</th>
<th>Service step 4</th>
<th>Service step 5</th>
<th>Service step 6</th>
<th>Longevity step 7</th>
<th>Longevity step 8</th>
<th>Longevity step 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (a)</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (b)</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,900</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire inspector assigned as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (c)</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,100</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire officer assigned as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant marine engineer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant pilot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (a)</td>
<td>$8,185</td>
<td>$8,505</td>
<td>$8,825</td>
<td>$9,145</td>
<td>$9,465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,185</td>
<td>$10,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire sergeant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (b)</td>
<td>$8,655</td>
<td>$8,975</td>
<td>$9,295</td>
<td>$9,615</td>
<td>$9,935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,655</td>
<td>$10,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire lieutenant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (c)</td>
<td>$8,765</td>
<td>$9,085</td>
<td>$9,405</td>
<td>$9,725</td>
<td>$10,045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,765</td>
<td>$10,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police sergeant assigned as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle officer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire lieutenant.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police lieutenant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire captain.</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$12,200</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion fire chief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy fire marshal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police inspector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 8:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subclass (a)</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,900</td>
<td>$11,300</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$12,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant inspector of machinery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy fire chief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire inspector assigned as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant fire chief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police executive officer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding officer of the White House Police.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 10:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire chief.</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,500</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sec. 2. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the adjustment made by the first section of this Act apply shall be adjusted in accordance with this section, and on and after the effective date of this Act, section 2 of the Act approved October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1861), shall not apply to any such officer or member whose rate of basic compensation is so adjusted in accordance with this section. Such rates of basic compensation shall be adjusted as follows:

1. Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (b), each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a class or subclass in the salary schedule in the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service or longevity rate in effect on and after the effective date of this Act.

2. Each private in service step 6, longevity step 7, or longevity step 8 in any subclass in class 1, upon completing a minimum of twenty-one years of continuous service as a private—including service in the Armed Forces of the United States but excluding any period of time determined not to have been satisfactory service, shall be advanced to longevity step 9 in class 1, and receive the appropriate scheduled rate of basic compensation in step 9 in the subclass in which he is serving.

Sec. 3. Section 202(b) of such Act is amended by striking "rescue squad or fire department ambulance", and inserting in lieu thereof "or rescue squad; Provided, That on and after the effective date of this provision, privates in the Fire Department, while assigned as ambulance drivers may, in the discretion of the Commission, be placed in subclass (b) or subclass (c) of class 1 in accordance with section 205; Provided further, that any private assigned as an ambulance driver who on the effective date of this provision is designated as technician 1 in subclass (b), class 1, until action is taken to change his subclass placement in accordance with the preceding proviso or such assignment is terminated.

Sec. 4. Section 205(c) of such Act is amended by striking "(c), (d), or (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (c)".

Sec. 5. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code sec. 4-823) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, each officer and each member of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall, upon completion of thirty years of continuous service on the police force or fire department, as the case may be, including service in the Armed Forces of the United States, but excluding any period of time determined not to have been satisfactory service, be placed in, and receive basic compensation at, the highest longevity step in each of the two salaries to which he is entitled."

Sec. 6. This Act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 20, strike out "officer and each member" and insert in lieu thereof "deputy chief."

Page 5, strike out lines 7 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6(a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia Government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1964, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 86, 81st Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1964, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or member who dies during such period."

For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved
from training and service in the Armed Forces, or who has resigned since last January 17 members authorized by the Congress have resigned since last January 1964, a total of 93, for reasons given in the force for various reasons. Today, there are 128 vacancies in the District of Columbia Police Department and your committee is informed that because of the severe shortage of qualified recruitment drive in this area to fill these vacancies, the Police Department has found it necessary to send recruiting teams into surrounding States with areas of substantially increased unemployment to maintain the minimum strength of 3,000 members authorized by the Congress.

A further consideration is the fact that the other communities in the Washington metropolitan area are actively considering substantial salary increases for police and fire personnel. In nearby Virginia, for example, Fairfax County is considering an increase in their recruitment rate for police privates from $4,980 to $5,496, and Arlington County is proposing an increase in the recruitment rate from $4,900 to $5,400. Such increases, together with transportation savings in moving through working in suburban communities, may well affect adversely the recruitments and retention of police and firemen in the District of Columbia.

In addition to the present salary rates for privates in the police and fire forces, this bill proposes also to adjust the longevity rates for privates appointed to the force prior to the enactment of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Department's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 481). Under the provisions of that act, a private appointed after January 1958 can reach the maximum salary for that rank in 19 years. However, a private who may have had a number of years of service prior to that date is required for newly appointed privates to reach the top salary; and fourth, to permit better pay alinement among members.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

This bill provides for an average salary increase for policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia of 8.9 percent. This increase will facilitate considerably the recruitment and detention of fully qualified members of the city's police and fire department. For example, the increase from $5,650 to $6,010 provided by the bill for the minimum salaries of privates would move the District in first place in comparison with the nearby communities in this respect and would raise the relative standing of the District from eighth to sixth place among the 20 other U.S. cities with population in excess of 500,000. Also, the increase provided by this bill in the maximum salaries for police privates, from $7,150 to $7,610, would maintain the District in first place position among nearby jurisdictions and would retain also the relative standing of Washington, D.C., in fifth place in comparison with the same 20 major cities in this regard. Furthermore, the increases provided in H.R. 12196 compare favorably with increases given recently to other District employees.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 6 on August 5, 1964, the nature of the proposed legislation was pointed out by testimony from an official of the Metropolitan Police Department. This official revealed that 17 members of the Metropolitan Police Force have resigned since last January to accept employment with other police jurisdictions, and that during fiscal year 1964, a total of 17 members resigned from the force for various reasons. Today, there are 128 vacancies in the District of Columbia Police Department and your committee is informed that because of the severe shortage of qualified recruitment drive in this area to fill these vacancies, the Police Department has found it necessary to send recruiting teams into surrounding States with areas of substantially increased unemployment to maintain the minimum strength of 3,000 members authorized by the Congress.

A further consideration is the fact that the other communities in the Washington metropolitan area are actively considering substantial salary increases for police and fire personnel. In nearby Virginia, for example, Fairfax County is considering an increase in their recruitment rate for police privates from $4,980 to $5,496, and Arlington County is proposing an increase in the recruitment rate from $4,900 to $5,400. Such increases, together with transportation savings in moving through working in suburban communities, may well affect adversely the recruitments and retention of police and firemen in the District of Columbia.

In addition to the present salary rates for privates in the police and fire forces, this bill proposes also to adjust the longevity rates for privates appointed to the force prior to the enactment of the District of Columbia Police and Fire Department's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 481). Under the provisions of that act, a private appointed after January 1958 can reach the maximum salary for that rank in 19 years. However, a private who may have had a number of years of service prior to that date is required for newly appointed privates to reach the top salary; and fourth, to permit better pay alinement among members.

.reason for amendments

Section 5 of H.R. 12196, as introduced, would have provided that all officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the District of Columbia Fire Department, upon completion of 30 years of continuous and creditable service, would be placed in the top longevity salary step for their rank. After considering testimony adverse to this proposal, however, your committee decided to delete this provision. For despite the deputy chiefs of the two departments. This provision is in recognition of the fact that a member of these forces achieving rank as deputy chief after 30 years of service is not likely to be able to remain in service sufficiently long to advance through the longevity steps to the top salary, and that such long and distinguished service entitled these men to the reward. Your committee is informed that at present 15 deputy chiefs would be affected by this provision.

A second amendment adopted by your committee would make the act effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning after July 1, 1964. This is in line with the effective date of the recently approved salary increase for classified workers in the Federal and District of Columbia government of this legislation, for the failure of a concentrated recruitment drive in the Armed Forces, or who has resigned since last January
Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a pending increase bill for police now under consideration. The police department in Washington works under terrific circumstances and deal with all the top Government officials, all the diplomatic officials of all the countries who have embassies or consulates located in Washington and they are continuously confronted with obstructions from certain private organizations who would like to dictate to the Chief of Police.

They are subject to abuse from the leftwing newspapers and their hands are practically tied by certain Supreme Court decisions. I realize that a high salary cannot and will not make them more efficient policemen; however, it will assist in relieving some of the high living conditions here in the Nation's Capital.

My committee accepted the bill as it was drafted by the Commissioners and I presume some of their advisers here in the District of Columbia without making any changes other than a slight change in the longevity of the Deputy Chiefs in the fire department and the police department who may be compelled to retire after their promotion to Deputy Chief without having served sufficient time of a Deputy Chief to be able to collect their longevity even though they have served more than 30 years as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Washington Fire Department.

I was of the opinion that this should be applied to the lieutenants, captains, and inspectors; however, the Commissioners objected on the grounds that it would cost several hundred thousand dollars to take care of all the changes included in the police department and the fire department.

The committee amended the pending bill so as to provide for a Deputy Chief of the police department who may be required to retire before they have served as Deputy Chief a sufficient length of time to collect their longevity. The unofficial ultra-liberal press here in Washington would make the citizens of Washington think that the House District Committee wrote the bill since they stated that the House District Committee reported a bill that would increase the salaries from 8½ percent to 50 percent. The District Committee did not write the pay scales included in the Police and Fire Department bill and if the privates do not get what they justly deserve it is because the Commissioners and the persons responsible for this piece of legislation did not recommend a higher pay scale.

Mr. BROHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, I introduced a bill for the purpose of amending the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, so as to increase salaries and adjust pay alinement for members of these forces. More recently, H.R. 12196, containing the provisions of my bill, was reported out of the Committee on Government Operations for amendment at some 8.9 percent. The additional cost to the District of Columbia government for the first full year of operation is estimated at approximately $3,730,900. It is my conviction that this legislation is necessary in order to maintain the salaries of officers and members of these forces in a competitive position with respect to salaries of police and firemen in other major cities, in nearby communities, and of other District and Federal Government employees.

I am informed that a recent study, made as a supplement to a survey conducted in August of 1952, reveals that during this 2-year interim at least 18 of the 20 other American cities with populations in excess of 500,000 have increased the salaries of their police and fire department employees. Police privates in these cities, for example, have received increases averaging 6.4 percent during these 2 years.

In addition to the increases granted in these major cities, the other communities comprising the metropolitan area are also actively planning increases for their police and fire personnel. In Virginia, for example, Fairfax County is considering increasing the recruiting rate for police privates from $4,980 to $5,496; Arlington County is proposing an increase in their recruitment rate from $4,900 to $5,450; and Alexandria is also studying the possibility of an increase, although the amount has not been disclosed at this time. Such increases, if approved, together with certain other advantages such as transportation savings in time and travel, and promotions in these nearby communities, may well have an adverse effect upon recruitment and retention of police and fire personnel in the District of Columbia.

At present, the District of Columbia ranks eighth among the 20 major American cities with respect to minimum salaries paid to police privates, and first in the metropolitan area. The increase in this figure, from $5,650 to $6,010, provides that additional years of service would also be counted as years of service in the Washington metropolitan area. The increase in this area, and the increases being considered in nearby communities, may well have an adverse effect upon recruitment and retention of police and fire personnel in the District of Columbia.

At present, the District of Columbia ranks eighth among the 20 major American cities with respect to minimum salaries paid to police privates, and first in the metropolitan area. The increase in this figure, from $5,650 to $6,010, provides that additional years of service would also be counted as years of service in the Washington metropolitan area. The increase in this area, and the increases being considered in nearby communities, may well have an adverse effect upon recruitment and retention of police and fire personnel in the District of Columbia.

As for maximum salaries for police privates, my bill would raise this figure from $7,150 to $7,610, and thus would maintain the District's present rank of fifth place among the 20 major cities and first in the metropolitan area.

In addition to increasing salaries, this bill would also provide for a payment after pay alinement for certain privates in the police and fire forces. This is necessary because of certain inequities presently existing in this area. Under the provisions of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, a privates appointed subsequent to January 1, 1959, are entitled to attain his maximum salary in 19 years. However, privates who had a number of years of service prior to that date were required to serve more than 10 years to reach the top longevity step. H.R. 12196, passed November 24, 1962, attempted to correct this inequitable situation by providing a one-step advancement for all privates having 13 or more years of service as of the first day of the first pay period following January 1, 1968. After this law became operative, however, it was found that a number of privates would still be required to serve more than 24 years to attain longevity step 9. For example, a private appointed in October 1945, now in longevity step 7 with 18½ years of service and still needing 2 more years of service for advancement to longevity step 8, and 4 more years for advancement to longevity step 9, would be required to serve 24½ years in all, to reach the top longevity step. Because of the date of his appointment, he would not receive the pay increase under the 1962 act which would have reduced his time to reach the top step.

This bill will correct this situation by advancing all privates to longevity step 8, and the completion of 25 years of continuous service as a private, including creditable military service but excluding any period of service determined not to have been satisfactory. The bill has been considered carefully by the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the White House Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, and the Police and Firemen's Associations, all of whom are in general agreement with its provisions.

H.R. 12196 will provide also for a higher pay rate for the Deputy Chief of the Police Department and of the Fire Department who acts in the capacity of assistant chief. Also, it is provided that all deputy chiefs in both services will attain the top longevity pay step after 30 years of service. I hereby move adoption of an amendment providing these additions to my bill, and urge the support of my colleagues for this bill as reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

REGULATING LOCATION OF CHANCERIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Munro] to call up a bill from the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows: Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of
America in Congress as assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act providing for the zon-
ing the District of Columbia and the reg-
ulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and the uses of land in the District of Columbia, having been passed by Congress and approved for him under the con-
stitution of the United States, and that the amendments made by the first section of this Act shall pro-
hibit—
(1) the future or continued use of a building as a chancery or the making of ordi-
nary repairs to any such building for which lawful use as a chancery existed on the date of 
enactment of this Act, or
(2) the construction, reconstruction, expansion, or alteration in accordance with any 
permit issued by the Board of Zoning Adjustment after May 1, 1964.

"SEC. 4. After the date of enactment of this Act, no building or chancery being used by 
a foreign government in the District of Columbia shall be transferred to or used by 
another foreign government unless such use is in accordance with the Act approved for 
May 1, 1964, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5-418), or unless such use was in accordance 
with applicable law at the time of this enactment.

"SEC. 5. This Act and the amendments made thereby shall not be administered in 
such a way as to discriminate against any foreign government on the basis of the race, 
color, or creed of any of its citizens."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

"Mr. Speaker, the committee, as a result of its public hear-
ings and studies, revealed that a critical 
problem had developed in relation to the location of chanceries of foreign 
governments. The injection of such use into residential areas brought voluminous protests from citizens of the 
District of Columbia. Chancery use, be-
ing a business use, brought into residen-
tial areas a type of activity for which no 
citizen of the District of Columbia might 
expect to be approved for him under the 
government of the nation. The location of 
new chanceries for new nations and the enlargement of existing chan-
cerries presented many difficulties and the situation became increasingly confused.
and unsatisfactory to all parties concerned.

Prior to 1957, the location of chanceries was not subject to regulation by any agency of the District of Columbia. In the course of revision of zoning regulations of the District of Columbia during that year, chanceries were determined to be a use entitled to special exception under the zoning regulations. The transfer of use of a chancery issued prior to February 18, 1964, shall not be affected. Also, amendments in the first section are not applicable to applications for special exceptions to zoning regulations which were filed with the Board of Zoning Adjustment prior to May 1, 1964.

Nothing in the bill is to be construed or administered in any way which would discriminate against any foreign government or its nationals on the basis of race, color, or creed of any of its citizens.

Your committee is aware of the fact that while this legislation meets an urgent immediate need, it does not provide a long-range, desirable solution of the problem of the location of chanceries of foreign governments in the District of Columbia. Agencies of the District government and Federal Government are constantly reviewing this problem and exploring the possibility of establishing some special areas which will be particularly suitable for the location of chanceries in the District of Columbia. Your committee was unanimously of the view that this bill will be in the best public interest for meeting the immediate problems, since it is designed to provide the maximum fairness to all parties concerned.

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?

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

Mr. SICKLES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question at this time in order to be certain that there is no confusion about the matter of preserving existing chanceries.

The language of the bill, as amended by the committee, seems to have cleared up this point. As I understand the bill as it is presently pending, when a building is now lawfully being used for chancery purposes and if the government presently occupying that building moves, the owner of that building has an undisputed right to lease or transfer the building as a chancery to another government; am I correct in my understanding?
of the committee in bringing this bill, as amended, to the floor of the House, I assume that the socialists are shocked. Mr. Speaker (Mr. Fink) is that the intention of the committee in coming here and urging the passage of this bill as amended.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of the committee on unAmerican activities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deepest sympathy to the parents of Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner, and to the widow of Michael Schwerner. One thing I want to say is that the whole country is in mourning for the fate of the three young civil rights workers, who disappeared on June 21 in Philadelphia, Miss., was ended. Prejudice, inhumanity, and ruthless brutality had taken their lives in the foulest triple murder. The hours, days, and weeks of waning hope were ended for the distraught parents and an anxious nation. The horrible knowledge of the deed is upon us. We are torn by the struggle everywhere and it makes imperative that the perpetrators be brought to justice.

On Sunday in New York City thousands mourned James E. Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner. At the funeral service for Andrew Goodman Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld spoke:

There are two levels to our grief today and paradoxically the two are one.

First we grieve for a precious individual. A rare blend of tenderness and manliness marked his unfolding years.

But we also grieve for all ordinary people. The progress of American society toward a world where every race and color and creed will have the freedoms and opportunities which our founding fathers promised is deeply affected by this tragedy. To the parents and friends of the three young men who lost their lives in Mississippi, we say: "This tragedy is not private. It is not local. It is national. This tragedy is not private. It is not local. It is national. This tragedy is not private. It is not local. It is national. This tragedy is not private. It is not local. It is national. This tragedy is not private. It is not local. It is national."

Three dedicated young men were brutally murdered for helping fellow Americans to secure a precious political right long denied—the right to vote—the cornerstone of our democracy. They lived and fought for democratic ideals in a society which has yet to realize its dream of equality for all. Because of their sacrifice the fulfillment of that dream is further advanced, and future generations will breathe inspiration from their courage.

The place in history of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner is honored and secure.

Speaker JOHN MCMORRACK, revealed the depth of compassion and understanding for which he is beloved. I want to acknowledge his constant concern and sincerely thank him.

Despite the overwhelming burdens of his office, President Lyndon B. Johnson took a personal interest in the missing young people. It was a deeply moving experience for me to see the President of the United States put down the telephone, turn to Carolyn and Robert Goodman and Nathan Schwerner, and quietly inform them that the FBI had found the burning car.

The determination with which President Johnson then directed FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to conduct a ceaseless search assured the parents that every effort would be made. And it was. The President himself called the families last Tuesday to convey the grim truth.

Mr. Speaker, I know the President's sympathetic understanding and personal involvement was a source of comfort to the families. I am grateful to him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also commend Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall, and the First Assistant of the Civil Rights Division John Doar for their diligence and sincere efforts. The FBI, under J. Edgar Hoover, did a thorough and good job which will surely culminate in the apprehension of the murderers.

And at the White House Jack J. Valenti, Lee White, and Myer Feldman of the President's staff must be singled out for their understanding and assistance.

Throughout their anguish ordeal Mr. and Mrs. Robert Goodman have shown incredible courage. In a time of great personal anxiety and sorrow their deep concern for all the civil rights workers in Mississippi and for the cause of equality is a great testimony to them and to the memory of their son. When they knew for certain that Andrew Goodman was dead, the Goodmans wrote an eloquent message for the President. Mr. Goodman and I will respond to their son. Seeing the tragedy as "part of the public conscience" of America, they called upon the Nation to confront the social sickness which led to such inhumanity. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, they reminded us:

"It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves that these dead shall not have died in vain."

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I include the eloquent message of two magnificent Americans, Carolyn and Robert Goodman:

STATEMENT OF MR. AND MRS. ROBERT GOODMAN, AUGUST 5, 1964

The passage of many weeks of uncertainty has ended in the knowledge of the murder of our companions James Chaney and Michael Schwerner. Hope, slim though it was, has passed away and a painful certainty has come.

Our grief, though personal, belongs to our Nation. This tragedy is not private. It is part of the public conscience of our country.

It is necessary, especially in such a time of agony, to confront ourselves with our own values. I want to confront society with the social sickness that still remains long after "the binding together of our Nation's wounds" that was our Civil War.

The values our son expressed in his simple action of going to Mississippi are still the bonds that bind this Nation together—its Constitution, its law, and its heritage.

Whenever and wherever part of a people mock our heritage, as has now again been done, we must respond with the full power and strength of our heritage.

The solution of this crime and the punishment of those who have committed it is necessary as part of the process that will enable this Nation to endure.

Throughout our history, countless Americans have died in the continuing struggle for equality. We shall continue to work for this goal and we fervently hope that Americans so engaged will be aided and protected in this noble mission.

For ourselves, we wish to express our pride in our son's commitment and that of his companions now dead, and that of his companions now alive, now in Mississippi acting each hour to express those truths that are self-evident.

In Washington 4 weeks ago, my wife and I in a sense made a pilgrimage to the Lincoln Memorial in the evening and stood in that great shrine looking down past the Washington Monument and in the soft glow of the light around the White House. Full of the awe of a great Nation that surrounded us we turned to read the black letters on the white marble: "It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves that these dead shall not have died in vain."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill reads: "To regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia." A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF RELOCATION COSTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Dowdy), to call up a bill.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I will call up (S. 1024) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to provide such relocation services as they shall determine to be reasonable and necessary to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations which may be or have been displaced from real property by actions of the government of the District of Columbia, such actions to include, but not be limited to, acquisition of property for public works projects, condemnation of unsafe and insanitary buildings
and enforcement of the laws and regulations relating to housing. The Commissioners are authorized to make housing surveys in connection with furnishing of such relocation services.

Sec. 2. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the Commissioners after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

Sec. 5. The Commissioners and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

Sec. 6. Except as provided in section 5 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying any provision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

Sec. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, without limitation, regulations for the furnishing of housing accommodations, and the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this Act: Provided, That no regulation affecting individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia, in connection with relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

With the following committee amendment:

Sec. 2. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

Sec. 5. The Commissioners and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

Sec. 6. Except as provided in section 5 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying any provision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

Sec. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, without limitation, regulations for the furnishing of housing accommodations, and the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this Act: Provided, That no regulation affecting individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia, in connection with relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.
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Sec. 6. Except as provided in section 5 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying any provision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

Sec. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, without limitation, regulations for the furnishing of housing accommodations, and the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this Act: Provided, That no regulation affecting individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia, in connection with relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

With the following committee amendment:

Sec. 2. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.
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Sec. 6. Except as provided in section 5 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying any provision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

Sec. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, without limitation, regulations for the furnishing of housing accommodations, and the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this Act: Provided, That no regulation affecting individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia, in connection with relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

With the following committee amendment:

Sec. 2. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

Sec. 5. The Commissioners and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency are hereby authorized to make relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the requirements of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.

Sec. 6. Except as provided in section 5 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying any provision of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

Sec. 7. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including, without limitation, regulations for the furnishing of housing accommodations, and the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia after the effective date of this Act and are hereby authorized to pay such relocation payments on a reimbursement basis, for all relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this Act: Provided, That no regulation affecting individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for the reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired by the District of Columbia, in connection with relocation services furnished by the Office, and upon being so recorded shall be accessible to their places of employment. The determinations made by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be indicated in the records relating to the acquisition of such real property, and upon being so recorded shall be conclusive.
The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARITABLE SOLICITATION ACT**

Mr. Dowdy. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 5990) to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 2-2104) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:*

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no such certificate of registration shall be issued after the date of the enactment of this subsection unless the Commissioners shall have affirmatively found and publicly declared that the solicitation which would be authorized by such certificate would benefit or assist in promoting the health, welfare, and the morals of the District of Columbia."

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act or any other provision of law, the certificate of registration heretofore issued to the Matachine Society of Washington under such Act is revoked.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out all down to and including page 2, line 6, and insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Commissioners shall not issue a certificate of registration after the date of enactment of this Act unless the applicant shall have furnished in connection with the application for such certificate such information as may be necessary to show to the satisfaction of the Commissioners, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioners, that such solicitation will benefit or assist in promoting the health, welfare, and morals of the District of Columbia.

Amendment offered by Mr. Dowdy

Mr. Dowdy. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dowdy to the committee amendment: Page 2, beginning in line 14, strike out "health, welfare, and morals of the District of Columbia" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "public health or welfare and will not offend the public morals."

Mr. Dowdy. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this proposed legislation as set forth in the House report (H. Rept. 1222), is to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act (71 Stat. 278, D.C. Code title 2-2101 et seq.) so as to require, as a condition precedent to the issuance of a certificate of registration or amendment, such certification to any applicant for permission to solicit funds for charitable purposes in the District of Columbia, that the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners make certain findings that the proposed solicitation is in the

Mr. Gross. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman: How does this bill, if it does, differ from the payment of relocation costs in other municipalities over the country?
public interest as benefiting or assisting in promoting the health, welfare, and morals of the community. At the same time, however, language in the bill to the effect that this law attempts to prohibit every bona fide charitable and religious organization from attempting to solicit funds in the District of Columbia.

The mere statement of the facts, I believe will indicate that this bill is unconstitutional.

In my opinion, this bill would prevent organizations like the American Red Cross, the United Jewish Appeal, CARE, and many number of presently existing, reputable charitable organizations from soliciting funds in the District of Columbia unless they could first show that the funds to be collected in the District of Columbia were going to be used within the District of Columbia for the improvement of the health, welfare, and morals of the District of Columbia or the people thereof.

The bill is badly drawn. The amendments do not cure any of the defects. I urge the defeat of the bill.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. The gentleman opposite failed to listen to the reading of the amendment which I sent to the House which changed the words relating to
public health or welfare, and provides for not offending the public morals.

The District of Columbia is not mentioned at all.

Mr. MULTER. The new words, the gentleman adds to the bill, are “not to offend the public morals.” There still remains the language “public health and welfare.” The best prove, under the amendment, as adopted, exactly what I said. In order to get a permit they would have to establish that the funds would be used for the public health or welfare and that this would not offend the public morals.

Mr. DOWDY. But the gentleman limited it to the District of Columbia. It is not limited to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MULTER. If it is not limited to the District of Columbia, what right does the District of Columbia Committee have to bring in a bill of such great magnitude?

Mr. DOWDY. It is because they are seeking for solicitation of funds in the District of Columbia. This is the purpose which is involved.

Incidentally, the bill does not apply to religious institutions and so on.

Mr. MULTER. I beg to differ with the gentleman. It covers almost every kind of institution which attempts to solicit money in the District of Columbia.

If this is not limited to the District of Columbia, then it will have national application and will affect the whole country. You have made the bill worse instead of better, because you have made it of national application instead of applying just to the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWDY. This is the code which we are seeking to amend. It is the District of Columbia Code. Obviously the gentleman has not read it.

The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to any person making solicitations, including solicitations for educational purposes, solely for a church or a religious corporation or a corporation or an unincorporated association under the supervision and control of any such church or religious corporation.

The bill we are here considering does not change that wording at all. I suggest to the gentleman that he read the committee report. He will find out that what I have just stated is accurate.

The gentleman certainly misunderstands the bill and its purpose.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that the bill does apply to other than religious organizations?

Mr. DOWDY. The gentleman said it did apply to religious organizations.

Mr. MULTER. And the gentleman from Texas says it does not. Suppose it does not.

Mr. DOWDY. We are amending the law. We are adding another section to a law which is already on the books. It does not change that exemption of religious institutions one iota.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. MULTER) whether in his opinion that strictly religious organizations are exempt, an organization such as the United Jewish Appeal, which is not necessarily a religious organization, would be prohibited from soliciting in the District of Columbia under the amendment? I do not see how we can say it necessarily operates for public health purposes.

Mr. MULTER. It would apply in that instance. It would apply to CARE. It would apply to the Red Cross, which certainly is not a religious organization. It would apply to charitable activities of the Salvation Army, which may be deemed a religion and also does charitable work. It would certainly apply to the Salvation Army.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman, and I must agree with him.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. To correct the statement that this bill would apply to the Red Cross. If you will read the law, you will find that the American Red Cross is specifically exempted from the license requirement.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I will ask the gentleman from Texas if that be the case, are the CARE project, UNICEF, and HOPE exempted?

Mr. DOWDY. They are not specifically exempted.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. They are not specifically exempted, and therefore this amendment would apply to these organizations, would it not?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes. And if they are offensive to the public morals or the public health or welfare, they should not be here.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I think you are giving it a different twist, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOWDY. No, I am not. You are the one who is giving it a different twist.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. No. You are twisting it the other way around. First they have to promote, or these organizations, according to this particular amendment, must promote the public health, welfare, or morals. There is nothing about being "offensive" to unless it was changed in the last half hour.

Mr. DOWDY. It has been changed.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Will you read it to me again?

Mr. DOWDY. "And will not offend the public morals." This all came about because the homosexuals were coming down here, and the District government gave them a permit to solicit charitable contributions in the District of Columbia. When I asked the District officials about it, they said under the law Congress passed they did not have any option except to give them a permit. The man who issued the permit apologized for having to do it and said the law ought to be changed, and I agreed with him.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. If that is the case, why my-changing the present rather and specifically name this organization. We exempt other organizations in the beginning, so if we are going to exempt from coverage under this particular section of the code, why not specifically point to this particular organization and say they will not be issued a permit?

Mr. DOWDY. If I did that, the gentleman would be in here saying the committee ought not to be doing it that way.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Under the statute being amended the Commissioner is authorized to issue regulations and under those regulations, among other things, they have exempted, as they have a right to under the statute, organizations that do not collect more than $1,500 in money or property in any one year. The organization at which this is aimed has not collected anything like that sum. However, this will affect every other organization, such as CARE and other organizations doing the same kind of work as the American Red Cross. They would all be subject to this new amendment unless they can come in and prove to the satisfaction of the District of Columbia that they promote the health, welfare, and morals of the community.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Does the gentleman from New York agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY) that under this latest amendment where he says these organizations should be found offensive to the health, morals, and so forth of the public laws of the District of Columbia, this will do the job? Does this do away with the previous status wherein the Commissioners had to find this would promote the public health, welfare, and morals?

Mr. MULTER. It is my considered opinion that the amendment makes the bill worse than when it was reported from the committee. It does not improve it, but it makes it worse.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill with or without the amendment. The issue really before the House is whether or not the District of Columbia Commissioners are to be set up as judges of public morality in the District of Columbia. Are we going to make the District Commissioners dictators of what is offensive morally? They are not even elected, so it cannot be claimed that they represent a community consensus.

Furthermore, there are no definitions in this bill of public health and welfare or what offends public morals. There are absolutely no standards. It has been pointed out amply by those who have spoken before, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MULTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROOSEVELT), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), that this is a bad bill. The amendment does not cure it. This bill makes it possible to reject the applications of many charitable organizations in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?
Mr. RYAN of New York. Yes, I will.

Mr. MULTER. One of the very bad things about this bill is just this: If an organization wants to do these things and gets a certificate from the District Commissioners, in fact they are giving government approval as District Commissioners to do this. Then many of the people from whom you explained it might assume that this must be all right because the District Commissioners say so. We do not want to give them the right to say which is a bad organization and which is a bad organization.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I think there is a basic issue here of constitutionality. The wording is so vague, and the language is so broad, and the power conferred so discretionary that it is clearly unconstitutional. I urge that it be defeated.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield.

Mr. DOWDY. That was one of the very things I had in mind at the time I introduced this bill in the first place, that the District of Columbia was placing its brand of approval upon this organization of homosexuals by issuing to them a permit to solicit charitable contributions, to go around to people's homes and say, "The District of Columbia is approving what we are doing, they gave us a permit to solicit." That is what I am trying to cut down.

Mr. RYAN of New York. What you are doing is placing an affirmative duty on the Commissioners to make a finding that any organization which gets a permit from it is promoting the public health and welfare and that it will not offend public morals. This is not a power that should be vested in the Commissioners.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, where would he put the burden?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. Another point to be made against the bill as presently offered with the amendment is, the present statute is merely a registration statute. It gives the District Commissioners no right to approve or disapprove. But this bill will now give them the right to approve or disapprove instead of merely registering them.

Mr. RYAN of New York. That is exactly what I thank the gentleman.

The bill would make the District Commissioners censors.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to see if I understand the gentleman correctly; perhaps I am confused. I have just read clauses 2 and 3 of the report. Do I understand that the gentleman concedes what this Mattachine Society has been doing?

Mr. RYAN of New York. The purpose of the bill is before the House at all. If the committee wants to legislate against a particular group, let it bring such legislation before the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman refuse to say that he does not condone what they are doing?

Mr. RYAN of New York. That is not the issue.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. I will answer the gentleman's question categorically. On behalf of all of those who signed the minority report of the Mattachine Society. As the gentleman has said, it is not before us. But whether we do condone or not, this bill does not reach them, and I again say categorically that we do not condone anything that they are doing.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been of interest to all of us who serve on the subcommittee. I am a member of the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Dowdy). I must say in candor equal to that of my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MULTER) that the organization which brought this to the attention of the committee was an organization known as the Mattachine Society which seems to be operating in various parts of this country and abroad. The society, according to the testimony of the president of the organization, has as a part of its purpose the following:

Our primary effort, thus far, has been an attempt, by lawful means, to alter present discriminatory policy against the homosexual minority—a policy which is as long as the Negro minority.

I hope to goodness he is wrong in his estimate on that. He went on to say this:

We are also interested in altering the criminal law in regard to private, consenting homosexual acts of adults. We are not interested in promoting violations of that law as it stands, but in altering it, and in assisting the members of the homosexual community, individually and collectively, in every possible way.

Now, at the time we were taking testimony, even though there seemed to be some unwillingness on the part of the officials of the District of Columbia to issue any licenses, Mr. Nottingham, testifying, did the test questions of the gentleman from California (Mr. Sisk) obtain some testimony from Mr. Nottingham. He said:

These, of course, would be my own feelings and not the Commissioner's, but I was against this type legislation when it was first enacted—

And there he was referring to the existing Charitable Solicitations Act—

Mr. Sisk. I thought that it is still necessary to have normal licensing procedures and that we should have the authority that is contained in Code section 47-3946; that is, the right to deny a license where there is a threat to public decency, the peace and quiet of the community, general welfare or for any reason, deemed sufficient.

Now, that is what the gentleman in charge of the bill said. I believe that is what the committee is presenting to us here today. This is a bill which merely would not have the licensing agency of the District of Columbia sitting down at the District Building issuing licenses as a ministerial act upon the application of any immoral group that might be in existence.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the opponents may say about this bill, the bill does exactly what Mr. Nottingham says should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of the House come from States that have charitable solicitation acts. In my own State of North Carolina no organization can solicit funds from the general public unless they have filed an application and been approved by the State Board of Public Welfare. There must be a finding by that board that it is in the public interest to permit the solicitations.

Therefore, whatever your view may be about this matter, it seems to me to be unreasonable, as it said by the gentleman from California (Mr. Sisk) in the hearings, to have an arm of the Government having to place the hand of approval upon an organization such as the Mattachine Society of America, or any other organization that is in operation for an improper purpose.

Mr. Speaker, as I view the present Solicitations Act, the Communist Party is not doing that. Other organizations go down to Mr. Nottingham's office and file an application and he would be powerless to deny them the right to solicit funds in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Am I correctly informed that the Mattachine Society under the existing act, which would not be changed by this law, would be exempt anyway because they do not raise $1,500 or more and that, therefore, what we are doing is not going to affect the Mattachine Society at all? So, what are we trying to do?

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman from California that if they do not raise much they will be disappointed because it will take a great deal more than that to ever get this Congress to pass a law legalizing marriage between two males, as they testified they are interested in.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The record shows that they do not propose that; is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.
Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. In view of the facts and the figures presented as to whether or not the Members of the House approve of what the Mattachine Society stands for, I would like to make it perfectly clear that the Commissioners in the District of Columbia in recommending against the enactment of this bill also made it perfectly clear that they are opposed to the activities of this association and individuals such as are in the association.

They indicated very clearly in the testimony before the committee they would continue to enforce all of the laws of the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government, against homosexuality in the District of Columbia, but at the same time recommend against the enactment of this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Does the gentleman know the Mattachine Society in the District and all over the country has never raised the $1,500 and therefore this Commission in the District of Columbia, even if we pass this bill, would have no right to register it. Will you yield?

Mr. MULTER. In the District of Columbia, your statement is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOWDY. These regulations are promulgated by the District Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which they have a right to do under the law. The law itself does not exempt them.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They are going to lower the $1,500 limitation to reach them?

Mr. DOWDY. When we enact this bill the Corporation Counsel will no longer advise Mr. Nottingham, who issued these permits, that he cannot do anything except issue the solicitation permit when he requested.

Mr. Nottingham testified he was instructed by the Corporation Counsel when the Mattachines asked for this permit that he had to give it to them under the law. Mr. Nottingham said if the Communists had applied he would have to give them a similar permit to solicit for them. He read the law. Mr. Nottingham said if the Mattachines asked for this permit, when the Mattachines asked for this permit they have a right to do under the law. Mr. ROOSEVELT. The Commissioners prescribed certain terms and conditions under which permits would be issued. The Congress provided the Commissioners with authority to issue regulations under which exemptions might be granted, with a limitation that the exemption shall not exceed $1,500 for any calendar year if they collect more than $1,500 in money or property. That is not an exemption that was given to them by Congress. It was given to them by the District Commissioners. May you have no trust in the Commissioners.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I assure the gentleman that we are going to change the regulation if this particular piece of legislation is enacted.

Mr. DOWDY. They have not given me any such assurance.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Has the gentleman asked the Commissioners if they would?

Mr. DOWDY. We have no assurance one way or the other. If they keep on granting licenses to homosexuals after this law is enacted, if they keep on granting permits of this kind, we will certainly call them to order.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say, when the gentleman does that we will have something to vote on. In the meantime we have a piece of legislation that can be misinterpreted and hurt a lot of other organizations. If the gentleman wants to do what he has in mind I hope he will have the courage to come back and do it.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, when this thing came up Mr. Kneipp came over and testified that the Commissioners were against the purpose of the bill. Of course he was talking about the bill before it was amended. I would suggest that the Members who are opposing this bill, and being misled by these queer ideas should get a copy of the hearings and read it. They will find a good deal of food for thought here. In the District of Columbia they did not know about. This Kameny fellow claims 10 percent of the employees in all the departments of Government are qualified for membership in his society. I had statements made to me that nothing could or would be done about this problem because of the power of the homosexuals in Washington. I do not believe that. The people who came before us and opposed this bill were very few in numbers. Mr. Kneipp, from the District Government testified that the Commissioners were opposed to the purpose of the bill, namely, to prohibit licenses to such organizations. I asked each of the Commissioners separately if they are opposed to keeping homosexuals from having this license, and from going into homes and soliciting contributions with the authority of the District Government. The Engineering Commissioner, General Duke, told me he certainly supported the purpose of the bill. He did not think the homosexuals should have such a license. I talked to Mr. Nottingham. I could not get an answer out of him, but you cannot get any definite answer out of him on anything. He will not say he is for it or against it. I think his statement should be considered to mean that he does not want to assume his responsibility in these matters.

Commissioner Duncan was talked to by one of the staff. He said he certainly is in favor of the purpose of this bill. He does not want this thing going on in the District of Columbia; there should not be such approval under the seal of the District of Columbia for such organizations to go into homes and solicit for purposes such as this.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I do not think there is any quarrel in what the gentleman was saying. The purpose of the bill is laudable, that being that the society is misusing money and the society does not have the right to require them to register. Is that true?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I think our Nation became great because of this bill. The mess that we are going through now is the result of that. The Mess in London has significance for us here in Great Britain. There was an editorial about it on Monday, 19th November last year. I think our Nation became great because we have moral strength in our people, and we ought not let it be destroyed by allowing this sort of thing.

This editorial says—

The current mess being aired in the London courtroom is more than just that. It is not just the development of a few immoral or amoral individuals.

Then it goes on to say this:

What is happening is the inevitable result of a liberal attitude toward social abnormalities. More than once in recent years this attitude has marred the diplomatic and military security of Britain. The mess in London has significance for us here in the United States. Like other nations we have been caught with a scandal or two. It is something the people of any nation can continue to tolerate only at their peril. The publication of immoral standards will eventually rule out the conscious and systematic teaching of moral concepts to our children.
Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I think there has been some misunderstanding about the $1,500 proposition. I read the District of Columbia Code, section 2-2103, which provides that no person shall solicit in the District of Columbia unless he holds a valid certificate of registration authorizing such solicitation. That means any amount of money, and no person may solicit without a certificate of registration. In subsection (d) of section 2-2103 it says that the Commissioners may by regulation prescribe the terms and conditions under which solicitations in addition to those enumerated in subsection (b) may be exempted from the provisions of subsection (a) and section 2-2105 and 2-2106.

Then this subsection (d) goes on to say:

That no exemption granted under the authority of this subsection (d) shall exceed in any calendar year $1,500 in money or property.

So under the law there must be a permit to solicit funds, but the Commissioners have authority to exempt churches and others up to $1,500.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman has just said about the exemption is quite right, but he has not said accurately. Under the law the District of Columbia Commissioners issued a regulation which has never been challenged exempting small solicitations totaling $1,500 or less during any one calendar year. That exempts the very society that they are trying to get at.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a much more basic and fundamental reason why this bill should be rejected and defeated. That reason is stated very clearly in the minority report wherein we have cited any number of U.S. Supreme Court cases dealing with precisely this kind of language and exempting the solicitation of funds totaling $1,500 or less during any one calendar year. That exempts the very society that they are trying to get at.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a much more basic and fundamental reason why this bill should be rejected and defeated. That reason is stated very clearly in the minority report wherein we have cited any number of U.S. Supreme Court cases dealing with precisely this kind of language and exempting the solicitation of funds totaling $1,500 or less during any one calendar year. That exempts the very society that they are trying to get at.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a much more basic and fundamental reason why this bill should be rejected and defeated. That reason is stated very clearly in the minority report wherein we have cited any number of U.S. Supreme Court cases dealing with precisely this kind of language and exempting the solicitation of funds totaling $1,500 or less during any one calendar year. That exempts the very society that they are trying to get at.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a much more basic and fundamental reason why this bill should be rejected and defeated. That reason is stated very clearly in the minority report wherein we have cited any number of U.S. Supreme Court cases dealing with precisely this kind of language and exempting the solicitation of funds totaling $1,500 or less during any one calendar year. That exempts the very society that they are trying to get at.
Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the veterans' non-service-connected pension bill. I would have voted in favor of the bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, reserving a personal statement for the consideration of the bill, as to what it would or would not do. It is of vast importance, it appears to me, to the people of the District of Columbia, and has overall implications most far reaching.

Mr. DOWDY. The next bill would be S. 628, the urban renewal bill, and the order in which it might be called up, I merely ask for information, not only for myself but for other Members who are also interested.

Mr. DOWDY. It is the last bill on the list, and this is the next to the last one. That is all the information I have. So far as I know, there is nothing else.

Mr. SISK. I consider it my duty to understand that the gentleman actually intends at the present time to call up that bill after we have completed action on this bill?

Mr. DOWDY. I would have to confer with my chairman about that. I am taking these one at a time.

Mr. SISK. It seems to me that this is a reasonable question, in view of the lateness of the hour. I might say to my good friend from Texas, I am inclined to object to the consideration of the Columbia Plaza bill in the House, because I think it is too important. I believe it needs some discussion. A lot of light needs to be shed on some of the things which are happening.

I am curious to know to what bill we will proceed afterward, in the event we should be able to consider this bill in the House.

I yield to the gentleman for a comment.

Mr. DOWDY. The next bill would be S. 628, if the hour is not too late.

Mr. SISK. I call up the veterans' non-service-connected pension bill. I would have voted in favor of the bill, H.R. 1927, the veterans' non-service-connected pension bill.

Mr. SISK. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman actually intends at the present time to call up that bill after we have completed action on this bill?

Mr. DOWDY. It is the last bill on the list, and this is the next to the last one. That is all the information I have. So far as I know, there is nothing else.

Mr. SISK. It seems to me that this is a reasonable question, in view of the lateness of the hour. I might say to my good friend from Texas, I am inclined to object to the consideration of the Columbia Plaza bill in the House, because I think it is too important. I believe it needs some discussion. A lot of light needs to be shed on some of the things which are happening.

I am curious to know to what bill we will proceed afterward, in the event we should be able to consider this bill in the House.

I yield to the gentleman for a comment.

Mr. DOWDY. The next bill would be S. 628, if the hour is not too late.

Mr. SISK. I believe that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9774) to terminate the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project area and plan, to restore certain property in the District of Columbia to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between both sides.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?
Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.
The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.
Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion pending.
Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. May we have the motion restated, please? I did not understand it.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] is that we go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9774.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. SISK. Did I understand that there was any time limitation included in that motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] asked unanimous consent that the time limit be confined to 1 hour, to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] objected. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9774.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.
The motion is taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hays) there were—ayes 69, noes 81.

So the motion was rejected.

OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS, MISSOURI

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 807 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Resolved, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1803) to provide for the establishment of the Ozark National Rivers in the State of Missouri. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] asked unanimous consent that the time limit be confined to 1 hour, to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] objected. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9774.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.
The motion is taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hays) there were—ayes 69, noes 81.

So the motion was rejected.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I think the House is entitled to some explanation as to what took place with reference to S. 628, to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. We have this bill up before the House on a previous occasion. The bill passed. This year we have a Senate Concurrent Resolution which we passed 2 years ago. We have not passed any act on this side or any amendment to the act in order that the down-town progress people could get started. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a division—may I say on honest division of opinion—as to which ought to prevail. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] that he is dead wrong, and I respect him for the stand that he has taken in behalf of his bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are many of us—and I believe a majority of the committee—who do support the Senate version as a substitute for the Dowdy version.

Mr. Speaker, what we have been trying to do is to get the bill before the House so something could be done about this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Senate version, but I have said very frankly that if the Senate version does not prevail, and the House decides the Senate version is not the proper one, then I will support the Dowdy bill, and we can go to conference and come back with a bill.

I would hope that as a result of the conference there will be some action until such time as the people in the District of Columbia can work.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter on which the people in the District of Columbia have been working continuously for a number of years. These people have spent a lot of time in a great state of indecision as to what can be done for the future of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, this is the reason I believe S. 628 should have been brought up today as planned.

May I say this is not in any way critical of anyone, and this includes the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, Mr. Multer, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], who has tried to work out the differences in this bill. However, I believe it is a mistake to continue postponing this matter.

We ought to meet the issue straight on and decide whether we want the Senate version or the so-called Dowdy version and come back and decide on the matter.

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

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House is going to be required to meet this issue nevertheless. We will very shortly have pending before the House a housing bill. The housing bill as passed in the other body does contain provisions similar to those contained in S. 628. The bill will be considered as a housing bill and if such provision is not contained in the housing bill the Senate will certainly insist that those provisions be considered in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, we have been as well as meet this issue on this matter now as when the housing bill comes before us, with appropriate amendments, so the entire matter can go to conference.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that we bring the bill to the floor of the House and decide which course we are going to pursue. That is the important thing, in order to help the District of Columbia.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend remarks concerning the housing bill and if such provision is not contained in the housing bill the Senate will certainly insist that those provisions be considered in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, we have not as well as meet this issue on this matter now as when the housing bill comes before us, with appropriate amendments, so the entire matter can go to conference.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that we bring the bill to the floor of the House and decide which course we are going to pursue. That is the important thing, in order to help the District of Columbia.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend remarks concerning the housing bill and if such provision is not contained in the housing bill the Senate will certainly insist that those provisions be considered in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, we have not as well as meet this issue on this matter now as when the housing bill comes before us, with appropriate amendments, so the entire matter can go to conference.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to burden the Members of the House at this late hour, except I would like to call to the atten-
tion of the Members of the House some of the accomplishments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, particularly in the field of public health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to my colleagues on the subcommittee for their assistance in passing what I consider to be many landmarks in the field of health legislation for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to review briefly for Members of the House the accomplishments of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the field of public health and safety during this Congress. I believe we have accomplished more in this field during this Congress than has been accomplished during any other comparable period in our Nation's history.

First, Mr. Speaker, we reported, and the Congress has passed, H.R. 12, now Public Law 88-139, designed to provide assistance in the construction of schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, public health, and other health professions, and to provide loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. This vitally needed legislation is intended to offset the personnel shortages which the country will need in these fields in future years.

We recently passed legislation, H.R. 10041, revising the Hill-Burton hospital construction program designed to meet the health needs of the Nation in another area through providing hospitals and other facilities, such as diagnostic and treatment centers, public health centers, rehabilitation facilities, and facilities for long-term care.

The Hill-Burton program which, through its past operation has provided 268,489 beds for care of patients, is further strengthened and improved by H.R. 10041, which also provides funds specifically designed to meet part of the pressing needs of the Nation in the field of modernization of many of our hospitals.

The Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been extremely active during this Congress, and has submitted to the responsible members of the House a number of vitally needed and important measures designed to meet the pressing needs of the Nation in the field of modernization of many of our hospitals.

The Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been extremely active during this Congress and has submitted to the responsible members of the House a number of vitally needed and important measures designed to meet the health and safety needs of the Nation.

This subcommittee consists of myself, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pickle], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelson], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Brotzman]. Each of these gentlemen has worked long and hard on the business of your subcommittee. We have our differences over legislation, but we always resolve them, and as a result, every bill we have reported out of our subcommittee this Congress has been ordered reported by a unanimous vote of the subcommittee.

We have reported a number of bills of major importance in the field of public health and safety. We reported to the full committee, and the Congress passed S. 1576, now Public Law 88-164, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This bill will have a major impact upon our national attack on mental retardation and associated problems.

We also reported out of our subcommittee this legislation, but we always resolve them, by making the portion of that bill dealing with mental health as we anticipate that they will, ultimately the treatment of mental illness in this Nation will be revolutionized for the benefit of the American people.

In the field of health personnel, we reported to the full committee, and the House has passed H.R. 11241, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, a new program designed to meet the training needs of the nursing personnel this Nation will need by 1970. This bill is currently pending in the Senate and all indications are that that body will act on the measure in the near future.

In addition, we reported, and the House has passed, H.R. 11083, the Graduate Public Health Training Act, which continues and expands the existing programs designed to assist in meeting the needs of the States and localities across the Nation, as well as the Federal Government, for trained personnel in the field of public health. This bill is also designed to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

We have reported to the full committee, H.R. 8546, a bill to extend to qualified students of veterinary and students of optometry student loans under the provisions of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act.

We have reported to the full committee, and the House has passed, legislation, S. 978, designed to restore to self-employed commercial fishermen the right to medical care which they enjoyed for over 150 years until an administrative ruling took this right from them. This measure is pending the signature of the President.

We reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, H.R. 134, now Public Law 88-206, an amendment to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and control of communicable diseases.

We have reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, H.R. 10047, requiring that seat belts be provided in all heavy trucks and buses, and we have reported to the full committee introducing S. 978, designed to restore to self-employed commercial fishermen the right to medical care which they enjoyed for over 150 years until an administrative ruling took this right from them. This measure is pending the signature of the President.

We have reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, legislation, S. 143, designed to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and control of communicable diseases.

We have reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, legislation, S. 978, designed to restore to self-employed commercial fishermen the right to medical care which they enjoyed for over 150 years until an administrative ruling took this right from them. This measure is pending the signature of the President.

We have reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, legislation, S. 978, designed to restore to self-employed commercial fishermen the right to medical care which they enjoyed for over 150 years until an administrative ruling took this right from them. This measure is pending the signature of the President.

We have reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, legislation, S. 978, designed to restore to self-employed commercial fishermen the right to medical care which they enjoyed for over 150 years until an administrative ruling took this right from them. This measure is pending the signature of the President.

We have reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, legislation, S. 978, designed to restore to self-employed commercial fishermen the right to medical care which they enjoyed for over 150 years until an administrative ruling took this right from them. This measure is pending the signature of the President.

We have reported to the full committee, and the Congress has passed, legislation, S. 978, designed to restore to self-employed commercial fishermen the right to medical care which they enjoyed for over 150 years until an administrative ruling took this right from them. This measure is pending the signature of the President.
By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MOORE, Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 1803, is the first bill to establish a new major unit of the national park system that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has brought before the House during the 85th Congress. It is a bill that has been before this House for a few years, but so far this year, but none that ranks as major.

What H.R. 1803 proposes is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set up the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in the State of Missouri. This will be administered as, in effect, a national recreation area under most of the laws that are generally applicable to the National Park Service. Whenever a bill like this one comes along, the question that arises in my own mind and, I am sure, in the minds of other Members of the House is this: What was the need and what standards ought we to use to determine whether to include the new area in the national park system?

Leaving aside those areas which are primarily of historical significance, I answer this question for myself by applying two tests:

First. Is it an area of national outstanding scenic or scientific value?

Second. Is it an area which has great value for recreational purposes to a large segment of the American public?

If you will think of Yellowstone National Park or Cape Cod National Seashore or the Blue Ridge Parkway or Everglades National Park, the extent to which the two tests I have just mentioned are met is evident. I am convinced that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will also meet them successfully.

First, as to the population that it will serve. As we pointed out in our committee's report on this bill, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is so located as to be readily accessible to almost 25 million people. It is within 175 miles of St. Louis; 200 miles of Memphis and Little Rock; 250 miles of Kansas City and Nashville; 300 miles of Louisville; 350 miles of Des Moines, Indianapolis, and Wichita; and 400 miles of Chicago, Lincoln, and Oklahoma City.

I emphasize this to show that this new unit of the park system will be an area of national, not merely local, significance and that, therefore, the cost of establishing it must be borne by the United States and not left to the people of Missouri alone.

The other test, "Is it an area of outstanding scenic value?" is also met. Too many of us have got so used to dirty, polluted streams that we have forgotten that this is not the way nature made them. We look at a Potomac or a Mississippi and lament that things are as they are. If we have the chance to preserve 140 miles of two streams that are still as pure as they were in the days of the Indians. The Current River and the Jacks Fork, with which H.R. 1803 is concerned, are still in a pristine state. They are spring-fed streams and the greatest of all the attractions which this national legislation will offer will be a chance to float down them in one of the long flat-bottom Johnboats that are used in the area.

Quiet enough to give us that sense of peace that only the State of Missouri can give us. Remote enough to give us solitude if we want it, beautiful enough to invite us to return time after time—this is the Current River country. It is not rugged in the sense that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is so located in the State of Missouri. This will be administered as, in effect, a national recreation area under most of the laws that are generally applicable to the National Park Service. Whenever a bill like this one comes along, the question that arises in my own mind and, I am sure, in the minds of other Members of the House is this: What was the need and what standards ought we to use to determine whether to include the new area in the national park system?

Leaving aside those areas which are primarily of historical significance, I answer this question for myself by applying two tests:

First. Is it an area of national outstanding scenic or scientific value?

Second. Is it an area which has great value for recreational purposes to a large segment of the American public?

If you will think of Yellowstone National Park or Cape Cod National Seashore or the Blue Ridge Parkway or Everglades National Park, the extent to which the two tests I have just mentioned are met is evident. I am convinced that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will also meet them successfully.

First, as to the population that it will serve. As we pointed out in our committee's report on this bill, the Ozark National Scenic Riverways is so located as to be readily accessible to almost 25 million people. It is within 175 miles of St. Louis; 200 miles of Memphis and Little Rock; 250 miles of Kansas City and Nashville; 300 miles of Louisville; 350 miles of Des Moines, Indianapolis, and Wichita; and 400 miles of Chicago, Lincoln, and Oklahoma City.

I emphasize this to show that this new unit of the park system will be an area of national, not merely local, significance and that, therefore, the cost of establishing it must be borne by the United States and not left to the people of Missouri alone.

The other test, "Is it an area of outstanding scenic value?" is also met. Too many of us have got so used to dirty, polluted streams that we have forgotten that this is not the way nature made them. We look at a Potomac or a Mississippi and lament that things are as they are. If we have the chance to preserve 140 miles of two streams that are still as pure as they were in the days of the Indians. The Current River and the Jacks Fork, with which H.R. 1803
sive park preservation than is asked for to have the Federal Government come back to this House and to the other body repeatedly asking for additional sums to buy up additional land along the banks of this stream because of encroachments of those things which would muddle the waters and which would detract from the pristine beauty of the area.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a moment, not in the usual fashion we do this job on the floor, but in a most serious effort to express my very great admiration for and, incidentally, my very great admiration for the gentleman who is the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

We have heard a lot on the floor in recent months about the parsimony of committee chairmen and about the unfitness of committee chairmen. I wish to say before all Members on both sides of the aisle of this House that no chairman can hold more faith than has been his member on my side of the aisle than has been the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Aspinall). He is expert in his field. He is fair. He is always fair. He is an individual to be highly regarded and admired by all who serve under him.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the motives which bring this bill to the floor are more than enough. This is a beautiful area. In my own mind I am convinced that the thing we do in respect to preservation of this area today will be in the near future—not too many years—detract from that beauty and bring to that area all the dangers and all the pollutions we expect if we do not take action at the Federal level.

The cost, as is true with respect to all others of these bills, is an estimation. I believe it is an underestimate. As the chairman said, to obtain more money they will have to come back to this House and the other body to get appropriations. After all, the original bill has been authorized, of course this becomes a rather "pat" proposition.

I would much have preferred the Ozark Riverways as a State proposition, using funds from the land and water conservation fund bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. As I understand it, there are estimated costs by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. The Department of Interior estimates land acquisition costs at $7 million, and I believe the Secretary of Agriculture had an estimated cost of $8.3 million.

Mr. KYL. The difference between the figures, I say to the gentleman, partly is caused by the fact that the first report, which came from the Department of Agriculture, was based on a park which was considerably larger than that included under the terms of this bill. The original proposal called for a more extensive park preservation than is asked for in this legislation. That would explain the difference between the figure of the Department of Agriculture and the later figure.

Mr. GROSS. They seek to acquire some 78,000 or perhaps as much as 85,000 acres of land.

Mr. KYL. I say to the gentleman that the committee would be able to come to estimating the cost of this project, after all of the factors were taken into consideration, after all the best estimates had been made, was a cost of about $7 million.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would agree that this is what might be called the foundation cost; that it will likely go up from there?

Mr. KYL. There is one factor which always enters into these cases. Whenever the Federal Government proposes to buy an area, the price tag usually jumps. No one can estimate how much it will jump. The committee was very diligent in trying to arrive at the figure, which is $7 million. At this time I believe that is the best estimate which can be made.

Mr. GROSS. Mrs. Aspinall of Eminent and Van Buren ask to be excepted from this park preservation?

Mr. KYL. I would say that was a natural request of those communities. They are located right in those areas. They are in the way, and they insist that the land would have been taken into the preservation system. They need land for additional growth, for the expansion of the communities in normal procedures. If they had not made such a request the preservation would have gone right into the city limits, in all probability. Therefore it was a natural request.

The gentleman does bring up another point which is of concern to me. I believe every available spot which is left out of the riverway and available to these communities will be filled with commercial ventures, with tourist ventures, with residences of one kind or another, usually of less permanent nature, much as has been the case in the area of the Lake of the Ozarks, which, sad to relate, has become a less attractive area than it was originally.

Mr. GROSS. As we go forward, again we are confronted with this situation: We have heard much about the tremendous land holdings of the Federal Government throughout the United States.

Now we are confronted again with a bill which would add 78,000 or 85,000 acres to the public domain. Is this correct?

Mr. KYL. I say to the gentleman that anything that would be good for the Ozark that anything would be good for it over a long time, and in the meantime, if there is any appreciation of the area, it would be emphasized in the days ahead because the longer you postpone these things after you first talk about them, the higher the price of the land becomes and the more undesirable property is developed along the stream.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMPDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Ichord), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CHORDEN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1558 is the final result of many long and hard hours of work by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs over the last 4 years, spanning the 87th and the 88th Congresses. It is a well-written bill, and I hope that the committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman Aspinall, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Saylor, and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman Morris, are to be commended. The present generations of Americans owe and the future generations of Americans owe the three men and all of the members of the committee a tremendous debt of gratitude for their dedicated and untiring efforts to preserve and protect the beauty of our great country for the enjoyment of all Americans, as illustrated by their action on this bill and many other measures already enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, during recent years a great deal of attention has been devoted to the need for setting aside in public ownership the unspoiled portions of our rivers, lakes, and ocean shorelines. The need, I might say, becomes more apparent each year. This bill fulfills that need and follows the example of the Cape Cod and Point Reyes legislation. The Current River and the Jacks Fork River country in my district in southern Missouri represents a striking opportunity for the preservation of a beautiful area, not only the interest of the Midwest but of the entire Nation, for they are two of the most outstanding free flowing streams in the Nation—clear, cold, beautiful and long-faced and measured of remaining in that state unless something is done. The truth of the matter is that if this bill is not passed the beauty of the rivers will be gone. I think it was with that consideration in mind that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman Curtis, back in the 86th Congress first introduced legislation pertaining to this subject but the area was not located within his district.

If this bill is not passed the present beauty of these rivers will be lost to all of America.

I appreciate the concern of the gentlemen from Iowa, but I have the exactly opposite view. This legislation will not result in the area becoming a Coney Island. As a matter of fact if this legislation is not passed the area will be a Coney Island and it is rapidly becoming so with no legislation touching the matter.

The bill as passed by the committee is not as far reaching as the bill I originally introduced. The original bill I
Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I hope they do not try to do anything about anything near the problem.

Mr. KYL. I am glad the gentleman from Missouri has approached the Department of the Interior to see if they have language which permits not only the acquisition of lands but interest in those lands. However, scenic easements have already been acquired in a few instances such as Antietam and perhaps at Mount Vernon. In these cases there is a very great debate that the landholder asks so much money for the scenic easement that the Government might as well, as far as the economics of the matter are concerned, have asked for an outright fee title.

Mr. CURTIS. May I say to the gentleman that the kind of easement about which he is talking represents a development in the Park Service where they actually bought a single easement along a highway in order to preserve a vista; bought it for a very small price. I am referring more I say again to the setback law kind of easement where there is a mutual benefit derived by all people who grant these scenic easements to each other, and such type operation would particularly fit a river. Further, I would not expect the Government would have to pay anything for these easements. In fact I know that in the Ozarks areas and in the Current River area already landholders are offering to submit their lands that border those rivers to restrictive covenants against buildings or whatever is necessary in order to provide this kind of preservation of the beauty of the river banks.

So if this technique of scenic easement is developed, as I expect it will be in light of the letter of the Secretary of Interior, this should not cost the Federal Government to pay the people for the scenic easement, and I expect this mutual covenant concept to be carried out. It is here that the people granting the easements derive the benefit of their mutually beneficial actions.

Mr. KYL. I am glad the gentleman puts it in that context. However, in my own mind I am not convinced this is going to be a very rapid operation for the Government. I think the Raccoon should show that we are not encouraging the Department of the Interior to go out and purchase scenic areas at a price lower than the acquisition price.

Mr. CURTIS. If they do not purchase any scenic easements. I hope what is going to happen is they will avail themselves of the scenic easements that have already been offered by many of the riparian owners of the Current River, as I say, which restricts their lands, and convey it without cost. There is a great benefit to the owners of the banks of the river derived from mutually restricting their lands in this manner.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.
Mr. Chairman, I want to add my word of commendation for H.R. 1803 and to recommend to all the Members of the House a favorable vote on this bill.

I visited the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers just a year ago with some of my colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, so I can speak of the various features of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways from the national park system from my own experience. I went there in doubt; I came back convinced.

As H.R. 1803 is reported to the House, it calls for a designation of 65,000 acres of land. This, you will note, is considerably less than the 78,000 acres which the Department of the Interior recommended for inclusion. In addition, it is expected that the State of Missouri will donate somewhere between 15,000 and 22,000 acres, and 800 acres will be transferred by the Forest Service to the National Park Service. The total area within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will thus be in the neighborhood of 80,000 to 85,000 acres.

I can attest to the merits of this area from firsthand inspection. I was, of course, impressed with the beauty of the Ozark country itself. I thoroughly enjoyed floating down the Current River for the greater part of a day without seeing much more than a quarter of the stretch. I also enjoyed the fact that the federal land in the Ozark area is more than a little envied of our good friend 

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado who is chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has already told the House about the cost of this project, so I will not go into it. I must confess that, if the Congress does not appropriate the necessary funds, I will be very sorry about this. Yet they serve their purpose and in serving it, serve the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support H.R. 1803.
Mr. GROSS. I will accept the gentleman for his opinion as to how the scenic easements will be acquired. Does the gentleman believe they will be obtained without compensation, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Cuellar), suggests, or will the Government have to buy the scenic easements?

Mr. MORRIS. We are hoping they will be acquired without cost to the Federal Government. We will give to the Secretary, by this language, authority so that if he deemed it in the public interest he could purchase a scenic easement, or exchange some land for the easement.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that. It is a hope, and only a hope, on the part of the gentleman, that the Federal Government will have to buy the easements; is that correct?

Mr. MORRIS. It is a little more than a hope. We have had some indications from some of the people that they would be willing to give the Secretary scenic easements.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would agree, I assume, that easements will be quite important to this narrow, 140-mile-long tract of land. It is a good deal like the Potomac—a mile wide, an inch deep, and never runs dry?

Mr. MORRIS. It is a little more than an inch deep. You can float down it on a boat, and it is more than an inch.

Mr. GROSS. Very well. Let me say to the gentleman that acquiring of easements seems to me to be particularly important in this sort of layout.

Mr. MORRIS. The easement is important. That is why we included the language in the legislation.

Neither the committee nor the Department wants to push people off this land. We are hoping that the majority of these owners will agree to give scenic easements. Then we will not have to acquire them. The people can continue to live there as long as they desire.

In other words, they can have their cake and eat it, too.

Mr. GROSS. What is proposed to be established under the terms of this bill is, I assume, on the order of the attempt to do much the same thing with the old C. & O. Canal up into Maryland. That was attempted some time ago, but has never gone through, has it?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not familiar with that, I say to my friend.

Mr. GROSS. That has been stopped for some time. I do not know whether it is dead or alive in the committee.

Mr. MORRIS. It is not under active consideration.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, though I have several reservations about the wisdom of this bill creating the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri, I will not actively oppose the bill today out of deference to the hard work and spirit of compromise that has prevailed among my two Missouri colleagues most directly concerned.

I am personally familiar with the area to which this legislation pertains. I have floated these Springfiled rivers on many occasions and grew up in the area. It is a beautiful place, and I think it should be noted that the only reason we are even considering this legislation is because it has already been preserved for generations by the people most directly concerned, and without the need for further Federal acquisition of land. In one sense, I only hope that the Federal responsibility resulting from this bill will do as good a job as the private interests which have prevailed until now.

Two years ago the area was threatened with another lake being built by the Corps of Engineers, which has prevailed until now. This could have been done along these lines, and thus the pressure that has developed for this bill. I told the Governor I felt we should not go forward with this rare source of recreation, cold, constant-temperatured water for Missouri and industrial development, if not for recreation. I do think that recognition should be given to the fact that this is a much better bill than was originally proposed. It has been greatly modified and emphasis given to obtaining scenic easements rather than purchasing an enormous chunk of land in fee simple.

There has been recognition given to private property rights to a far greater degree than was originally proposed, though we are deluding ourselves if we believe that some property owners are not going to be peevish about the potential disposition of their land. One of the three original rivers has been removed by political amputation.

I have some further worries as to whether we in Missouri are going to have to pay to use our own in the event that admission fees are subsequently authorized by the land and water conservation fund bill which previously passed this House.

I also think that the area should be viewed from the standpoint of its entire potential use, instead of attempting to set up arbitrary management on a portion of it for single use with the exclusion of all others. This could have been done better by the forestry service, in my opinion.

So that all these factors will be understood, and in the hope that the future management of the area will be cognizant of the objections that have been raised, I submit for the Record, copies of letters I have received on this issue from Mrs. R. E. Vaughn of the Current Jack's...
Fork River Association and Mrs. Wayne Blackwell of the Current Eleven Point Rivers Association.

CURRENT & JACK'S FORK RIVER ASSN.,
INDIVIDUAL RIVER PRESERVATION,
Eminence, Mo., March 6, 1964.

Dear Sir: It is probable that H.R. 1803 (Ozarks national bill) will soon come up for House consideration. This bill concerns my home area and so, of course, is of vital interest to me and my neighbors. The park proposal appears as a threat to our way of life and best interests. From the start, we have studied this proposal and now oppose it. Our grassroots organization numbers some 1,000 landowners and citizens, both resident and nonresident—deeply concerned people. It is our firm conviction that this is an unwise and an unnecessary expenditure that will not attain the professed objective of river preservation. There is already adequate park space in our State parks and National forests, totaling more than 350,000 acres in this area.

I appeal to you to vote against this bill and to use your influence against it. Sincerely yours,

Mrs. R. E. VAUGHN.

P.S. We have already submitted ample testimony to substantiate our arguments on this bill and companion S-16, and their predecessors; H.R. 3712 and S. 1361. We feel that a careful reading of this record will show the strength of our position.

FACT SHEET
REFERENCE: H.R. 1803 OZARKS NATIONAL RIVERS BILL.

November 2, 1963.


1-B. Without precedent. See House hearing on "Ozark National Rivers, Mo.", April 5, 1963, pages 5, 53, letter from Norman J. Small, legislator, to Hon. Edward V. Long, paragraph 2: "Insofar as scenic easements are obtained solely through voluntary negotiation with property owners, no legal question is likely to arise. On the other hand, if Federal acquisitions of such property interests is to be perfected by compulsory process, the validity of such an approach might be challenged on the ground that condemnation of private property interests to promote esthetic purposes such as the preservation of scenic beauty is not a taking for a public purpose; that is in the public interest, health, safety, or morals such as is requisite to support exercise of the power of eminent domain ...

1-C. Violation of Missouri Law (Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1959, chapter 12, section 12.010) and violations of individual right to ownership and accomplishment. This bill and its development plan call for power of eminent domain for esthetic and recreational purposes.

2. Over half of the rivers is already pledged to the area by Fork River Preservation Association, Inc. Riparian landowners are offering voluntary deeds of restriction; and this movement is expected to accelerate.

3. Much high cost of Government—and taxes—result from people's request for more services than can be obtained for the dollars spent, or even desired, not needed. The Ozark river plan (1955) dates prior to multiple use program authorized by Congress for U.S. Forest Service, which is included in entire watershed, presently owns a great percentage of the Ozarks, and is developing recreational areas without an additional expenditure of funds. Example: voluntary local cooperation on Eleven Point River.

4. The Park Service is a perpetual public debt; the Forest Service is a continuing source of revenue to the Government. Forest Service—not Park Service—is already in Ozarks.

5. Every thinking person is alerted by "national rivers"—and even if it is changed to "monument" the bill will nationalize Missouri's first rivers, for the rivers of other States. The Current and Jack's Fork Rivers in normal stages are case-tried law open for public use.

6. No threat to preservation of riparian lands, one-third farming, one-third forestry, one-third recreation permits us to have balanced economy. Participation of property owners beneficially only about 100 days out of the year.

7. Eighty-five percent of the Ozark region is in timber. The forests themselves—not humd, and infected with ticks and chiggers in summer—have modest recreational potential. Present fine young forest, if left to become decedent under Park Service, will change to less desirable trees from esthetic and commercial viewpoints. Some sites here grow pine 45 feet tall at age 50. Area of Current River drainage has long had reputation of producing finest white oak cooperage in Midwest.

8. Carter and Shannon produce a lot of Missouri's cattle and hogs which are raised in the fertile valleys of these rivers. This industry is compatible with preservation, or conservation. Eight hundred thousand people touring this area during a summer would certainly be incompatible with preservation of natural resources. Local economies such as are requisite to support exercise of the power of eminent domain ...

9. Current and Jack's Fork Rivers flow through proven mineral region. Before Congress ties up the area for restricted recreational use, study should be made of total resource potential.

10. The report of Senate passage of companion bill S 18 in Congressional Record, November 22, 1963 (is biased because it indicates none of the opposition registered at hearings at Eminence, Mo., or in Washington, D.C. Whole days of testimony were apparently ignored.

11. We saved this region from inundation in early 1950's when Corps of Army Engineers proposed dams at Doniphant and Blair Creek. We saved the beauty the Government again wants to take from us.

12. Though appropriate for outdoorsmen, the Ozark rivers are swift and treacherous, better suited to dispersed recreation than to control of privately-owned land. Landowners' interests are synonymous with public interest. River travel is the only way to see the scenery that this bill would acquire.

13. The near 600 farmers and other property owners in this area do not want to be displaced and disrupted, now live unobtrusively, screened by timber and bluffs. Life remains under H.R. 1803 with tolerable park regulations and without incentive for maintenance of property has no appeal—even though we would pay for privilege.

14. Of the polls made by Congressman Jones (10th Dist. Eleven Point River) and by Congressman Ichord (8th Dist. Current-Jack's Fork), the first was direct and valid (by petition at the death of such owner, or the death of any one owner in whose name and capacity the property on the date of such acquisition less $6 million expenditure is not prudently said will be reserved. The Secretary shall, for the public interest:

That any parcel of land containing less than 10 acres of land in private ownership so acquired for agricultural purposes, shall be acquired by the Secretary in its entirety unless the owner of any such parcel consents to the acquisition of a part thereof. Any parcel of land so acquired which lies outside the boundary generally depicted on the map referred to in paragraph 1 of this Act and acquired by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value within the boundaries. Lands within the boundaries of the State of Missouri. The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, shall designate for inclusion in the Ozark National Scenic Rivers area "such property on the date of such acquisition less $6 million expenditure is not prudently said will be reserved. The Secretary shall, for the public interest:..."
have been acquired by the United States in sufficient quantity to provide an administrable unit. The boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways by publication of notice in the Federal Register. The Secretary shall, from time to time, consult with the Conservation Commission of the State of Missouri, its political subdivisions, and any other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall from time to time consult with the members of the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and shall consult with the members with respect to carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(f) It shall be the duty of the Commission to render advice to the Secretary from time to time upon matters which the Secretary may refer to it for its consideration.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, that is to say $7,000,000 for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands) as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MORRIS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read, be printed in the Record, and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Committee amendment.

The Committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Sergeant at Arms declared the House of Representatives adjourned at 1:15 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, July 13, 1960.
watersheds of the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers.

(b) The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the Ozark National Rivers and Recreation Area, in accordance with the laws of Missouri. The Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be allowed, for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment and shall issue regulations after consultation with the Conservation Commission of the State of Missouri.

Sec. 6. The Ozark National Rivers shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1910 (31 Stat. 295), as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management and natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(a) There is hereby established an Ozark National Rivers Commission. The Commission shall cease to exist ten years after the date of establishment of the area pursuant to section 4 of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the members of the Congress of the United States of the area in which the Ozark National Rivers is situated (Carter, Dent, Shannon, and Texas), one member from the recommendations made by each such court;

(2) Two members to be appointed from recommendations of the Governor of the State of Missouri;

(c) One member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member of the Commission, who may be chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary shall reimburse members of the Commission for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall from time to time consult with the members of the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Ozark National Rivers, shall consult with the members with respect to carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(f) It shall be the duty of the Commission to render advice to the Secretary from time to time upon matters which the Secretary may refer to it for its consideration.

Sec. 7. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance other than that to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRIS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Morris: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 16 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 1803 as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.
The 14th amendment corrected an unpopular decision of Congress and the people as well. While the 13th, 14th, and 16th amendments were adopted to nullify a decision of the Supreme Court, the 21st amendment was adopted to nullify an unpopular decision on the part of Congress and the people in prohibiting that which established prohibition to sell, manufacture, etc., intoxicating liquor. The 21st amendment represents a more popular sentiment.

WHAT ABOUT THE BECKER AMENDMENT

The purpose of the Becker amendment is to nullify decisions of the Supreme Court which in the opinion of the majority of the people of the United States are decisions not in the national interest. The Becker amendment will permit voluntary Bible reading and prayer in our schools, and it is in keeping with this concept of adding to the free-enterprise system.

The 18th amendment which established prohibition to sell, manufacture, etc., intoxicating liquor was a violation of the 10th amendment to the Constitution: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Thus there must be an area in which the Constitution is silent, and as long as there is no governmental action tending to establish religion or to prohibit its free exercise voluntary devotional exercises in public schools will help to bring religion into children's lives, and help youngsters to grow up into more moral adults than they otherwise would have become.

THE JOHNSON COMPROMISE

Mr. Speaker, since filing my statement on June 10, 1964, it has become very apparent that the House Judiciary Committee does not intend to take any steps leading to the release of the Becker amendment to the floor of the House for a vote which if adopted would permit voluntary Bible reading and prayer in our schools. Those against the Becker amendment base their dissent against tampering with the first amendment to the Constitution on the fact that the Supreme Court has broadened the effect of the amendment as never intended by the Framers of the Constitution.

But the people back home want the right to have voluntary prayer or Bible reading in our schools.

As a compromise, on July 23, 1964, I introduced a new proposed constitutional amendment. It provides as follows:

Nothing in this Constitution or in any article of amendment shall be deemed to relate to the power of the several States to make laws permitting the free exercise of religion.

It is intended by this resolution to permit the States to provide for the recitation of prayers, or the reading of the Bible in our public schools on a voluntary basis.

EFFECT OF THE ADOPTION OF THE JOHNSON COMPROMISE

The adoption of this resolution would not mean that immediately any State legislature could pass any law it wished concerning an establishment of religion. Quite the contrary. Inherent in our dual system of government is the proposition that each State shall have its own constitution which restrains activities thought undesirable by its people. Accordingly, each of the 50 States now has in its constitution a provision respecting freedom of religion, and the separation of church and state.

This proposed joint resolution would leave the determination as to whether there would be religious activities in public schools and similar places up to the States. If such activities are prohibited in the public schools of a State by its constitution, nothing in this proposed amendment would change that situation in that State.

Each State shall be free to establish its own policy respecting religion, as it did before the Supreme Court decision of Engel against Vitale, dated June 25, 1962. Adoption of this amendment will still leave the first amendment as a restraint on Congress, and will not solve the Federal questions concerning chaplains in the Army, in Federal prisons, or other Federal religious activities. Whether these violate the first amendment would be properly left to the Federal courts to decide.

CONCLUSION

Time still remains this session for the Congress to adopt this proposed resolution, or the Becker amendment. If that is not done, in view of the huge percentage of citizens who demand action on the Becker amendment or its equivalent, will it soon adjourn sine die without the Members being permitted to vote on the question.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR IMPORTATION PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to question the statist attitudes of some of my conservative colleagues. I would warn them against seeking to impose on the people the central Government. I wonder why they want to scuttle the law of supply and demand, which is the basis of the free enterprise system.

The reason for my expression of great concern, Mr. Speaker, is the reported introduction today of a bill to extend the Mexican farm labor importation program.

Most Members had thought that when the House of Representatives reversed itself last year and gave the corporate growers 1 more year of the bracero program as a transitional period, there would be no more demands for renewal. Although some of us warned to the contrary, most Members believed that the growers would be satisfied with that extra year of grace.

Now we see, Mr. Speaker, that some of the staunchest conservatives of the land, some of the greatest deporters of statism, some of the biggest enemies of big government are demanding that this Federal Government program be continued.

Here is a program of the Central Government which runs counter to the free enterprise system, which completely blocks the laws of supply and demand in the farm labor market.

Here is a program through which growers simply call on the Federal Government to recruit and import foreign workers if U.S. workers will not work for the wages offered.

Here is a program which obviates the need for the employer to raise wages and improve working conditions in order to obtain an adequate supply of labor, as he must under the free market or free enterprise system.

Yet we are asked to continue that program, and we are asked to do it by some of those who usually see such immense dangers in big government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to save these conservatives from themselves. But perhaps they will not listen to what they may consider a politically "hot" soul.

If that is the case, perhaps I can improve my preachings by urging them to read a magazine article which appeared in the July 18 issue of the Packer, a trade magazine of the vegetable growing and shipping industry.

Under unanimous consent I include the article, headlined "Says Public Law 78 Not Consistent With Free Enterprise," in the Congressional Record.
situation has been received by the editor of the Packer from Richard Horner of Horner Farms, Union Grove, Wis., vegetable grower and shipper:

"I am sure that Palmer Mendelson and most readers are agreed that Federal controls, subsidies, master plans, and all the other claptrap of a regimented economy are something with which to do without.

"Truly the question is, is it 'commonsense' to cry the blues over the passing of a Government program? Not so, apparently; if the program were terminated, Mr. Mendelson, a vegetable farmer, and a staunch advocate of free enterprise, I would like to ask Mr. Mendelson:"

"Is it the responsibility of the Government to bail out any, or every, grower who builds production capacity without any idea where he is going to find the labor to run the establishment?"

"Is it necessary for any governmental agency to 'prove' that there is a labor pool available at the beck and call of the growers?"

"Do you, Mr. Mendelson, while proclaiming the merits of free enterprise, lack enough faith in it to trust that enough lettuce will be harvested to provide for milady's salad, and the Mendelson household as well?"

"You 'sensual success' of the fresh fruit and vegetable industry, a success 'built on a once highly regarded law of supply and demand.' I agree with you."

"In fact, I am such a believer in the law of supply and demand, that I believe growers should work out their own problems, and not have the whole country going down the drain if we can't have a Federal program to import foreign labor."

"I might add, if I wanted to be nasty that Public Law 78 added to the regi-

ment of the farmer."

"If I think all this howling is apt to spoil that image of the rugged individualist, in fact someone is liable to question your sincer
ty about the law of supply and demand."

FOREIGN AID: PRIVATE ENTERPRISE STYLE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Federal administration would spend just one-hundredth the amount of time and money publicizing the fine accomplishments which continually go on in the private sector of our society that it spends in propagandizing what the Federal Government is doing in the same areas.

For some years I have followed the annual reports of the various U.S. companies doing business abroad. One report I followed with particular interest has been that of the Arabian-American Oil Co., Aramco.

The particular parts of the annual reports which have interested me the most have been those which discuss the employment situation. Two words, "Aramco" and "Aramco and the Community" are the titles given the sections of the 1963 report. Of greatest interest to me has been the bar charts (not printed in the Record) which, over a period of years, have shown the continued increase in employment of Arabian nationals, both in absolute numbers and in percentages. Accompanying these charts are other charts which show the increase in the advancement of the Arabian nationals to a position of higher pay and higher responsibility, again absolute numbers and in percentages.

The record is one which would make any American proud, as I am certain it makes the Arabian nationals involved proud.

The other area of progress is in the development of what our governmental bureaucracy chooses to call infrastruc-

ture, which makes possible the roads, sewers, hospitals, etc. cetera, those physical structures which are essential to a continued uplift of the standard of living of any society.

A few months back I was told by an ardent believer in increased Government activity as opposed to increasing the activity in the private sector that course you could not expect private enterprise, operating for a profit, to build schools, roads, hospitals and so forth. "Government, of course, must do that," he said. My reply was, "Well, maybe you could not expect people in private enterprise to do all that but the answer is that they do it."

Of course private enterprise will always do that which is necessary to de-
velop a resource which has economic value. In modern technologies this re-
quires great emphasis to be placed on education and training people, seeing that the incidence of absenteeism from sickness and accident is reduced to a minimum, providing short hours, recrea-
tion and vacation time to improve hu-
man efficiency, seeing that the children get education and that there is retire-
ment for old age and disability, because all that has not been done it would be shortsighted at all. It is a source of great pride and should be to all Americans who will look at it objectively, with fair criticism because it can be improved.

Here follows the two sections I re-
ferred to, "Men of Aramco" and "Aramco and the Community":

MEN OF ARAMCO

Aramco's regular employees in Saudi Arabia at the close of the year numbered 12,988, of whom about 1,050 were Arab. Americans numbered 1,521, or 11.7 percent, and others 1,076, or 8.3 percent. Nearly three-fourths of the Saudi Arabian employees had at least 10 years of service with the company. Average annual income of all Saudi Arabian employees was $3,167, more than double the average income in 1955. For each hour worked, the average employee received more than $1.10. This average hourly earnings is in sharp contrast to wage demands to manufacture working in manufacturing industries in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Italy, and West Germany ranging from an average of $5.06 to $1 an hour, according to data provided by the United Nations in 1963.

Saudi Arabian employees continue to ad-
vance to positions of greater responsibility. At yearend, Saudi Arabs held more than 90 percent of the clerical jobs, 79 percent of the transportation, sup-
nervisory, service jobs, 85 percent of the clerical jobs. Saudi Arabian advance in these types of work has been achieved through work experience and training programs.

Saudi Arabs filled 76 percent of the first-
line supervisory positions. They also held 76 percent of the positions requiring technical, professional, and administrative and management skills. At yearend 42 percent of the technical positions and 8 percent of the professional positions were filled by Saudi Arabs. They held 20 percent of the unit, section and division head positions, with required administrative and man-
agement skills. As more employees move into these positions, the company is continuing to emphasize training designed to qualify them for greater responsibilities.

At the close of 1963, two-thirds of the company's Saudi Arabian employees were being supervised directly, industrially.

MANAGEMENT COURSES CONDUCTED

During 1963, more than a third of the company's Saudi Arabian employees enrolled in one or more of Aramco's training courses, either as a part of their regular employment assignments in the Middle East, the United King-
dom, and the United States. Each year management was part of an individual training program designed to prepare the employee for a specific job or type of work.

Of these trainees, 82 took courses in secondary schools or universities in such fields as accounting, agriculture, business adminis-
tration, education, engineering, and person-
nel management. Others had practical work assignments, studied oil operations techniques used in the United States or worked with companies specializing in equipment used by Aramco.

BENEFITS PAYMENTS TOTAL $2.2 MILLION

Saudi Arabian employees received $2,970,000 during the year as a result of various company benefits plans. Payments were for retirement, disability, death, and special benefits.

Ninety-eight percent of the Saudi Arabian employees continued to accu-
sive year, declining from 51 to 50 per million

INJURIES PER 1,000 Employee Hours, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15 to 19 years</th>
<th>5 to 9 years</th>
<th>Up to 4 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,391</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family health was stressed. Seventy-five percent of the employees' wives delivered pre-natal, matronal, or child care instruction; about half of the employees' children were brought to company health centers for prevent- 
vive care. School nurses and midwives attending health instruction clinics regularly had a low incidence of serious disease.

More than 3,000 patients with 12 diseases were given employees and depend- 
ents, including 6,100 vaccinations against tuberculosis. Since 1958, diagnosed cases of tuberculosis, whooping cough, typhoid, poliomyelitis, and smallpox have dropped sharply as a result of the company's inoculation programs.

Spread of tuberculosis among employees' families continued to decline as a result of intensive preventive care during the school year 1963-64

Government. These schools become part of an agreement with the Saudi Arabian Ministry of Education. An intermediate school for boys accommodates 300 students. Two schools for girls, the first such to be built in the Eastern Province, were nearly completed late in 1962 by the Ministry of Health, the World Health Organization (WHO), and the company. The Government com-

The average interest-free home loan made to employees by the company during the year was $7,852. Employees repay through monthly installments 80 percent of the total amounts loaned; the company absorbs 20 percent. During 1963, Aramco made indi-

Aramco established a $185 million research program in cooperation with Harvard in 1955. Strains of the virus were isolated in 1958 and a vaccine first was developed in 1963 by the Ministry of Health, the World Health Organization (WHO), and the company. The Government completed and opened the 250-bed King Sa'ud Base Hospital in Dammam in December; con-

The Government has requested the company to undertake more research in the field of trachoma. During 1963, an extensive test vaccination program was carried out in selected Eastern Province communities. Children who did not receive the vaccine, 52 percent de-

The vaccine was used to compare the incidence of trachoma in common in Saudi Arabia and the Middle East.

Late in the year, a Harvard-Aramco re-

In the Qatif area, technical assistance was agreed to refund to the Government approxi-

BECKER CHALLENGES CELLER

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my re-

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to dispel some very unjustifiable claims made by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; namely, the gentleman from New York, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER.

In an Associated Press statement Wednesday, August 5, the gentleman said:

Mr. CELLER also said:

I would challenge the statements made by the Congressman:

First. My amendment does not in any way change or alter the first amendment.

Second. I challenge the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], to bring an amendment to the floor of the House. If it is contention that Congress will never approve this amend-

I know he is afraid to do this, and it is a tragedy that one man in the Con-

I fear the gentleman's statement that mail is running heavily against an amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools. I have a personal check with many Members of the House, and the results of the count made by Mem-

I further challenge the gentleman's statement that the American people are overwhelmingly in favor of such an amendment. The answers on
MEMBERS' QUESTIONNAIRES RUN BETWEEN 75 TO 95 PERCENT IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

I AM INSERTING THIS NEWSPAPER ARTICLE FOLLOWING, AND IN THE NAME OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY THAT I AM PERFECTLY WILLING TO HAVE THIS MATTER COME BEFORE THE HOUSE AND GO TO THE PEOPLE THROUGH THEIR VARIOUS MEANS TO DETERMINE THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

I CHALLENGE THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEW YORK (MR. CELLER) TO DO THE SAME.

THE ARTICLE FOLLOWS:

GOP PLATFORM DRAFTS DRIVE FOR PRAYER AMENDMENT

(By W. B. Rogersdale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON—The Republican platform may pump new life into a bitter controversy that was dying down in Congress—whether to amend the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools.

A total of 146 proposed constitutional amendments have been offered to offset Supreme Court decisions which said that required prayers and Bible reading in public schools conflicted with the first amendment. But a year after the first prayer decision, the High Court in ruling on Pennsylvania, Maryland and New York, declared that Bible reading and recitation of the Lord’s Prayer, as required exercises in public schools, conflicted with the first amendment.

The decision was worded so that there appeared to be no room for a schoolteacher to hold such exercises on his own, since public school teachers are government employees. At first reaction among church leaders and laymen alike was overwhelmingly critical. Gradually, however, the major church groups endorsed the prayer decisions as a necessary step to retain separation of church and state.

The National Council of Churches and most major Protestant groups have gone on record against the Becker amendment. Roman Catholic officials have divided on the issue, but the churches’ bishops in the United States were advised by their legal counsel to go on record against any changes in the first amendment.

Historically, the Supreme Court has had little to say of religious observances in schools.

In March 1948 the High Court ruled unconstitutional religious instruction in public schools on a majority rule basis.

But in April 1952 the Supreme Court approved New York’s released-time program which frees public schoolchildren from school 1 hour a week for out-of-school religious instruction.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Cyprus is political and racial as two of our NATO allies, Greece and Turkey, attempt to prevent open conflict between themselves. As I pointed out in an article appearing in the February 17, 1964, issue of the Washington Post, when the Soviet Union was the only nation, then, to put itself openly and formally on record with a formal note supporting the Greek Cypriots and giving them assurances of being safeguarded in their efforts to vitiate the 1960 treaty which made possible the independence of Cyprus. This article also points out that most of the news media now consider that the Communists, through their allies, the Greek Cypriot parties, the Small Traders’ Union, the Democratic Union of Greek Women and the Pan-Cyprian Peace Committee, now control 40 percent of the Pan-Cyprian population.

You may remember that in a speech here on this House floor on February 5, 1964, I suggested that President Makarios was refusing to negotiate within the framework of NATO because all of the other interested parties had agreed to do so—in order to have support from the Soviet Union in the United Nations. The activities in the United Nations on Sunday would indicate that my supposition in this regard was true. The Cyprus fighting, it seems clear to me, underlines the bankruptcy of this country’s policy in the Middle East and the ineffectiveness of the United Nations today.

I would now emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the administration not removed the U.S.-NATO rockets from Turkey to the Russians. We have not dared try to get a base in the Mediterranean at Cyprus. It is noteworthy that, in the U.N. on last Sunday, the Soviet Union and its stooge, Czechoslovakia, abstained from the formal vote on the cease-fire resolution and news reports make clear that the Cypriot delegation was vigorously supported by these two Communist countries. It is very interesting that Greece did not support the Greek Cypriots in their effort to prevent the passage of the cease-fire resolution.

Nevertheless, the Cypriot delegation, along with vigorous support of these two Communist council members, was successful in stalling the vote for over 3 hours. This we know comes on the heels of the communiqué from Khrushchev to Turkey demanding a halt of military operation and announcement of the Turks. Turkey has thus been forced to try to defend the anti-Communist Turks living on the island only 40 miles off the Turkish coast.

The administration has us in this position. We are doing nothing about Cuba on our very doorstep where Soviet troops and weapons are poised, but we are fighting a hot war right up against China and much nearer to Russia—12,000 miles away from our shores in Vietnam. At the same time, Communists are whipping up racial disorders and riots within our own country, despite the admonitions of more responsible Negro leaders.

My question then is, quite frankly, this: Is President Johnson and the administration going to allow the Russians too, at long last, get into the Mediterranean at Cyprus? I am perfectly willing to hear the administration’s proposal, but I am suggesting that the administration not re-pass the administration not re-pass the Russia, to the United Nations?

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this time in the record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to authorize investigations and reports on the water resources and reclamation of the Colorado River Basin, and to protect existing economies in the course of development of such resources. This bill necessarily encompasses every known aspect of this field, and I should like to discuss for a