

areas in the United States under the impacted-area aid bill and where disasters have occurred where, if they can get the assurance of this legislation, then they can more adequately prepare their budgets. That is the only reason, that is, solely because it is necessary now.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an additional question?

Mr. POWELL. I will, sir.

Mr. HALL. I will certainly agree that rules are made for flexibility and this House needs that. If there is need of this legislation for school budgets in impacted or disaster areas, then this is a need that the House should certainly address itself to. However, in connection with the base closures, will this in any way affect the consideration of those bases included in the recent veto of the President of the military construction authorization bill for 1965—that is, those bases that are involved therein or other base closings contemplated by the Department of Defense, insofar as this impacted education aid is concerned?

Mr. POWELL. There were only six as of last November. I would like to read this memorandum to the gentleman:

ESTIMATED COST OF IMPLEMENTING SECTION 3 OF H.R. 9022 TO ELIMINATE INEQUITIES IN THE APPLICATION OF PUBLIC LAW 815 IN CERTAIN MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS

In testimony before the General Subcommittee on Education it was indicated that only six school districts were involved in school construction under Public Law 815 at the time of the base closing announcement of November 19, 1964. In one of the six school district situations the base closing announcement had no effect. The following is a brief analysis of each school district:

1. Nebraska—Lincoln Branch School District: The base closing will result in no schoolchildren connected with the military installation after 1968. Construction had already started and was allowed to be completed. Section 3 has no effect on this situation.

2. Truax Air Force Base, Wis.—Sun Prairie School District: A total of approximately \$85,465 to fulfill fund reservations to the school district made prior to the November 19 announcement and involving construction of an elementary school and the equipping of a high school.

3 and 4. Connally Air Force Base—Waco Connally Consolidated School Districts, Tex.: Approximately \$21,000 for each of two school districts.

5. Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont.—School district: Received a reduction of \$153,000 from an original reservation of \$295,000.

6. Amarillo School District, Tex.: Received a reduction of approximately \$15,000 as a result of the base closing announcement.

In summary, total estimated cost of section 3 derived from the above information is \$295,465.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and thank him for his explanation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support adoption of a rule needed for passage of H.R. 9022, another Federal aid to education bill. This measure has particular significance for New York City which stands to gain about \$9 million for its public schools. This assistance will come under the aid to federally impacted areas programs. It results from cutting the minimum percentage of children of Federal employees

in a school district necessary for the district to qualify for Federal aid. The program now requires that 6 percent of the student body be children of Federal workers. This bill would reduce the figure to 3 percent.

The new Federal aid which will be available when this legislation is enacted will be for public schools in New York City and will supplement the \$46 million a year provided in the aid to primary and secondary schools bill enacted earlier this year. Particularly impressive is the fact that this new sum would be added to the budget of the New York City public school system with no restrictions whatsoever.

The same bill cleared for floor action today by the House of Representatives gives aid to schools in areas directly affected by major disasters or by closing of military installations.

I am still convinced that we should also provide Federal assistance to school districts in the major urban centers, as such. This recommendation was contained in the report of the task force appointed by President-elect Kennedy in 1960—chaired by our new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner. I have introduced legislation designed to implement these recommendations, H.R. 5558, and I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move 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. 10586) making supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10586, with Mr. ULLMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot say, as I have without exception for so many years, that we are bringing you another unanimous report on a Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill. I am sure many Members are aware of the minority report and of the fact that the minority will offer a motion to recommit this bill to the committee.

Since the minority report refers hardly at all to the individual items that are carried in the bill, I assume they object to them in general rather than specifically. Therefore I will first simply summarize the requests and the action on them.

The requests considered by the committee totaled a little over \$1.5 billion. Most of this was \$1.3 billion for the first year of activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The only two other items involving significant amounts are the manpower development and training program for which a little over \$150 million was requested, and the authorized part of the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program for which \$44 million was requested. These three programs account for over 99 percent of the funds in the bill.

For all practical purposes the committee has made no cuts in these programs even though the report table shows a reduction of \$330 million. This is made up of three things: a relatively small reduction because the personnel involved in administering these programs was budgeted to be on the payrolls earlier than is now possible; \$1.2 million budgeted in excess of current authorization, and \$328,684,000 from the \$1,295,684 budgeted for elementary and secondary educational activities which was for the full amount authorized for the first year of the program.

The last mentioned cut was made in recognition of the fact that over 2 months of the fiscal year will be past before these funds can be in the hands of the people who will run the local programs, many programs will be delayed because of civil rights problems, there will be the usual delays because of unforeseen problems in getting a new program underway, and other factors probably of less importance.

However, since some school districts may be in position to use more than their pro rata share under this appropriation, the committee has included language in the bill, in connection with the basic part of the program, that allocations be made on the basis of the maximum authorization. Thus those schools that are in a position to use more than their pro rata share will receive it, and schools that are not in a position to use their pro rata share will result in savings to this appropriation.

The committee estimates that these two groups will balance each other and so the funds in the bill will be adequate, but as pointed out in the report, if more funds are required a supplemental appropriation to meet the additional need would be almost mandatory.

So, as I mentioned before, for all practical purposes we have approved the programs as presented.

Now I would like to take a little time to touch on the need and value of a few other programs that are sometimes overlooked because they do not involve hundreds of millions of dollars.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT

There is a real sense of urgency in speaking in support of the supplemental appropriation and, particularly, the section authorizing funds for the Older Americans Act of 1965.

After 4 years of frustrating delays, the enactment of this legislation established the organization and approved funds for a practical, positive program to achieve the goals for which the White House Conference on Aging was held in January 1961. The 600 recommendations of this meeting have been shelved for the lack of a responsible organization with sufficient staff and funds to carry out the mandate of more than 3,000 of the Nation's leaders in the field of aging who attended as delegates and consultants.

Few bills, within my recollection, in Congress have merited and been given the bipartisan support that the Older Americans Act has received. You will recall that it passed this House on March 31 of this year a vote of 394 to 1. It received a prompt and favorable vote in the Senate and was signed by the President June 14.

The budget for the Older Americans Act was carefully drawn to provide proper incentives to the States to be equitably distributed in recognition of the percentage of older persons within the State to be served and broad enough to make possible a practical, yet imaginative program for older Americans throughout the Nation.

The President defined the appropriations and grants in the bill as "seed corn." These amounts are small but well planted, will result in achievements far beyond the minimum outlay of the money authorized by the bill.

I do not see how, in good faith, we can deny these funds or postpone their availability when the need is so apparent and further delay so unnecessary.

We have only to observe the war on poverty to recognize the limitation of its scope as it applies to older Americans.

That a bill such as the Economic Opportunity Act could have been written without an awareness that the elderly are also poor is an oversight that an administration on aging could have corrected at the prepassage stage. Instead, efforts are now being made to stretch and extend the language of the law to include a program for the elderly.

That a special task force had to be named to explore possible projects for older persons is a task that the staff and advisory committee authorized under the Older Americans Act would have fulfilled as part of its regular function.

The implementation of the medicare program with all of its many ramifications for the aged extended far beyond the areas of hospital and health care.

The housing legislation offers new vistas for decent living arrangements for more of the elderly.

The Education Act creates new opportunities for continued learning in the later years.

The manpower and training programs include untapped possibilities for employment and income supplementation for the elderly.

These and many more examples could be cited of the vast area of service and programs that are presently in operation. However, even a casual review of the projects and achievements to date would reveal the conspicuous absence of aging in the planning and projection.

I cite these programs not in criticism but to illustrate the potentials for older persons that are not being developed or coordinated because there has not been an effective organization to serve as consultant and adviser in the field of aging.

Each day that we delay the funds necessary to establish and finance the organization authorized under the Older Americans Act finds the elderly further overlooked and denied his rightful opportunities.

I urge your support of the supplemental appropriation, knowing that it is in reality the fulfillment of the pledge we implied in our original vote of 394 to 1 for the Older Americans Act of 1965.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT

Now I wish to address my remarks for a few moments to the portion of the supplemental appropriations bill which deals with the establishment of a national technical institute for the deaf. As important as this entire bill is to the welfare and education of all the citizens we serve in this great Nation of ours, there is no portion more deserving of your attention than that which concerns the training of the deaf youth of our Nation for a chance to share in a better life.

Not since 1864, when Abraham Lincoln signed the charter for Gallaudet College, here in the Nation's Capital, has any other facility for postsecondary education been provided for this group of deserving citizens.

The need to establish a facility for the technical training and education for post-high-school deaf students has been well identified. Educators and administrators of educational programs for the deaf have through their various organizations almost unanimously documented this need. A national conference addressed to the problems of post-high-school training for deaf youth was held in October 1964 in Nashville, Tenn. This conference, which was attended by over a hundred educational leaders from all across the Nation, recommended that opportunities for the technical training of deaf youth be made available as soon as possible. It was stated that a lack of proper attention to this would lead to a greater reduction of employment opportunities for this group.

Every attempt has been made by educators of the deaf to accelerate the learning of reading, language, and communication skills by deaf children. For the most part, the objective in our schools has been to teach these tool skills well enough at the elementary and secondary levels so the deaf children could go on with their education or further vocational training in our colleges, universities, and

vocational training facilities for normally hearing students.

This goal, as reasonable and desirable as it is, has been achieved by a very small percent of this group. Our educators are now and should continue to be dedicated to the improvement of educational techniques so that more deaf students can achieve this goal. Teachers of deaf children have been convinced that this kind of preparation is the best way for the deaf child to become a full participant economically and socially in a hearing world. I would be the first to agree that the attempt to achieve this goal should be maintained. However, we are faced by the reality that was revealed in the report on the education of the deaf by the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, that for the general deaf population this is not being achieved.

To deny a substantial portion of this particularly deserving group of handicapped persons the opportunity for continuing education would be to foreclose the mortgage that our Nation holds as an investment in the manpower potential of these individuals.

Of approximately 3,000 deaf young adults above the age of 16 leaving or graduating from schools or classes for the deaf each year, little more than 200 are admitted to Gallaudet College. What happens to the rest of these young people when they have nowhere else to turn for further training? The only thing available for most is nonskilled labor or unemployment. Five-sixths of our deaf adults are already working in manual jobs as compared with one-half of the hearing population.

This facility as planned would be tailor made to meet the special needs of the individual student. The curriculum would include remedial academic, college enrichment, and communications courses, all designed to prepare the student to function better in a hearing world, by broadening his concepts of himself, and by giving him the skills to find his role as a useful, productive member of society.

The question was once raised on the floor of this House as to why this problem should be a concern of the Federal Government. My distinguished colleague, Mr. Hugh Carey from the great State of New York, pointed out that in view of the relatively small number of deaf children in the population of the Nation as a whole and in view of the fact that it would be difficult for each State to have a separate educational program that would be adequate, it seems obvious that this is an area which is most appropriate for Federal concern.

An amount of \$420,000 has been requested for fiscal year 1966 to plan for the establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be required to report to the Congress what progress had been accomplished at the end of the planning year.

We have authorized the Secretary of HEW in Public Law 89-36 to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the eventual establishment, construction, equipping, and

operation of this National Technical Institute for the Deaf. The major purpose in providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf would be to prepare them for successful employment.

The need for this Institute has been clearly identified in the reports of both the House and Senate committees which conducted hearings on the bill. It has been estimated that at least 200 students each year of some 400 who could qualify for further education would be able to profit by the special programs that would be offered in the National Technical Institute.

This Institute will be designed not only to provide the education and training for a total of some 600 deaf students, but to become a standard setter for technical training of deaf people everywhere and a source for special teachers, counselors, and other professional persons who need training to assist in the proper adjustment of deaf persons.

The establishment, by our action here today, of an additional institution of higher education to handle those deaf young people who are not able to profit from training that is offered in our regular college and university programs seems to me to be most commendable. I believe that this legislation is long overdue and rightfully deserves the support of the House.

HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE

Mr. Chairman, I could not close without making a few remarks about the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration's part in the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program.

The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke has placed great emphasis on making available to victims of these diseases the benefits of what we have learned so far as well as pushing out the horizons of hope for future generations. It is to this application of present knowledge that the VRA proposals have addressed themselves in striking fashion. To delay their implementation would be a serious disservice to the victims of these disorders.

Let us look at these proposals in detail. Under the research and demonstration activity, there would be 35 projects at a cost of \$2 million—all designed to improve rehabilitation techniques or validate some new methods. All the projects proposed would have direct implications for returning victims of these disabilities to work. What we must remember is that in all these proposals is the element of direct service to those most concerned; that is, the cardiac impaired, stroke victims, or those who have had cancer. According to best estimates, at least 2,000 sufferers from these diseases would receive improved rehabilitation services and the end result would be their return to gainful occupations. And this is in addition to the new knowledge and techniques which would become available for the rehabilitation of countless others in the near future.

There are modest requests in the area of training and traineeships—\$1.6 mil-

lion in all. This may well be too modest a request because the need is so great. It is a truism to say that services must be delivered by people, the best and most highly trained we can get. So the VRA proposes to accelerate its program in those areas most closely related to rehabilitating those with heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and in which shortages of skilled personnel are so severe.

A total of \$500,000 is asked for adding 217 skilled persons to directly deliver services—nurses, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech pathologists.

In addition VRA proposes to initiate an intensive program to train researchers specifically to concentrate on the areas of heart disease, cancer and stroke, and the rehabilitation methods and techniques they require. This should be looked upon as complementing the research and demonstration program alluded to above.

One of the most important aspects of the training program is short-term training. Here the emphasis is on applying what we know now, so as to give more and better service to those with heart disease, cancer, and stroke. The planned program of over 40 courses reaching over 1,700 practitioners of the various rehabilitation disciplines means immediate service to people—and this is what the President's Commission is calling for—immediate action. Speech therapists would learn the latest methods for dealing with aphasia in stroke cases or teaching esophageal speech to the victims of throat cancer. Physical therapists and occupational therapists would learn better techniques in stroke rehabilitation. Above all, State vocational rehabilitation personnel would learn better techniques in stroke rehabilitation. Above all, State vocational rehabilitation personnel would learn improved ways of returning victims of all three conditions to work, with consequent economic savings to the community. These are activities which cannot be delayed—and they cannot be done with present resources available to the VRA.

Last, but most importantly, there is the request for \$2.5 million for Research and Training Centers. These funds would go to the 10 outstanding medically oriented centers now being supported by VRA.

When the Commission made its report, it made reference to the comprehensive nature of the needs of those with heart disease, cancer and stroke and the rounded services that would have to be provided if they were to live in reasonable comfort and make a contribution to society. Nowhere is this comprehensive, all-inclusive service better illustrated than in the research and training center program of the VRA. While the program is centered primarily in the medical school, it is university-wide in scope because the medical aspect of disability is but one part of a complex problem. Here in these centers one has an integrated program of research, training and patient care—one enriching and

sustaining the other. At present the program is modest but at the same time impressive. The funds requested would go far in bringing to heart disease, cancer and stroke victims the best of modern know-how and skill.

Among other things, it would mean over 20,000 patient days of the best rehabilitation service available in the United States. Probably some 5,000 victims of heart disease, cancer and stroke would be helped, at least partially, along the road to independence and constructive community living in the form of work. For they would have the benefit of assistive devices to make work more feasible, development of tolerance for work, and, as important as anything else, the development of positive attitudes toward their own rehabilitation potential.

Surely we are interested spiritually and economically in rehabilitating the victims of heart disease, cancer and stroke. Miss Switzer, the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, in her appearance before our committee, stressed the fact that "much needs to be done to help State agencies increase their efforts to rehabilitate people in these categories" through the use of rehabilitation knowledge we already have. Since only about 6,000 persons in these categories were rehabilitated into employment last year, the need for improvement is obvious. The funds approved by the Committee for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration would probably result in at least a 50 percent improvement of this picture in the first year.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has very adequately explained the appropriations provisions of this first supplemental appropriation bill of 1966.

We on the minority side of the aisle have taken exception to the procedure which is being used here today as far as the House of Representatives is concerned. In particular, we take exception to the procedure used by the House Appropriations Committee in bringing to the floor of the House this first supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1966 without giving consideration to the other supplemental appropriations for nondefense items that will be requested by the President within a matter of days and without taking into consideration the increased needs of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, supported by every minority member of the Appropriations Committee, to offer a motion to recommit this bill to committee at the appropriate time.

The large-scale needs of a war situation are now upon us. To attempt to finance them by additional deficit financing without first bending every effort to tighten the Nation's belt in the non-defense spending area is to court an economic situation that will further erode

the value of the dollar, more deeply threaten the economic well-being of low- and middle-income citizens, and the economic health of the Nation.

There may well be reasons for cutting back or, for that matter, increasing the appropriations for specific items in this bill on their merits; but the overriding issue that is involved here has to do with the fact that this is one of several supplemental appropriations that will be requested for fiscal 1966.

I wish to make it crystal clear that the reason for this motion to recommit has nothing whatever to do with the substantive contents of this bill.

According to the announcements of the Speaker, this Congress will adjourn next month. The major portion of the funds in this bill were requested in April by the administration. To delay action a mere 3 weeks more by recommitting this bill to committee would do no harm to any program. On the contrary, it would do great good for the country by allowing the committee to evaluate all supplemental requests for fiscal 1966 appropriations at one time.

At another time, in another year, it may have been proper to consider a specific request for supplemental funds in an isolated fashion; but in those other times and in those other years, there was not the specter of vastly increasing needs for supplemental funds to carry on a war.

This year, this Congress cannot afford blindly to appropriate vast sums of money for domestic needs—no matter how desirable—unless or until this Congress has a far clearer idea than it does today of what we will be asked to appropriate for the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, in delaying these requests until all of the funding proposed by President Johnson is considered by this Congress in one package is most important if the Congress is going to fulfill its responsibility of keeping track and keeping control of the purse strings of this Government.

The President received a great deal of notice in January when he submitted a budget, and he set certain guidelines for that budget. The major guideline was that the expenditures in the fiscal year 1966 would not exceed \$100 billion. He received a great deal of public notice at that time from one end of this country to the other that he had performed an almost impossible task in keeping the total expenditures for fiscal year 1966 below \$100 billion.

If a \$100 billion expenditure limit was important 6 months ago, isn't such a limitation just as important if not more so today?

As our minority report indicates, the initial budget request of the President drastically underestimated the expenditure needs of our defense budget. One would expect that the great pains the President took to keep his budget below \$100 billion must have been taken for a very sound and worthwhile reason. He must have realized—as we in the minority have for so long—that a budget which broke through that ceiling would create an unhealthy climate for the economy of this country.

If the President, with all of the pressures that are upon him, finds himself compelled to reverse his earlier sound judgment, it is incumbent upon the Congress to take the responsibility upon itself of keeping the President's budget as closely within these guidelines as is humanly possible.

This cannot be done by piecemeal supplemental appropriations. Rather, it is necessary for the Congress to exercise its special responsibility in this session to review at one time all of the remaining supplemental budgetary requests that will be submitted for the year ending June 30, 1966.

I cannot stress too much how important the guidelines which the President set last January are to the economy of this country. Yet, you know what has happened in this 1st session of the 89th Congress. We had a request just a short time ago for \$700 million to finance the war in Vietnam. Almost all of those expenditures of necessity will take place in the fiscal year 1966 and then within the period of the last few weeks there was another request submitted in the amount of \$1.7 billion. The President, in submitting that request through the Secretary of Defense, stated that this would merely be a partial funding for the activities of our Government in Vietnam during this particular fiscal year.

Those of us who serve on the Defense Appropriations Committee know full well what the shopping list is as far as Vietnam is concerned. It is among other things, to replenish spare parts, replenish aircraft, helicopters, and pay the additional expense of the escalation of the war in Vietnam. We know that the military has a shopping list at this time that totals several billions of dollars.

It is especially necessary at this time that the Congress insist that an estimate be provided by the executive branch of how much its best judgment indicates it will need to prosecute the war in Vietnam during fiscal 1966.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an unreasonable request. Quite the contrary. The unreasonable request is that this Congress appropriate in the blind vast sums of additional money with no firm idea of how many more billions will be required for the war effort.

This is not a sound way to legislate. It is not a healthy way to appropriate. It can be said unequivocally that estimates are available of how many billions in additional funds need to be requested by this administration for the war effort.

Let this Congress have those estimates and we can proceed with a clear conscience about our business of determining what it would be reasonable to appropriate on the domestic level.

Without those estimates, we may proceed anyway.

But, if we do, and if we are forced to appropriate several billions of dollars next January for the war in Vietnam, this Congress will have launched this country once again on a stepped-up inflationary spiral that in this year and in these times we can ill afford.

As I have indicated, there are others in the Congress, in the other body—the

chairman of the Senate Preparedness Committee, for example—who estimate the costs will be from \$10 to \$12 billion. According to the shopping list available now for procurement, operation, and maintenance and for the other costs and the increases that are involved, we know we will have a supplemental request before this Congress in January to add to the 1966 budget, and I predict that supplemental requests to cover the costs will be in the neighborhood almost of another \$5 billion for the fiscal year 1966.

So we have the costs of this war that the President refers to as a war in southeast Asia, continuing to increase. We are financing it on an installment basis and every member of the Defense Appropriation Committee would have to agree with me on that particular point because they know full well that we are not financing all of the costs on a current basis as far as Vietnam is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, in view of all these facts—in view of the fact that we will have submitted to us for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare requests totaling in excess of \$3 billion within a matter of a few days; in view of the fact that this particular bill contains over \$1,200 million; and in view of the fact that another \$4 billion will be requested to finance other programs in future supplemental appropriation bills within the next 2 or 3 weeks—it would seem to me to be the better part of wisdom for the House of Representatives to return this first supplemental appropriation bill to the Committee on Appropriations so that all of the items still to be financed in fiscal year 1966 can be considered in one supplemental request.

Only in this way will the Congress realize what it is doing—and realize how much it is authorizing so far as appropriations are concerned—and only in this way will the Congress then be able to understand what the total costs of this budget for 1966 are.

We have already broken the imaginary budget ceiling of \$100 billion set in January. The question now is—How far do we go beyond this \$100 billion important guideline that the President established in January?

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

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to say to the gentleman that I agree with him completely in all that he has said on this matter. I would hope the House would recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations so that by orderly procedure and with real fiscal responsibility, we can take a look at all of the supplemental appropriations that we have coming before us during this year. I do not know how we can anticipate what our deficits are going to be until we do know all of the requests being made of us. It would seem to me, in the emergency that the gentleman referred to, the situation in Vietnam, and the increased costs of military hardware, that there must be some areas of low priority that can either be suspended or dispensed with, so that

we can have some semblance of an understanding of this budget and so that we may have the opportunity of knowing what our deficits are going to be and how much we are going to increase this great debt.

I should point out that during the period of time the present Secretary of Defense has been in office about \$216 billion has been expended in the Defense Department alone. I believe it is very important that we begin to take an overall look at these appropriations.

This is not a partisan matter. It is a matter with which we are all concerned, on both sides of the aisle, in the executive branch as well as the legislative. We are all concerned with fiscal responsibility and cutting down the large deficits we have experienced.

I would hope that the gentleman's motion to recommit will be approved and that all Members will support him in his effort. He is to be congratulated for the effort he is making today for sound fiscal policy.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

My colleagues in the House, we are in a war situation today. War calls for sacrifices, and it seems to me that this war in Vietnam is no exception. To postpone the sacrifices which must be made will only invite a terrible strain on the economy of this country.

The rising cost of living, the records being made almost on a daily basis, and the shrinking purchasing power of our dollar in large part are a result of the "business as usual" philosophy which we are trying to follow in this particular war period.

We must review the priority of various items which are still to be considered by this Congress, with an estimated \$7 billion still to be requested by the President of the United States by way of supplemental appropriation bills before this Congress adjourns. It seems to me that all of these things should be carefully considered at one time, so that we can truly know how much we are borrowing to pay the costs of Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman from Rhode Island's belief that no part of a budget figure is sacred. We felt that the President of the United States in the HEW appropriation bill which we passed here last week, had underfunded the programs for the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, and the various areas dealing with dread diseases, so far as research is concerned, because the President's budget did not allow for any increase in new research projects in heart, cancer, neurology, and other of those particular programs. So we reduced in some other areas and we increased these NIH programs so that they could move forward in accordance with the program which had been established by our subcommittee during the past 12 years, since the institutes were established.

So we do not believe that these estimates which are submitted by the President of the United States are necessarily figures we must accept at their face value. In the conference report which we unanimously approved here for the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we made many changes in the President's budget, in areas where we felt he had overfunded and in other vital areas where we felt he had underfunded.

This is what the Appropriations Committee should do. But this is what the Appropriations Committee must do on each and every supplemental request for 1966.

The \$100 billion guideline which was established by the President of the United States in January, when he submitted his budget request, is just as important on this 24th day of August as it was on the 24th day of January.

So I plead with my colleagues in the House of Representatives to give some consideration, not to the item-by-item approach in this supplemental bill, but to give consideration to resubmitting these items to the Committee on Appropriations, so that the entire supplemental request in the nature of some \$7 billion can be examined, not only by our committee, but the House of Representatives at one time.

In that way, proper priorities can be established and we can look at the total overall spending for fiscal year 1966 at one time, bearing in mind the increased worldwide commitments which our President has made and the funds for which I will support when they are asked for.

However, I think all of you must realize that to finance a war on the kind of installment approach we are using today is not being honest, fair, or forthright as far as the American people are concerned. They have the responsibility of paying these costs, but we have a responsibility for bringing the facts and information to them so that they understand full well what the costs are.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat it is incumbent upon the Congress to discharge its urgent responsibility of reexamining thoroughly those programs that have yet to be funded in this fiscal year.

Wherever possible, dollar amounts for nondefense programs should be cut back or eliminated. A hard decision must be made on programs which may in the short run be desirable but that in the long run can only contribute to the further deterioration of what is essential in time of war—a sound dollar and a sound economy.

In substantial degree, we are entering once again a period when a choice must be made between guns and butter, between absolutely vital war needs and some desirable domestic programs.

War calls for sacrifices.

This war is no exception.

To postpone the sacrifices can only invite a terrible strain on an already burdened economy. The rising costs of living and the shrinking purchasing power of the dollar in large part are the result of business as usual in recent years even without the added strains and stresses of the large-scale needs of the present war situation.

Now that those needs are upon us, it is up to the Congress to reevaluate non-defense items.

It is the Congress, after all, that is charged with the primary responsibility

of determining how large a Federal budget our economy can stand.

Let us not relinquish that responsibility.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

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

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, the need for training people so that they can find and hold jobs, that they may become useful citizens and uphold the family structure of this country is a basic need.

To characterize programs which will provide this training, as "business as usual" is to be deaf, dumb, and blind to reality and a basic lack of understanding of the problems of the minority groups and older worker population and I say this "head in the sand" philosophy of those who want to recommit this bill is about "par for the course" for those who are not living in the 20th century.

It is utterly "realistic" for this Congress to be concerned for the welfare of its own people and at the same time to be helpful to others.

We must fight domestic enemies as well as our foreign enemies and we must afford to do both because a failure to do so will result in our own ultimate destruction.

There is nothing magical about a \$100 billion budget ceiling if the economy and our needs demand more. The history of this Nation is one of its citizens being willing to make sacrifices of their dollars, their talents and if need be their lives against any enemies—whether they be foreign or domestic—whether it be a threat to their health or to poverty—and to do this willingly.

It has been said that war demands sacrifices—so, too, does the danger and realities of poverty and of threats to our health.

Every indication we have is one of continuing improvement in our economy—employment is up and unemployment is down; corporate profits are at an all-time high; capital spending is accelerating. Much of this is due to tax reductions and resultant increases in consumer purchasing power. This is not a record of a "reckless and spending Congress." It is a record of a wise and prudent Congress.

It is not a question of whether we can afford to meet both our foreign and domestic needs—we cannot afford not to and remain a strong and healthy democracy.

The appropriation committees have made a careful and thoughtful examination of all programs for which legislation has been enacted by Congress and so too has the legislative committee been equally diligent in recommending the enactment of new legislation.

I submit that both have made hard decisions and have not taken any action which would even remotely result in any deterioration of a sound dollar or a sound economy. The record demonstrably reads otherwise—our current economic well-being, for most of us, attests to this.

To infer or to say that programs designed to find jobs for people, to improve

the health of people, and to save the lives of people are "butter" is sheer nonsense and an inability to grasp the facts of life.

The minority members of the Committee on Appropriations are using the old saw of the "sound dollar and sound economy" to cover their typical shortsighted thinking. They are suggesting that the supplemental appropriations bill of the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare be recommitted. Their theme is that the Vietnam situation calls for a choice between guns and butter. I maintain that they are incapable of recognizing the difference between guns and butter and their suggestion is a good example of fiscal myopia designed to weaken this country's defense efforts.

The minority claims that our current and future expenditures for Vietnam call for an immediate reduction in public services. They are wrong in thinking of this as a question of separate alternatives—an either-or issue. They fail to understand that the services in the supplemental bill are the very ingredients which give this country its moral and physical strength. They give our people their iron spirit, their love of country. Our citizens recognize that the services are provided so that every person will be given the opportunity to reach his fullest potential. These services are testimony to the respect we have for each individual in our society.

The minority is not only wrong in basing its arguments on alternatives, but it is also guilty of offering up a weak strawman of our Nation facing impending doom because of "an already burdened economy." The minority Members cannot be serious in calling for a reduction in providing for human needs at a time when our economy is demonstrating its vigor by achieving a gross national product of \$666 billion. The minority cannot be serious in recommending postponement of needed services to a Nation committed to spending \$30 billion to put a man on the moon.

This supplemental bill contains the appropriations for manpower and development and training activities. Does the minority suggest that this country, during the Vietnam crisis, reduce manpower training? Do they not know that the Communist nations outnumber us? If we are to compete with Communists we must make the fullest use of our human resources. This means that we must make sure that every worker who can make a contribution to our economy and defense effort is given skills and training to his fullest capacity. A well-trained labor force is one of the most important weapons in modern war. The recommendations of the minority Members to recommit the supplemental appropriations would delay training and reduce the level of training under the Manpower Act. I suggest such an action would be worse than shortsighted, it would be downright irresponsible.

About two-thirds of the \$155 million supplemental budget for the Manpower Act is needed by the Federal Government just to pay for the matching funds which were the States' obligations under the original act. The House amended the act only 4 months ago to postpone State

matching and indicated at that time that the Federal Government would pick up these costs. Now, the minority asks us to renege on this promise. If these funds are not made available the number of trainees will have to be reduced.

Do we want to tell the unemployed workers that they will be denied the opportunity for training because the House of Representatives of the United States does not keep its word?

Shall we tell the men overseas that they will not get their guns because Congress has decided that their needs are not essential?

Who among you wants to go back to your constituents with this story?

Those who call for recommitment of the supplemental appropriations bill are being less than fair to the Americans who are now fighting for us. To throw back the very phrase of the minority members, "a prudent evaluation of the domestic needs of this country" does call for passage of the supplemental bill.

Training under the Manpower Act can help military men make the difficult adjustment to civilian life. The research program of the Manpower Act has shown us that the men who are now retiring from military service are having a difficult time in finding jobs. Six months after retirement, 21 percent of the enlisted men and 17 percent of the officers were still actively seeking work. The retirees have called for the opportunity to get into retraining programs. Many of the soldiers in Vietnam today will some day be retiring from the services.

Does this House wish to say to the fighting man in Vietnam that we will provide you with skills for war but we are unwilling to give you training and education for civilian life? Are we willing to go on record as being more concerned with false economy than with human needs?

The supplemental appropriations also call for some expansion in on-the-job training. This program has proved to be an efficient and inexpensive method of providing unemployed workers with new skills so that they can again become productive members of society. Both the House and Senate reports on the Manpower Act urged that this type of training be enlarged. An increasing number of our business leaders and community organizations such as the Urban League have recognized the practical value of a program that provides training on the site under actual working conditions.

A denial of the supplemental funds would mean that we are willing to disregard the recommendations of our own colleagues who have carefully evaluated the program and concluded that on-the-job training is one of the most promising instruments for helping the unemployed get realistic work experience.

The Manpower Act has already proved itself in the 3 years of its existence. The half-million workers and their dependents who have benefited or who are about to benefit from the training programs will testify to the wisdom of this legislation.

I believe we are making a mistake to

continue to treat the Manpower Act as a small pilot program. I am convinced that if we had made the commitment last year to support a training and retraining program large enough to take in many more of our citizens who have been bypassed by our society we never would have had the Los Angeles tragedy.

The choice is clear. The supplemental appropriations bill must be passed. We must keep our word as responsible legislators by backing our amending action. We must show the American military men who served us so gallantly in the past and who are protecting us today in Vietnam that this country is concerned with their welfare when they are fighting and that this country is concerned with their welfare when they return to their families.

Let us demonstrate our integrity by voting for this appropriations bill now.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests at this time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not take this time for the purpose of opposing this bill but for the purpose of supporting the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin to recommit the bill at the proper time to the Committee on Appropriations. Normally, when we recommit bills to committees we do it with the purpose either of killing the bill or, when such motions are coupled with instructions, for the purpose of amending or changing it.

The sole purpose of the motion to recommit this bill today is to send it back to the Committee on Appropriations to be held there and be rereported after that committee can give consideration to other supplemental requests which are down in the Bureau of the Budget today and which will be sent up to Capitol Hill shortly and which will have to be considered before this Congress adjourns.

We have just completed this morning in the Subcommittee on Independent Offices a hearing on one supplemental request for \$140 million to provide funds to be used in fiscal year 1966 to finance further research and development in connection with the supersonic transport.

We are not reporting that bill because we are expecting other supplemental requests to be transmitted to our subcommittee. We are holding up the reporting of the bill on the supersonic transport until we can wrap all of the requests up into one yearend supplemental bill.

I understand that the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, the chairman of the subcommittee, does not wish to handle this bill that way. There is simply an honest difference of opinion. I certainly am not here trying to tell him how to run his committee. I recognize the fact that the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations do not control the committee. All we are doing here today is pointing out to the Members of this Committee of the Whole reasons which seem to us to be compelling that this bill should be returned to the committee, to be held there until we consider all of the supplementals at one time

and know how big a deficit we are facing next year.

I can understand why the administration would not want to send all these supplementals up at one time. Frankly, my judgment is that they are afraid that it would be too much of a shock to the Committee on Appropriations and too much of a shock to the country to be told, in the closing days of this Congress, that we have got to appropriate \$8 or \$10 additional billions to finance the Government for 1966, in addition to the funds requested in the regular budget submitted to Congress just a few months ago and with which we have been laboring throughout this session.

So I can understand why the executive branch of the Government would want to handle these supplementals in piecemeal fashion, but for the life of me I cannot understand why Congress, which is the last line of defense against Executive spending should be willing to accept that as standard or approved procedure.

The distinguished chairman of our Committee on Appropriations was quoted in the press over the weekend as having stated that the President of the United States is going around turning off light bulbs in order to save money, but Congress is following in his footsteps and putting in bulbs with high wattage and turning them back on. So far as I am concerned, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I do not want to be put in that category.

Frankly, I am a little proud of the fact that during my service on the House Committee on Appropriations, that committee has reduced budget requests, submitted by four Presidents of the United States, in an amount in excess of \$40 billion. Those cuts did not all stand up because the House exercised its judgment and increased some of the bills, and we have another body which frequently increases appropriations made in this body.

But if the Congress had accepted the recommendations of the House Committee on Appropriations during the last 12 years we would have saved the taxpayers more than \$40 billion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating the abandonment of any of the programs covered in this bill. The House Committee on Appropriations does not have the jurisdiction to kill programs authorized by Congress. But we do have the responsibility, and we should not shirk it, of considering all of the supplemental appropriations at one time so as to be able to report to the House what the impact of these supplemental requests will be upon the overall budget and upon the deficit which is going to be accumulated during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, it may surprise Members when I advise that there has already been signed into law by the President of the United States this year, after having first been authorized and approved by this body and the other body, bills calling for increased or new spending authorizations amounting to \$57 billion, and that does not even include those that have been approved in recent days by this body and by the other body calling for additional authorizations. We approved

one last week. We have the higher education bill coming up and we have the other bill mentioned by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor today as well as additional bills that have not even come to the floor yet which will call for substantially higher authorizations. But I am referring now to the bills that have already become law which will require spending in the immediate future, and when you add them up they total \$57.8 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I referred earlier to the \$140 million request for supplemental funds for the supersonic transport. Let me show you how these requests mushroom and how they expand. The total cost of that program is estimated to be \$1.5 billion. There is a possibility that it might even go above \$2 billion. So when you are considering a 1-year incremental appropriation, I believe the Appropriations Committee ought to consider the overall cost, and I would respectfully urge my colleagues today to vote in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] to return this bill to the Committee on Appropriations, not for the purpose of killing it, not for the purpose of directing that any changes be made in the bill, but as a request to the Appropriations Committee to hold this bill until we have in our hands the other supplemental bills that are now in preparation. They are on their way to the Congress. This should be done in order that we can bring you at one time in the closing days of this Congress a supplemental bill which will include all of these new requests so that you will be able to determine whether we are not a little bit too ambitious, whether we are not imposing too great a burden upon the economy, whether we are not encouraging too much red ink on our books at the end of the current fiscal year, and whether we ought not to make some changes and some reductions along the line so as to hold spending within reasonable limits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. JONAS. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. The able gentleman from North Carolina, a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, has participated, along with the rest of us in the House, in making reductions in appropriation bills thus far and I believe the gentleman himself pointed out in the House not long ago the fact that the administration budget requests for appropriations have been reduced thus far in appropriation bills passed by the House by about \$1.9 billion, not counting the pending bill, of course.

We are all aware of the fact—we have all been on notice since January—that the overall appropriation or new obligatory authority budget for the current fiscal year 1966 is about \$106 billion; so we do have, we have had before us the general overall figure of \$106 billion,

which is the general dimensions of what we have had as a guide to the administration's program.

Mr. JONAS. May I interrupt to say that I accept that as fact. But the gentleman is referring now to regular appropriation bills to run the various departments and agencies of the Government. My comment today is directed only to the supplemental, and my only point is I do not think we ought to consider these supplementals piecemeal; that we ought to have them all before us so that we can see what the total is that we are considering, in addition to the regular appropriations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has made reference to certain reductions which have been made in the total of the appropriation bills thus far enacted by the Congress. I would like to take some credit for some of these reductions, but I do not believe that the credit can be accepted.

Take, for instance, this bill. This bill shows a saving of \$295 million under the amount the President requested for the basic part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The gentleman from Texas knows full well what kind of savings that is. There is contract authority written into this bill so that the expenditures are not affected by one dollar, because of the broad type of contract language which is written into this bill.

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

Mr. LAIRD. I would be most happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think my friend from Wisconsin will agree that much if not most of the cuts included in the \$1.9 billion, which is a reduction in the budget on regular and supplemental appropriations for this year approved by the House, have been bona fide reductions. I do not have precise figures before me.

Mr. LAIRD. I do not like to argue with the gentleman from Texas, but I would like to point this out: Take, for instance, in the area of welfare aid to States, we show a reduction of \$242 million. I would like to take credit for this reduction, but the distinguished gentleman from Texas knows full well these ADC payments and aid to the blind, old-age assistance, and so forth, will have to be made regardless of this action. Instead of actually being a bona fide reduction, we are going to have another supplemental in the near future for some hundreds of millions of dollars in this very area, partly to restore the reductions which were earlier made in this aid to States.

With all humility, may I say that we cannot contend that this Congress has reduced expenditures as far as the President is concerned. The gentleman from Texas just last week made a very good statement when he said that the Congress was running wild as far as authorizations of expenditures and appropriations are concerned. I would like to stand on the statement that the gentleman from Texas made last week in which he pointed out item by item where in-

creases have been made by the Congress in authorizations.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle has voted for these appropriation bills. Perhaps half the appropriation bills of the session have been adopted by record votes in the House, and I think there was relatively little opposition to any of them on final passage.

The record will also show that many of the reductions that have been made in the budget requests for appropriations are in no sense paper savings. They represent bona fide reductions. There are some areas where there can be disagreement as to whether a long-range saving is actually made by the cut; I agree there are some areas that come into this category. There are a handful of these in virtually every session, and regardless of party. But, on the whole, the major portion of the \$1.9 billion is a real genuine savings in appropriations.

It is true that last week I said that in authorization bills, as distinct from appropriation bills, we have gone far beyond the President's request in several instances. But this does not apply to appropriations. I might say that, in the final analysis, it is up to the Congress through its appropriation process to determine how much of an authorized program shall be funded for a given year. I merely pointed out that we have not been as economy minded as the executive has been in dealing with certain authorization bills.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, that when the Defense Department appropriation bill was up here on the floor of the House for consideration, it was pointed out at that time that additional funds would be needed to finance the cost of the war in Vietnam, just in order to replace stocks, bombs, ammunition, aircraft, and other items of equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, at that particular time the gentleman from Texas pulled out a letter from the Secretary of Defense which is in the Record of the day the bill was up for consideration. The Secretary of Defense wrote the chairman of our committee a letter and said—"the fiscal year 1966 defense budget request now before the Congress would provide all the funds we need at this time to continue the strengthening of our overall military posture and to carry out whatever combat operations our forces are called upon to perform during the next 12 months."

The ink had hardly dried on that particular typewritten letter signed by the Secretary of Defense when we were faced with another request for \$1,700 million. The chairman of our committee knows

full well this is only a meager beginning of the total costs that will be involved and that we will have to face up to in January and during the 2d session of the 89th Congress as far as supplemental appropriations are concerned.

I will support that funding for the war effort in Vietnam, as will the gentleman from Texas, but in my statement today I have tried to point out why this makes it absolutely necessary that we know in what direction we are going.

We have broken this great guideline that was established by the Great Society in January—that you cannot go above \$100 billion in expenditures or else the value of our dollar and our cost of living will be affected. I remember well those statements. I sympathized with the President then and I want to support him today in bringing that about.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Of course, liberty, freedom, and security are worth what they cost. As the chain of events emerges in this very complex world, additional funds are required from time to time for defense. I know of no one who denies that large additional funds will be necessary to fight this war in South Vietnam. But that is not something that we can control today by an appropriation bill. We have to provide the necessary funds to protect our national interest.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that we here in the Congress are the only ones who can control it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], a member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I certainly want to subscribe to the views expressed by our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] also brought out a good point when he said the administration was reluctant to send up all these supplemental appropriations in one block, because it would make such a tremendous impact because of the magnitude of the total figure of the supplemental appropriations that will be considered for this coming fiscal year.

Of course, the President has been basking in the sunshine of being a great economizer, with less than a \$100 billion budget being presented to the Congress. Just the other day the President got some more good publicity on the front page of our local paper relative to buying cheaper pens to sign bills into law, because he is using so many to give away as souvenirs. I saw another news item to the effect that he has 25 fewer employees than President Kennedy had. Well, this is just a matter of transition—the Kennedy clan leaving, and the Johnson wranglers moving in.

The President can parade as a great economizer in submission of a sacrosanct \$100 billion budget and then come up with supplementals totaling \$6 or \$7 or \$8 billion, and very little mention is made of it.

This puts the President in a good light and pictures the Congress as the free-wheeling spenders. Without these supplementals the President would have to come up with a budget of \$110 or \$115 billion next January. Within the span of 1 year, it could be shown that his administration has increased the cost of Government by 10 or 15 percent.

I share the concern expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and those who made the point of the gravity of the situation in Vietnam and what is required there. We should be going a little slow on domestic welfare spending.

Let me make a point with respect to the education item of this appropriation supplemental.

In our local paper there was the headline item: "School Board Urged To Plan Big Under Federal Funds Act." The article states:

Roland Sanders, whose appointment as the Peoria public schools new coordinator of reimbursable claims was approved last night, has just returned from a briefing on the new Federal legislation at the University of Illinois.

Sanders showed the board a film on what the act hopes to accomplish in upgrading education for economically disadvantaged pupils, and how school boards may seek new funds to aid them in developing such programs.

Of five titles under which the act will be administered, title I has the widest range of application and the bulk of the funds, an estimated \$1 billion the first year. Congress has yet to pass the appropriation.

That is what we are doing, today, in this supplemental.

The article continues:

Sanders used the "plan big" in a list of items which educators should consider when preparing a proposal or application for the new Federal funds. He said it was found people too often planned "for a little less than they need; they should plan bigger."

The article also says:

Dr. Mark W. Bills, superintendent of Peoria District 150 schools, said after the presentation that he felt "for the first time we will directly try to delineate educational needs based on economic needs."

Dr. Bills said he considered this a "new concept" in education. He said the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was a "bonanza opened up for both good and spurious material."

Of course, we do supposedly show a paper cut in these figures in the education area, but, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] pointed out, it is strictly a paper one.

My own view is, frankly, if we appropriated only half the figure requested for the remainder of this fiscal year that would be more than enough to implement the provisions of the Federal Aid to Education Act, for primary and secondary schools, which I did not support when it was authorized. Nonetheless, having been authorized, we on the Appropriations Committee do have an obligation to fund some of these programs

the Congress enacts by way of authorization legislation.

Personally, I hope the members will see fit to join in our appeal to recommit this measure, so that we can consider all of these supplementals in one lump sum and alert the American people to what the true costs of these programs in total are currently and what they are expected to be in the next year ahead.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the motion on this side of the aisle to recommit the bill. I hope that if it is recommitted, the Appropriations Committee will see fit to call before it representatives of the Ways and Means Committee, in order to endeavor to compute what will be necessary in regard to increasing the debt ceiling if these supplemental appropriations—this is one of them, but there are others coming along—are to be enacted by the Congress.

The figure on anticipated revenues has not yet been changed, though probably it has lessened a bit. According to the budget message for fiscal year 1966, which is a document often referred to but seldom looked at, I regret to say, in these debates, the revenues are going to be \$94.4 billion.

What we are discussing here does not have anything to do with expenditures for fiscal year 1966 as far as the actual, immediate situation is concerned. It has to do with expenditures in the long run, but the expenditure levels are solely within the power of the President. He has stated on page 43 of his budget message that he is going to spend \$99.7 billion out of the \$106.4 billion he has requested and which the Congress has granted almost all of this year, added to a carryover balance of \$96.7 billion. In other words, the Congress has given the President a pool of expenditure authority amounting to over \$200 billion. The House has nothing to say any more about how much of that \$200 billion the President is going to spend in fiscal year 1966.

The President alone said, "I will spend only \$99.7 billion." It is true if you continue to pass more authority to spend and add it to this pool of \$200 billion—plus, then he can and he probably will have to go beyond the \$99.7 billion figure which he gave us. However, the Committee on Ways and Means will certainly know it because we granted an additional increase in the debt ceiling to about \$328 billion because we know that we are going to raise only \$94.4 billion in tax revenues. The difference between that and the \$99.7 billion has to come from marketing additional Federal bonds.

Now, this is a pretty tough question. I asked the Secretary of the Treasury at the time of the debt ceiling legislation whether or not the administration had revised the \$99.7 billion expenditure figure in the light of the war in South Vietnam. He said, "No." I asked how about this \$700 million additional authority to spend which the House and the Congress granted and he said, "Well, we have been able to fit that into our present requests of \$106 billion new obligational authority.

I said, "Even though the foreign situation is as it is, do you still adhere to that?"

The Secretary of the Treasury and Director of the Budget said, "Yes," to that question.

The point is though that evidently there has been a revision in this expenditure level. We do not know how much of this additional request for authority to spend will result in actual increased expenditures for fiscal year 1966, but I do know this: The President cannot spend any more than \$98.7 billion, and not even the \$99.7 billion without getting a further increase in the debt ceiling. The reason is he asked for \$329 billion in the debt ceiling and we gave him only \$328 billion on the assumption that he could cut his expenditures for this fiscal year by \$1 billion to \$98.7 billion. I know he cannot spend any more than that without coming back to Congress and asking for an increase in the debt ceiling.

As I was saying when we had the interest equalization bill on the floor for debate, in an attempt to cut down on our foreign private investments abroad, we have a real problem here. If we continue to increase the amount of bonds extant, tied in as they are with our monetary system, our Federal Reserve System, we are monetizing the debt to a degree. In these particular times I am satisfied most of the additional debt will be monetization or, to put it in more common terms, inflation, will occur or, as our people back home understand it, their cost of living will be increased. This also has a direct bearing on a very serious problem which affects the security of the United States, our international balance of payments and the gold flow.

And we are familiar with that. Here is a chance for the House at any rate to try to bring together these areas that affect our fiscal situation which have been proliferated into two committees at least—really three—the Appropriations Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Banking and Currency Committee—to at least bring the Ways and Means Committee together with the Appropriations Committee so that we can consider what is going to be done if Congress does increase the authority to spend and the President has to increase his expenditures. What effect is this going to have on inflation and our balance of payments? How are we going to market these bonds?

This is why I would like to see this bill particularly before us recommitted at this time so that we can evaluate these fiscal matters that so vitally affect the future of this country. The time is going to come when the real President Johnson is going to have to stand up, as I have said before. Is it the President Johnson who is continuing to ask for more authority to spend on the theory, of course, that he will spend it and these carryover balances will not continue to increase, or is it the President Johnson who, up to this time, has actually not been spending the money? He has actually been living within the \$98 billion expenditure level for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. As the gentleman from Missouri has so adequately forecast here, if we make these same commitments with respect to what we have before us today, we destroy the elasticity and the maneuverability that we are going to have to have in financing the actual war obligations.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly we are. We have got to make the choice. As I said earlier, this is what this administration has to do, what the Labor Government in Britain did when it realized that the pound was in trouble—withdraw its budget, resubmit an austere budget that reflects the problems of the times.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the minority members of the committee have filed a minority report and have stated that a motion to recommit this bill will be offered.

The minority views, as set forth in the report, do not take exception to the substance of a single item in this bill. Nor do they have any quarrel with the amounts allowed by the committee for each of these activities. The reason given for wishing to defer action is that the minority members believe that the committee should review all remaining supplementary budgetary requests at one time.

The minority members are very candid in stating their purpose in suggesting this all-at-one-time procedure—and I appreciate their candor. They do not merely want to have these appropriation requests reviewed—they want them slashed.

They want the appropriations slashed not because they oppose the programs for which the funds will be provided but because they fear that this great country cannot afford them.

The minority report draws attention to recent developments in southeast Asia and to our increased activities in Vietnam. Then it comes to the amazing conclusion that all sorts of important domestic programs will have to be abandoned because, the report says, we are entering—and I am quoting—"a period when a choice must be made between guns and butter."

If such a choice really had to be made, no patriotic American would hesitate to make it. But let us not confuse patriotism with panic.

Do the authors of this minority report really believe that the time has come when we must choose between guns and butter?

Do they really believe that this great country of nearly 200 million people, with its vast resources and the world's most advanced industrial and technological know-how cannot honor its military commitment in Vietnam without putting important domestic programs into cold storage?

Do they really believe that our economy is so shaky, that our economic strength, which is the envy of the entire world, is so superficial, that we cannot help others to resist aggression without denying help to our own people in such

vital activities as education, manpower development, and the fight against disease?

The minority report claims that "business as usual in the nondefense spending area is not in the best interest of the Nation"; that we should put off "the implementation of marginal or not absolutely necessary welfare programs"; that we must "tighten the Nation's belt"; that the appropriations proposed will "more deeply threaten the economic well-being of low- and middle-income citizens and the economic health of our Nation"; and that "hard decisions must be made on programs which may in the short run be desirable."

Let us look at this bill in the light of these claims.

Of the \$1,223 million included in the bill, \$1,016 million—or 83 percent—is for strengthening elementary and secondary education. Most of this money will be used to meet the special educational needs of children from low-income families. This program instead of threatening the economic well-being of low-income citizens is specifically designed to benefit the low-income citizens. It is aimed at helping the children of low-income citizens to overcome their handicaps so that they will not become the low-income citizens of the future. The biggest single cause of poverty is lack of education. This educational program is a vital part of our war on poverty.

There is nothing marginal about this program. The war on poverty in the United States is no less important than the war on Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Poverty is not only an evil that must be eradicated from the American scene but it breeds other evils.

Let us not forget that less than 2 weeks ago this country suffered more casualties in a 3-day period in Los Angeles than it did in Vietnam. The enemy that inflicted those casualties was poverty and lack of opportunity.

The authorizing legislation for this educational program was passed by the House with a majority of 100. The Senate passed it with a vote of 73 to 18. It obviously has widespread public support. The President declared, when he signed the bill, that "no law I have signed or will ever sign means more to the future of America."

Are we now going to tell the American people that the future of America must wait—that this important and long overdue program is merely a "not absolutely necessary domestic welfare program" that we can coldly set aside?

The bill provides nearly \$155 million for the expansion and liberalization of the manpower development and training program. This represents another aspect of the program enacted by the Congress this year to make it possible for all our people to find a useful place in our modern complex society. It is another vital element in the war on poverty. Are we also going to write this off as "marginal"?

These two programs for education and training—which together account for over 95 percent of the funds provided by this bill—are not programs that "may in the short run be desirable but that in

the long run can only contribute to the further deterioration of a sound economy," as the minority report would have us believe. These are programs that in the long run will play a major role in strengthening the economic health of this country.

The third major segment of this bill—though it accounts for less than 4 percent of the total funds—will launch a major attack on the three groups of diseases that are now responsible for 70 percent of the deaths in this country. This is a new program, developed on the recommendation of a distinguished Commission appointed by the President early last year, and can in no sense be described as "business as usual."

I do not know what it will do to the economic health of this country. But this is not a question which the American public is likely to ask. The purpose of the program, on which this appropriation will make a small start, is to reduce drastically the number of deaths from heart disease, cancer, and stroke. I suppose that a program designed to save lives from these dread diseases can be described as not absolutely necessary, but I wonder if there is anyone in this Chamber who would like to go on record as considering it of marginal importance and, therefore, to be set aside as a useful economy.

I am not unconcerned about the economic health of our Nation but, when I think of health—and I think of it constantly—I think first of the health of my fellow citizens.

Part of the supplemental appropriation will make it possible to expand the screening program for the early detection of cancer of the cervix so that 1,250,000 women can be examined each year instead of 250,000 as at present. Cancer of the cervix is curable if caught in time. Is this the sort of thing the authors of the minority report would like us to put off until the situation in Vietnam calms down? The death toll from uterine cancer is 14,000 women each year. If early detection were the rule rather than the exception, this number could immediately be sharply reduced.

Other portions of the appropriation will be used for grants to assist the States in the mobilization of community health resources, training programs both for medical specialists and for technicians and supporting health personnel, and the development of better methods for communicating new diagnostic and treatment procedures to practitioners who are hard to reach, because they work in remote areas or have no hospital affiliation. These activities will make major contributions to combating the rising death rate from heart disease, cancer, and stroke. I sincerely believe that nothing short of a major national disaster should deter us from pressing forward as rapidly as possible with a program that so vitally and directly concerns every man and woman in this country.

While only a relatively small sum is involved, I do not want to overlook the first appropriation for the administration on aging which is included in this bill. The Older Americans Act passed

this House by a vote of 394 to 1 and was passed unanimously by the Senate. It would, indeed, be a hard decision for our senior citizens if we now decided to withhold the modest appropriation authorized for this new program.

The programs for which this bill makes appropriations are not "business as usual" but represent important new developments in education, health, and social welfare for most of which this Congress has passed the authorizing legislation with overwhelming majorities. The decision that these are not marginal programs has, in effect, already been taken. If we now deny the appropriations which will make it possible to implement these programs, we shall not be "tightening the Nation's belt"—we shall be drawing a noose around the neck of important new activities that hold great promise for the future welfare and happiness of all our people. Most of these programs will also clearly and substantially strengthen our economy—though I prefer to think of that not as their primary aim but as a welcome and important incidental benefit.

I am prepared to support reasonable and realistic appropriations for education and for health because I think that we have a solemn obligation to provide for our people the best we can offer in education and in health care. Both are essential to the preservation of a strong America.

To recommit this bill for later passage will only serve to delay the implementation of these important new programs. To recommit it so that its provisions may be cut, would be a serious disservice to the American people.

I strongly urge that a motion to recommit be defeated.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in bringing up this bill today I call attention of the membership to the historic action which was taken on April 11, 1965, when the President signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Just 2 days prior to this action by the President, the Senate passed this legislation by a vote of 73 to 18 after this House had earlier passed the bill by a vote of 263 to 153.

The President has said that "the first work of these times and the first work of our society is education." We are about to vote on a bill which makes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a reality. This act has stirred the American people and created anticipations for the improvement of education which are about to be fulfilled. Our action today in voting for the funds for this program will reinforce the determination of the Congress earlier this year to overcome deficiencies in the education of our children, particularly those who are caught up in the vicious cycle of poverty and educational deprivation. The time is running out for the appropriation of these funds so that they can be used effectively in the school year which is about to begin. Therefore, I am pleased to recommend your favorable action in voting on this bill today.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CHILDREN OF
LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The sum of money involved is \$967 million for the five titles of the act. This

sum is a significant sum both in and of itself and when looked at in terms of the past appropriations in behalf of education by the Congress, but it is a modest and conservative amount when viewed in the light of the problems it is intended to solve. For example, title I of the act is designed to meet the pressing educational needs of 5½ million children of school age who live in areas of concentration of low-income families. If we have serious intentions of improving the condition under which these poverty-ridden children are educated, we must not shrink from the price tag of creating the conditions for such improvement. This bill today provides a beginning, but only a beginning, in the solution of a major problem facing our society. Only as we attack the problem of poverty in terms of educating and training the young will we begin to relieve some of the pressures of frustration and ignorance which now plague us in our efforts to deal with the underprivileged segment of our society.

I am distressed by the proposed action of the minority of our committee to recommit the bill. Such action led by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin would be a cruel denial of the needs of children who are not only receiving a poor education but in many cases are arriving at schoolhouses hungry and in tatters and physically unprepared to receive the diluted education that is there awaiting them. Hundreds of thousands of children will appear in a few days to resume their education in ramshackle, dilapidated buildings that are unfit for human habitation much less productive education. It is for the members of the minority that have proposed this delaying action to answer the parents, the teachers, and the children who await the improvements in educational opportunity which we have offered them in a bill passed by this Congress only weeks ago. Perhaps the minority can tell these children why their educational aspirations must be rejected, but I cannot.

As former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Samuel Brownell, and now superintendent of schools in Detroit wrote the Office of Education last week:

If Members of Congress and of the Office of Education could sit in meetings I have with parents, they would be aware not only of the need for the funds but also for speed in making them available. Parents want their children to receive improved education this year, not next year or the year after.

The Office of Education has advised me of their continuing efforts to initiate the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with all possible and effective speed. Immediately following the signing of the act by the President the Office sponsored a series of meetings throughout the country in which thousands of educators were told to begin immediately to plan their programs for the coming school year. Since that time materials have been distributed to the States giving guidance and information about the programs and encouraging the States and localities to plan projects and to make ready for approval early in the fall.

For example, the Office just this past

week contacted 19 of our largest cities who will receive funds under title I of the act and who educate a substantial part of the urban slum children for whose benefit title I is assigned. These cities include 600,000 children from low-income families and they are entitled to receive some \$170 million of the funds. In all 19 cases the cities report that they have developed projects for initiation this year, and in some cases they are planning to initiate projects in September with their own funds in anticipation of Federal funds during September or October to continue the projects.

For example, the city of Milwaukee, Wis., which is entitled to receive \$2,829,000 is developing project proposals which will exceed \$3 million and has planned the initiation of a number of these with a smaller sum of \$100,000 of its own funds in anticipation of Federal funds. Other cities such as New York, Providence, New Orleans, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Washington, D.C., have assured the Office that their planning activities contemplate the full use of funds which are authorized and in most cases an intention to start them promptly this fall.

For example, New York City has projects totaling \$40 million ready to submit for approval to hire personnel to expand kindergarten programs, to provide after-school study centers, to provide programs for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children, and to provide a variety of correctional and remedial programs for educationally deprived children. All of us who have been struck by the ferocity of the Los Angeles riots must contemplate the situation we are fomenting in our cities when it is suggested that educational projects for slum children be denied or delayed.

The committee, in its report, has included language to guarantee to every school district eligible for funds under title I that it will receive the full amount of its authorized grants in fiscal year 1966 if projects are approved calling for the full authorization. On the other hand, the committee has wisely recognized that there will be many situations arising throughout the country as a result of the timing of the appropriation which will prevent their using the funds for the full fiscal year. In a few instances, the compliance requirements of the Civil Rights Act will delay or preclude the participation of school districts this year. This situation I understand is being rapidly overcome by the actions of the Office of Education which reports that 72 percent of the children in Southern States reside in districts which have already established compliance and it is expected that this figure will climb to 90 percent by the time funds are distributed. Nevertheless, in order to avoid the appropriation of funds which are not required because of various delays, we have made available in this bill only two-thirds of the authorized grants under title I of the act amounting to \$775 million. The latest data available

to the committee indicates that school districts throughout the country will be entitled to receive \$1,159 million in funds. I will insert in the RECORD at this time a table showing the full amounts of the authorized grants by State:

Estimated distribution of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

	<i>Estimated amounts</i>
United States and outlying areas.....	\$1,159,249,189
50 States and the District of Columbia.....	1,136,064,205
Alabama.....	34,632,142
Alaska.....	1,576,908
Arizona.....	10,246,647
Arkansas.....	22,600,021
California.....	77,915,038
Colorado.....	9,588,586
Connecticut.....	7,196,504
Delaware.....	1,975,217
Florida.....	27,477,512
Georgia.....	37,339,943
Hawaii.....	2,198,398
Idaho.....	2,446,630
Illinois.....	56,834,758
Indiana.....	18,377,230
Iowa.....	18,561,366
Kansas.....	10,482,963
Kentucky.....	30,131,330
Louisiana.....	38,344,221
Maine.....	4,014,213
Maryland.....	15,249,238
Massachusetts.....	16,539,689
Michigan.....	34,727,568
Minnesota.....	24,509,212
Mississippi.....	30,894,244
Missouri.....	29,856,573
Montana.....	3,631,645
Nebraska.....	6,920,191
Nevada.....	949,930
New Hampshire.....	1,452,253
New Jersey.....	24,559,433
New Mexico.....	9,789,895
New York.....	109,639,348
North Carolina.....	52,826,063
North Dakota.....	5,219,893
Ohio.....	41,681,245
Oklahoma.....	16,868,896
Oregon.....	8,166,814
Pennsylvania.....	54,906,916
Rhode Island.....	4,039,555
South Carolina.....	27,478,721
South Dakota.....	6,358,002
Tennessee.....	32,206,225
Texas.....	78,197,018
Utah.....	2,820,824
Vermont.....	1,731,300
Virginia.....	30,619,294
Washington.....	10,746,303
West Virginia.....	16,991,225
Wisconsin.....	17,701,478
Wyoming.....	1,463,660
District of Columbia.....	5,381,927
Outlying areas.....	23,184,984

Again I urge your favorable consideration of the committee's bill and report as recognizing both the urgency of educational problems facing us and the fiscal prudence that enables us to appropriate only the amount that is actually needed by the schools to operate approved programs this year. If we have missed the mark and the schools submit projects for approval which exceed the \$775 million, the committee has recognized the necessity of a supplemental appropriation which can be voted in the spring for the exact amount that may be needed.

SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act calls for a smaller amount of \$100 million, but it also is aimed at the bullseye of educational problems in target areas of the underprivileged. We have heard time and again of the cases of schoolchildren attending classes in both the slum areas of the city and the rural areas of the Nation with books that have no covers, are hopelessly outdated, have missing pages, and which represent a blot on our educational system. No thoughtful Member of this House would deny the need for remedying the deplorable state of our textbook deficiencies as revealed by reports of the Committee on Education and Labor. For example, it is a shocking fact reported by the Office of Education that 69 percent of our public elementary schools do not have libraries and 66 percent of our nonpublic schools do not have libraries. A total of 10 million public school children are without library services of any kind, as are 1.7 million nonpublic school children. To delay these funds further simply means that another school year will pass before the educational needs of children without books is to be remedied. I call your attention to the fact that the funds under title II of the act are allotted to each State on a basis which recognizes both public and private school enrollment in the States and assures the availability of textbooks and library books to all children on a fair and equitable basis. In meeting the special needs of children who have the poorest services with these funds, the States will be rendering a valuable service to equalizing educational opportunity for all children.

The committee felt that because the urgency of need for textbooks and library books is so great in our schools, coupled with the fact that purchase and distribution can take place all during the year without reducing requirements, that the full amount of the budget of \$100 million should be approved.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

One of the most promising parts of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the provision in title III for supplementary educational centers. These centers, which will serve as models of exemplary educational practice, will enrich educational opportunities for all children and adults. The projects will enable communities to provide services not now available to children in the community, to raise the quality of service that is already provided and to stimulate the development of model school programs.

Educational progress in this country depends on our ability to innovate and to take advantage of new educational practice. The supplementary centers which are authorized by title III of the act will demonstrate ways in which new educational practice can be made available to all children and to relate educational services to cultural and other sources of enrichment. The funds which are made available under this title are allotted by States and the projects are approved by the Commissioner of Education follow-

ing their submittal by local agencies through the States where they will be reviewed and recommendations made on the most effective proposals. A National Advisory Council will aid the Commissioner in his final selections.

The committee has decided to recommend \$75 million to initiate this project in 1966. This is a reduction of \$25 million from the amount proposed. In this instance we believe that the timing of the appropriation is a factor in reducing the fund requirements for the first year.

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING

An additional \$45 million is included in the bill for administration of the amendments contained in title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides for broadened research and training authority to the Office of Education and which authorizes the construction of regional research facilities.

The importance of research to educational improvement has been revealed to the committee in testimony presented both by the Office of Education and by various prominent educators who have testified in behalf of the successful program of cooperative research which has been administered by the Office of Education since 1956.

One of the serious impediments to effective research programs is the lack of personnel. The funds which are contained in the bill will permit the Office of Education to support projects which involve the training of skilled professionals in the field of education so that research efforts may be accelerated and expanded.

The construction of regional research facilities in various parts of the country will enable our universities and our educational agencies to provide research and training programs which are related to regional and local needs. We are still spending only a fraction of 1 percent of our national educational budget for research purposes. Until we reverse this anomalous situation we will be retarding improvements in all areas of education. This investment is one that is certain to repay the Nation fully and with a substantial dividend through improved use of our manpower.

STRENGTHENING STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Recognizing that the success of educational programs administered through State departments of education depends on the strength of those agencies, title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes funds for specialized personnel in all States. These funds are allotted on the basis of public school enrollments, and in the first year the sum of \$25 million has been authorized. The committee has recommended \$17 million for this activity. We believe that the reduction of \$8 million can be absorbed by the States because of the delays that have already been created by the passage of 2 months of the fiscal year.

The Office of Education reports that since passage of the act in April their contacts with State departments of education have shown that practically all of the States recognize their needs for additional specialized personnel and have taken steps to reorganize their depart-

ments and to recruit for their needs. The most pressing need in the States is for specialized personnel in various curriculum areas. Also because of the fragmented school organization in many States school districts receive only limited and scattered assistance from their State agencies. If the States are to provide effective leadership it will be essential for them to develop the professional competence that is needed to give leadership in all subject matter areas of the curriculum and in educational planning. For this reason the committee is of the opinion that the funds included in the bill are essential to a successful launching of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in fiscal year 1966.

In summary, I believe the committee has given very careful and considerate attention to the needs of all parts of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have made reductions where we felt that appropriation requests could not be fully used this year because of the passage of time and other impediments.

In the main, however, the funds that are included in this bill are essential to a rapid improvement in educational practice particularly for those children who are the victims of poverty and educational deprivation. In voting these funds today we are not only striking an effective blow at the evils of poverty but we are also providing an opportunity for overcoming educational barriers related to physical and mental handicaps. I urge your full support of the bill and I believe that the children, parents, and teachers of the Nation will be grateful for our action today in voting these funds.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10586. This bill makes supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

By far the largest portion of the \$1.2 billion recommended by the committee is to begin the operation of the programs provided for in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which we passed earlier this year. Those funds constitute more than three-fourths of the total appropriation recommended, and more than nine-tenths of the sums provided for the health, education, and welfare programs in this bill.

That is what we are talking about. That is what we are concerned with. There is no question—we are talking about education. We are talking about the money needed to make the elementary and secondary education program come alive; the money needed to transform it from a paper promise in the pages of the statute books into a program for the benefit of millions of schoolchildren, and for the benefit of the whole country.

A well-educated people is this country's most fundamental resource. There is nothing more important to our economic progress, and there is nothing more important to the Nation's strength in any foreign or domestic endeavor, than education.

This is undeniable. And yet, the minority members of the committee have filed separate views, recommending against the appropriation of these funds.

Frequently, I am in disagreement with my distinguished colleagues of the minority. Generally, although we do not see eye-to-eye, I respect their views even as I am not persuaded by them.

But here there is no responsibility in the position they take. The minority views reflect not reason, but hyperbole. What is the reason for this extravagant and irrelevant departure? What is the purpose of this excess?

The views of the minority are cloaked, they are bathed, in a transparent covering of false fiscal conservatism. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, they make the most shocking allegation with regard to the planning of the administration's defense budget. They allege that the President deliberately underfunded defense needs in order to promote the passage of the education bill and other domestic programs.

That charge is not only untrue, it is unworthy. Even as they bring partisanship to the question of educating our children, they charge partisanship in the conduct of this country's defense. The patent falseness of that allegation gives color to the entire statement of their views.

But let us consider their fiscal argument on the merits. What is the argument? In the words of the minority: "a choice must be made between guns and butter."

In other words, according to the minority, this country cannot afford both to defend its interests and to educate its children.

That is shortsighted, simple sloganeering. That is not fiscal integrity, but fiscal idiocy. That is not prudence; it is profligacy.

In this era of economic advance, as our society and its means of production become evermore complex, both the continuation and the stability of economic growth depend not only upon the increased efficiency of physical capital, but also very heavily upon the constant improvement of our human capital. And we develop our human capital through education.

Let me quote from the 1965 Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Economic Report of the President to Congress, January 1965, pages 156-157:

The education of our people is the most basic resource of our society. Education equips man to think rationally and creatively in his quest for knowledge, for beauty, and for the full life; it provides the basis for effective political democracy; and it is the most important force behind economic growth by advancing technology and raising the productivity of workers.

The impact of education on economic productivity, though long recognized, has recently come to be more widely appreciated. Expenditures on education produce a wide array of direct and indirect economic benefits to individuals and to society.

Evidence on the effects of education on productivity is mounting. Increases in conventional inputs of labor and capital explain only about half the growth of output in the economy over the past half-century. The rising level of education appears to account for between one-quarter and one-half of the otherwise unexplained growth of output.

Other effects defy both easy cataloging and quantification. They include the impact of

education on research and the development of new products and processes, and the economic efficiencies that result from general literacy and substantial educational attainment.

In sum, what the Council of Economic Advisers reported is that education is a continuing investment. And it is a sound investment. It is an investment in economic strength and stability, and it is an investment in the richness and quality of life in this country.

I say that those who argue for either guns or butter do not apprehend the impact of education on our national defense. For education is also an investment in military strength.

The technology of war is as complex as the technology of peace.

If anyone doubts that the failure to educate our young people weakens the ability of this country to defend itself, he need only recall the dismal statistics of the report of the President's Task Force on Manpower Conservation. That report was called "One-Third of a Nation." It revealed that one-third of our young men could not qualify for military service, and that half of those who could not qualify failed the mental test. One-sixth of the young men in this country cannot qualify for military service because they cannot pass the mental examination. Forty percent of these young men never went beyond grammar school, and four out of five did not finish high school.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the bulk of the funds provided for, is to support special educational programs to help educationally disadvantaged children from poor families. Those programs, those funds which the minority says should not be appropriated, those expenditures which the minority says we cannot afford, bear directly on this problem. For the "One-Third of a Nation" report concluded that:

The single most important fact that emerges * * * is that a large proportion of the young men who fail the Armed Forces mental test are the children of poverty. Too many of their parents are poor. Too many of them are poor. If the present course of events continues, their children will be poor.

That statement describes the vicious cycle we are trying to break—the cycle of poverty and ignorance in one generation being directly translated into ignorance and poverty in the next.

Mr. Chairman, we are fighting many wars, and we can afford them all. We can afford the \$967 million this bill provides for attacking ignorance, and illiteracy, and poverty; we can afford the \$36.75 million it puts into our war on disease; and we can afford the \$7 million it provides to make life better for the older citizens who have built and fought for America.

We are fighting wars in far-off places in defense of freedom and justice. We are fighting wars here at home—against poverty, disease, and ignorance—for our own sake, and for the sake of all men as well, to prove the viability and the vitality of the great American experiment in democratic self-government.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are fighting

many wars. And we must have no less heart, our determination to win must be as great, in battling these common enemies of all mankind, in pursuing here these struggles of the centuries, as it is in bloody wars, continents away.

Our colleagues of the minority would tell us that the cost of education is too great. I say that the cost of educational failure is far greater. Nearly one-half of the young men who were rejected by selective service for educational deficiency have fathers who did not themselves complete the eighth grade. The minority will tell us that the cost of fighting poverty is too great. But in those States where per capita personal income is the lowest, the draft rejection rates are well above the national average—sometimes close to a 50-percent rejection rate. And if a man has less than 9 years of education today, the chances are 2 out of 3 that he and his family will be living in poverty. In a decade when jobs for high school graduates increased by 40 percent, jobs for those who failed to finish high school dropped by 10 percent.

These, then, are the effects of the failure to educate people: ignorance; unemployment; poverty; and a weakening of the country's fiber for military defense and for economic progress.

True fiscal conservatism, sound social planning, indicates that, if anything, we should devote far more toward structural improvement of the economy through more and better education. This is brought out excellently, and with great clarity, by the August 1965 issue of the Monthly Economic Letter of the First National City Bank of New York:

A number of recent economic studies have revealed that investment in human capital—education, on-the-job training, health, etc.—has played a much bigger role in U.S. economic growth than previously realized. Thus, in his study, "The Sources of Economic Growth in the United States," Edward F. Denison calculated that the rising educational level of the labor force (including managerial and technical personnel) was responsible for 23 percent of the growth in real national income between 1929 and 1957. In contrast, the increase in physical capital accounted for only 15 percent, while the general advance of knowledge was seen as contributing 20 percent. Using a different method but with similar results, Prof. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago has estimated that the yield on our investment in education capital over roughly the same period accounted for about one-fifth of the rise in national output.

Such figures point up the fact that a modern economy does not depend simply on installing more and better machinery to attain rising efficiency. Not only are skilled engineers needed to design and install the improved equipment, but more technically trained personnel are required to plan and manage production, to sell and service the product and conduct research for newer and better products. A growing modern economy also requires more and more scientists, teachers, doctors and health specialists, advertising and sales people, computer programmers and technicians, and mechanics and maintenance workers of all kinds.

Now that is a realistic, conservative viewpoint. Certainly my distinguished colleagues of the minority are not going to contend that the First National City Bank represents a wild-eyed, prodigal,

spendthrift point of view. Certainly they will agree that it is one of the country's, one of the world's, great and responsible financial institutions.

What more convincing argument can be made? What better proof can be given, that we cannot fail to appropriate these funds? Exactly the same point is made by the Council of Economic Advisers and the First National City Bank letter, that the rising educational level of the labor force has accounted for at least 20 percent of the growth in real national income.

I think it is clear that we must move ahead. The educational gap continues to grow. More largely today than ever before, unemployment is structural unemployment. That means that the economy is providing jobs, but they are jobs which require a higher degree of training than the workers available to fill them possess. We must close that gap.

We can rest assured that any failure in our educational efforts today, at this crucial juncture, when our whole economy is undergoing a swift and massive technological revolution, any failure will be returned and multiplied in future years. We will see it in the unemployment figures; we will find it in the welfare rolls; we will discover it in the draft-rejection rates. And—the greatest peril—we will find it reflected in the narrow flexibility of much of the labor force, and ultimately in a slow suffocation of our economic expansion.

Mr. Chairman, I regret, I regret exceedingly, that the minority have seen fit to make this a partisan issue. On the question of education for the millions of schoolchildren in this country who need education most—the poorest, the most needy—there should be neither Democrats nor Republicans. These children need education not just for their own sake, but for the sake of our whole society.

And yet, unfortunately, the minority views do not bear the test of economic analysis. They sound not of economics, but of politics, plain and simple. This is not any recognizable kind of fiscal conservatism.

Two things are plain about the minority views: First, they have used the report on this bill to make an unfair, unfounded, and improper attack on the integrity of the Johnson administration's presentation of its defense budget items; second, they did not want the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the first place, and they still do not want it. The majority of this body worked its will once, and that should have been enough; but they are trying to kill it again. But I do know this: The elementary and secondary education bill passed by a margin of 263 to 153, and we are not going to allow the will of this great body to be flouted now by refusing to appropriate the funds necessary to carry out those programs.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 10586, which makes supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The money contained in

this bill will be used to fund some of the most important and critically needed programs enacted by the 89th Congress.

First, H.R. 10586 would fund the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965. This program is specifically designed to broaden and strengthen our school systems in areas beset by severe economic problems—where the local tax base is not adequate to provide a first-class education for first-class boys and girls. The bill contains a million dollars at the outset for the schools in my 10th Congressional District.

Second, H.R. 10586 provides funds for the Manpower Development and Training Act. I know firsthand of the tremendous good this particular program is doing. We are fortunate enough to have a training center in my district at Jackson, Ohio. Since it was opened, the center has trained more than 600 men and women in new jobs; some 92 percent went on to gainful employment in private industry. Many of these people were on the welfare rolls before new opportunities were opened up for them by the training center.

So it is succeeding dramatically in reducing welfare cost and replacing relief checks with pay checks. Present enrollment at the Manpower and Technical Training Center at Jackson is in the neighborhood of 300. The truth is that we could enroll another 400 or 500 people tomorrow if the physical capacity of the training center permitted.

The bill which we consider here today also provides funding for other essential programs and agencies, such as the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, which is doing a marvelous job helping those with disabilities to become self-supporting and productive members of society. I am confident that this program has the unanimous endorsement of every responsible and compassionate American. The bill contains funds for the Public Health Service programs, including those for chronic diseases, communicable diseases, cancer and heart diseases, blindness, and so on.

I cannot accept the argument of our Republican friends that any of the programs in H.R. 10586 are marginal or non-essential, or that they should be meat-axed and placed in cold storage for the remainder of the Vietnam conflict. This great Nation of ours has the means and the will to educate the poor, train the untrained and fight killer diseases even as we resist the advance of communism in southeast Asia.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman unless a motion to recommit prevails I certainly intend to vote on final passage for H.R. 10586 which makes supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. I support especially the increased appropriations for manpower development and training and likewise additional funds for the Office of Education for elementary and secondary educational activities. Also, favor additional funds in this bill to carry out the De Bakey Commission recommendation in connection with the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Public Health Service.

As explained earlier a motion to recommit the bill to the committee is to be made so that the Appropriations Committee would have an opportunity to review at one time all the remaining supplemental budgetary requests that will be submitted. As I understand Congress will be asked for an approximate additional \$3 billion shortly for fiscal 1966. The minority members of the Committee on Appropriations want to consider all supplemental requests in one bill rather than to approve these requests piecemeal. I have said that I will go along on their motion to recommit but this does not imply that I oppose the amounts in this bill. As I said at the start, I support the items in this bill and my vote on recommitment should not be interpreted otherwise.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the bill includes \$42,920,000 to implement some of the recommendations of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. The activities which this appropriation will support are not mere extensions of existing programs. They are essential parts of a comprehensive attack on the three major killer-diseases that are now responsible for 7 out of every 10 deaths in this country.

Each of these activities can be undertaken under the present authorizing legislation for the Public Health Service and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. They are not dependent on the new authorities which would be provided by the substantive heart disease, cancer, and stroke bill that was recently passed by the Senate and is now under consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The effect of this appropriation will be to make an important start on a program whose purpose is to make more readily available to people throughout the United States—even in remote areas—the latest and the best techniques for detecting these diseases and the most effective treatments for them.

No one who has studied the recommendations of this highly competent Commission, which was chaired by Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, one of the world's most distinguished surgeons, can have a moment's doubt about the value and practicability of the program recommended or the importance of making an immediate start on it.

The amount provided by the bill to get this part of the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program underway is very conservative—probably much too conservative. The administration's request was for only a third of the \$125 million suggested by the President's Commission for these particular activities. No satisfactory explanation was offered during the hearings for making so cautious a start on so important a program. The committee expects that a more comprehensive request for funds will be submitted after the authorizing legislation for the remainder of the program has been passed.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 2, line 11:

EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses", \$27,535,800.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from Wisconsin urging fiscal responsibility and reminding us that we were in what he called practically a war economy situation. I remind you that we put on excise taxes at the time of World War II and at the time of the Korean conflict, and that only a few short months ago we abolished those excise taxes to the tune of about \$2 billion a year in Federal revenue, at a time when we certainly knew that the costs for our Vietnam activities would expand and would increase. I did not hear the advocates of fiscal responsibility at that time talking about our great national debt.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest to the gentleman that he read the RECORD when he and I had a colloquy.

Mr. JOELSON. I heard the gentleman talking about it, but I also know that he voted to eliminate the \$2 billion of revenue. I judge people on how they vote, not on what they say.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman will also read what I said in the minority views and in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on these very deleterious taxes, he will know my position.

Mr. JOELSON. I would also like to state that we are constantly appropriating billions of dollars for the war effort but when the executive branch tries to close a base because they feel it is economically unsound and because they think they can save money, my friends on the right side of the aisle are the first ones to want to tie the hands of the executive.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure that the gentleman from New Jersey has not checked the record very closely when it comes to the question of base closings. The legislation to which the gentleman refers was sponsored by the majority of this Congress and it came from a committee that has a 2-to-1 control.

At the time the bill was up for consideration I happened to be one of those who supported the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOELSON. Well, I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. And I believe the gentleman from New Jersey should be a little more familiar with the facts before he makes such a serious charge.

Mr. JOELSON. I was not referring to the gentleman in particular. How-

ever, I do not want to indulge in individual votes or statements.

Mr. LAIRD. I thought the gentleman from New Jersey was, and I wanted the RECORD to be explicit in regard to what the gentleman was saying.

Mr. JOELSON. I did not refer to the gentleman by name, but I referred to the "gentlemen," plural, on the right side of the aisle, and I stand by that statement.

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad that the gentleman gives those of us with 141 votes in this total membership of 435 of the House of Representatives such great weight. We make up in quality what we lack in quantity.

Mr. JOELSON. Well, I would say to the gentleman that if your 141 people ever rose to 218 we would be well on our way to losing the contest with the Communists, because it is my opinion that the way we fight communism is to expand, enlarge, and improve our own democracy, and if because of the threat in Vietnam we stopped and cut off our vital health, education, and welfare programs, we would have surrendered to the Communists without a volley being fired. I feel it is just as important, not only domestically but internationally, to continue the march of progress in this country and, for that reason, I certainly hope that the motion to recommit will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The CLERK. Page 3, line 5:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, activities relating to admission and employment in agriculture of nonimmigrant aliens

For expenses necessary for the performance of such functions as the Secretary of Labor deems necessary to assure, in connection with the admission of nonimmigrant aliens under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184) for employment in agriculture, that maximum efforts are made to recruit and retain agricultural workers for available job opportunities, that domestic workers are given preference in employment over alien, and that the employment of alien workers does not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in this country, \$1,723,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if this is the place where the money is being provided to condition tomato pickers in California?

According to the newspapers last week, California is recruiting 500 tomato pluckers. They are not in condition to go to work and, so, some source in the Federal Government is providing the funds—I am not sure from what department or agency—to condition these recruits so they can pluck or pick tomatoes.

They are being conditioned, according to the newspapers, at a cost of \$45 to \$75 each per week. Physical education instructors are hired to get them into condition, and they are provided with housing, food, and something for incidentals.

Mr. Chairman, I note that in this particular item in this bill, money is

provided for recruiting agricultural workers, and I just wondered if this is where the Federal funds are coming from? I will appreciate it if someone can tell me whether this \$1,723,000, or any part of it, is to be used to get people in physical condition to pluck tomatoes in California.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, no, this is not that program. This is called the recruitment of domestic workers to take the place of the Mexican workers because of the expiration of the bracero program.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman agree with me that it is a strange situation that has arisen in this country when Federal funds are used to hire physical education instructors to put people in condition to pick tomatoes either in California, Iowa, or Rhode Island?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman is making a good point, but I do not think that is in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to find some agreement. Now, there is somewhere in one of your appropriation bills the money for a grant made recently to the University of Utah of \$30,018 for the study of the ovarian and circadian cycle of mice. I would be surprised if the Federal Government, through the years, has not already spent a good many thousands of dollars on the love life of mice. With a war going on, costing Americans billions of dollars, I seriously question whether we ought to be in the business of giving a university \$30,000, or any part of that, for a study of the love life of mice.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not in this bill, but I may say to the gentleman he may be entirely wrong about the importance of such a program that has been going on before.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes; I have been mistaken at times. I take it that most people have.

Mr. FOGARTY. I remember a couple of years ago we had a grant to the University of Wisconsin for studying the love life of monkeys. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] defended that program and it has turned out to be one of the best research programs we have ever had in this country.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman I wish he would get for me a report on the results of the thousands of dollars that were spent at some university in Israel for a study of the interpersonal, intrapersonal relationship of husband and wife.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether that is still going on or not, but we have some very fine research projects going on in Israel. This might be part of them, I do not know, but I will look into them. I think there is a good reason for it.

Mr. GROSS. There was also some kind of pictorial review going on in connection with this inter- and intrapersonal relationship of a husband and wife.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not believe that is still in operation.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman referred to tomato pickers. I would like

to advise him if he can find any pickle pickers to pick pickles up in Michigan we would appreciate it. If we fail to recruit pickle pickers now, the pickle packers will not have pickles to pack.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has spoken on an important subject, and an important part of this bill. That is the provision for \$1,723,000 which has been provided by the subcommittee for the Office of the Secretary of Labor in the program providing for admission and employment in agriculture of nonimmigrant aliens. In California and Florida—especially in my State of California—we have a most difficult situation at the present time. I wish to call the committee's attention to the language of the report on the bill before us on this regard which reads as follows:

The legislative authorization for the Mexican Farm Labor Program expired December 31, 1964. In addition new restrictions were placed on the importation of foreign labor under the Immigration and Nationality Act on the assumption that domestic workers can, in most instances, meet that part of the demand for agricultural labor formerly met by foreign laborers.

This transition has, to a large extent, been successful. However, even with some expansion of the Department's Farm Labor Service, there have been instances of severe hardship and crop losses that appear to have resulted from failure of the system to operate as well as it should.

The Department is convinced that this additional special appropriation will make it possible to more quickly and accurately determine the need for temporary entry into the United States of foreign agricultural workers to aid in planting and harvesting crops, and also assure that use of foreign labor does not adversely affect the wages and conditions of workers in this country. The committee is in complete agreement with the desirability of these objectives and wishes to give the Department every opportunity to achieve them.

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

Mr. McFALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to point out to the gentleman we amended this language somewhat so that the word "domestic" was dropped in the first instance where the requested language referred to "domestic workers."

The Secretary of Labor will have the responsibility to apply a plan or formula. I think this amendment which excluded "domestic" from the language requested by the Department of Labor is a step in the right direction because in many areas, particularly in the gentleman's State, there have been problems with domestic workers.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I would thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to our attention. I want to commend the committee for this language that they have provided. It reads as follows:

For expenses necessary for the performance of such functions as the Secretary of Labor deems necessary to assure, in connection with

the admission of nonimmigrant aliens under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184) for employment in agriculture, that maximum efforts are made to recruit and retain agricultural workers for available job opportunities, that domestic workers are given preference in employment over alien workers, and that the employment of alien workers does not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in this country, \$1,723,000.

I know that Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle are as interested in this problem as we are on this side of the aisle. The language of the bill and the report provides the Secretary with certainly more authority and flexibility than he has previously had. It is a most difficult situation in the State of California at the present time. We need workers and the Office of the Secretary of Labor is making every effort to meet the problem. And I would ask him to redouble his efforts. I would hope that the motion to recommit would not prevail for that reason, if for no other reason, because we need these employees in California and we need them right now. We have this precarious labor situation to take care of, and I think the motion to recommit which would deny these funds and their use right now would further impede the valiant efforts of the Secretary and his staff to ease our situation.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. With all of the energy that was expended recently in California over a 4-day period to tear down a part of the city of Los Angeles, I would think there are more than enough people physically conditioned to go out and pick all the tomatoes on the west coast. I have picked a few tomatoes as a boy on a farm and with all of that expenditure of energy in Los Angeles to tear things apart to destroy and loot, I would think there was an ample supply of people who could go out and pick tomatoes if they were so inclined.

Mr. McFALL. I would say to the gentleman, these unfortunate events to which he refers took place some 300 miles from my district, where the tomato pickers are needed. These people may very well be good tomato pickers or even pickle pickers, as the gentleman from Michigan expressed an interest in. If we could get them up into our area, they might do a good job for us. I wish to point out, however, that the Secretary has endeavored to use the manpower training law to assist farmers in California. Picking tomatoes is not the easiest job in the world. You have to know how to pick and what to pick. The Secretary has tried to use this program to assist the farmers.

I would like to read a telegram from our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] who is out in the area right now. He describes in his telegram the situation as he sees it. He says:

HON. JOHN J. McFALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JOHN: Last Saturday I personally inspected the tomato fields in the Merced area of California, which I represent, and which

extends into the southerly section of your district. I found a truly tragic situation resulting from the shortage of labor to harvest this economically important crop, with thousands of tons of tomatoes literally rotting on the vines. I am not at this time attempting to assess or fix responsibility, but I am determined that this shall not happen again, and I know you share my feelings that we must devise and carry into execution whatever legislative or administrative measures may be necessary to insure against a repetition of the personal and economic tragedies which affect the livelihood of thousands of our citizens.

While I am continuing to exert every effort to secure the work force which is needed immediately, I am afraid we cannot avert a heavy loss now taking place, and we must immediately initiate steps looking toward a correction in future years, under which we can secure not only a complete utilization of all available domestic agricultural labor, but also the swift supplementation of that labor force when it proves to be inadequate.

I ask that you make available to our colleagues this information and I join in your request for their cooperation and understanding of our problem.

Sincerely,

BERNIE SISK.

Most of the tomatoes have yet to be picked, and in spite of an acute shortage right now which was brought on by unseasonal rains, especially in my district and that of Mr. SISK, that came upon us last week, with the diligent efforts of the State and of the Department of Labor, we will be able to provide sufficient workers to pick the tomatoes. We must do this because millions of dollars are involved.

One of the problems we have encountered, which everyone is working on and trying to remedy, is that there has been no workable procedure set up to assist the farmers to recruit workers within the State. There are supposedly anywhere from 8,000 to 10,000 workers in San Francisco and Los Angeles, which are from 100 to 300 miles away, yet somehow or other there is a slippage. The workers are said to be there, and we have orders in, yet we cannot seem to get the workers.

The Department of Labor has responded to our cries for assistance. They are working with and counseling with the farmers, trying to get a domestic supply of workers. Members of Secretary Wirtz' labor panel have gone out and actually inspected the fields. I am certain that the workers will be provided, but there have been losses already, precipitated by the rain, but the persons who are running this program must try to anticipate what the farmer is always acutely aware of, that he is at the mercy of the weather—and try to plan ahead on this basis.

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

Mr. McFALL. I yield to my colleague from California [Mr. LEGGETT].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I thoroughly support my colleague from the Central Valley of California in his remarks respecting the critical need for pickers of tomatoes in the Central Valley of California.

We advised the House last year, when we talked about the recruitment efforts and supplemental labor forces, of this

AUGUST 24, 1965.

situation. We pointed out that half of the need for foreign labor imported to the United States was in California, and more than half of this need was in the tomato harvest.

We are now in the situation of being in the midst of the harvest. Last year at this time we had 32,000 workers harvesting tomatoes in California. This year, as of this morning, we have some 23,000. We are nearly 10,000 workers shy.

I know that one can look at general statistics and point out that we had 35,000 braceros in California at this time last year, yet at this time this year we have no braceros.

There are 30,000 domestic workers, but one must analyze the domestic workers. While they are young and hale and hearty—many of them are women—they are not capable of doing the job which the foreign workers did in years past.

A good bracero could earn \$50 a day on the current wages being paid by the farmers in the State of California; that is, at 25 to 30 cents a box for picking tomatoes. A young boy in school, or a woman, can make from \$5 or \$6 to \$20 a day. These workers all do receive, however, the \$1.40 per hour minimum.

The effect has been that the growers have raised the wage rates, pursuant to the criteria suggested by the Secretary of Labor. They have raised the wage rates as much as 50 percent, and 75 percent in many areas. The net result has been that we still do not have enough workers.

This morning in my district there was a critical need for 2,000 workers in one association, 1,000 workers in another association, 600 workers in a third association, and 200 workers in a fourth association. If we do not get those workers this week, I will necessarily have to report to the House at this time next week a cataloging of the damage which has been done to the tomato harvest in California. This I will be reluctant to do.

This matter has been compounded by a lack of a complete organization among the farmers themselves, and also the Department of Labor has kind of catalogued this situation on the farmers of our State.

We now have three of the best labor recruiters in California out in Oklahoma and in Texas, and I talked with a recruiter this morning at Baton Rouge, La. It was represented that there were 4,000 to 6,000 workers in Louisiana who could be brought to California by the Department of Labor. I ascertained this morning that we could possibly get 200 or 400, and we could not get any workers on a bus before Thursday of this week.

The buses will start on Thursday, and meanwhile we have the critical need today for 4,000 workers in my district. The assistance of the Secretary has been very helpful in certifying 8,000 workers to the State of California. However, only about 2,000 of those 8,000 will be apportioned to my district. The net effect will be that though we could use 4,000 workers in the district today we

can only expect 2,000 workers from the Bracero recruitment program in 2 weeks. That is going to be too late.

Certainly, I am against any motion to recommit this bill. We need the \$1.7 million for the Department of Labor immediately, not only to go through the pro forma recruitment effort of foreign labor, but actually to see to it that the labor is organized and certified in Mexico and brought to the recruitment centers in various portions of the southern border of California and other States, and brought in to actually do the harvesting.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, to those who believe that the present Department of Labor programs have any great effect on domestic unemployment, I submit the following report prepared last week by the department of employment of the State of California showing that there are 1,300 more unemployed in northern California today than there was last year:

REPORT FROM STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

SAN FRANCISCO, August 9, 1965.—Numerous trade disputes in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area this July obscured the usual employment-unemployment pattern, according to a report issued today by the California Departments of Industrial Relations and Employment.

At 1,216,300—a July high—civilian employment was off from last month by 7,100 but remained above the year ago job count by 25,800, or by 2.2 percent. This was reported by Ernest B. Webb, director of the department of industrial relations.

Construction, affected by strikes, reduced its employee ranks by about 10,000 from June. A seasonal dip in public school employment decreased the number employed in Government by 5,300 from a month ago. Other major industries recorded gains over the month.

Better than seasonal increases occurred in manufacturing and trade. A canning upsurge and an end to work stoppages affecting leather, lumber, and furniture helped boost the job total in manufacturing over the month. The only major loss in manufacturing was in shipbuilding where a strike reduced the job count. Services, the finance complex, and transportation-communication-utilities had more employees than ever before.

All industries had an increase in their ranks from a year ago except agriculture and construction. Over the year job growth was centered in Government, trade, and services. Trade and Government set record highs for the month of July.

The number of unemployed persons in the Bay area declined to 67,800 in July from 70,600 in June. The June to July decrease was much less than usual because many workers were affected by work stoppages in the construction industry. As a result, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate¹ rose to 5.3 percent in July from 5.0 percent in June. Last July, when 66,500 persons were unemployed, the adjusted rate was 5.4 percent.

The need for workers currently in California is uncontroverted. Today there is better than a 10,000-man deficiency

¹ The unadjusted unemployment rate was 5.3 percent in July, 5.5 percent in June, and 5.3 percent in July of last year.

as is borne out by the following reports from the California Department of Agriculture dated August 14 and August 21, 1965:

WEEKLY FARM LABOR REPORT, AUGUST 14, 1965

Tomato crop progress: Harvest of canning tomatoes is expected to be underway in all districts, with the exception of the central coast, early next week. Deliveries last week totaled 17,192 tons, including 11,487 tons from the Modesto district and 3,415 tons from southern California. Deliveries from Dixon and Woodland as well as the Sacramento River district were just getting underway. Harvest during the current week is expected to increase seasonally, and volume is expected to double in the following week. Early season deliveries parallel the 1963 season, which was a little later than in 1964. Unseasonal rainfall was widespread over most of the tomato-growing areas on August 11, but crop damage is not expected to be serious since harvest was not yet in heavy volume. With clearing weather, picking resumed on August 12 and should become heavy the week of August 16.

Delivery defects and load rejections: A sample of 100 loads delivered and passed in each of the major districts last week showed that total defects average 9.4 percent versus 8.3 percent during the entire 1964 season. Cumulative defects this season, based on sample data, average 9.2 percent. Rejections were 3.6 percent of the deliveries (50 loads out of 1,400 delivered). Comparable data for the same week of 1964 show that rejections were 3.4 percent (93 loads out of 2,711). Rejections during the entire 1964 season totaled 2.7 percent of the deliveries.

Worker shortage indicated: Total employment in the canning-tomato harvest as of August 14 is placed at 8,210 workers, well below last year and also below the projected number which was expected to be available in the current week. Estimates for the week ending August 21 place total employment at 12,830 workers versus 23,030 workers during the same week last year. The State Department of Employment expects a shortage of 3,400 workers in the canning-tomato harvest the week ending August 21, including 1,000 in Solano County, 1,000 in Merced, 800 in Yolo and 600 in Stanislaus County.

WEEKLY FARM LABOR REPORT, AUGUST 21, 1965

Tomato crop progress: Harvest of canning tomatoes is increasing seasonally with picks underway in all districts except the central coast. Deliveries last week totaled 42,959 tons, including 17,988 tons from the Modesto district, 8,554 tons from Woodland, and 5,903 tons from Dixon. Deliveries from other districts were still light. Harvest during the current week is expected to reach 85,000 tons, and this volume should double in the following week. Early season deliveries parallel the 1963 season, which was slightly later than in 1964.

Delivery defects and load rejections: See table under section IV for this data. Load rejections last week at 4.0 percent of the deliveries were well above average. Comparable data for the same week last year showed rejections of only 1.7 percent. Weekly delivery percentage defects for loads which passed inspection averaged 8.6 percent. This was below the previous period, but still above average.

Worker shortage indicated: Total employment in the canning tomato harvest as of August 21 is placed at 13,390 workers, well below last year. Estimates for the week ending August 28 place total employment at 20,900 workers versus 32,940 workers during the same week last year. The labor situation for the canning tomato harvest is becoming acute with an expected shortage of 4,710

workers the week ending August 28, including 1,000 in Solano County, 1,500 in Merced, 600 in Sacramento, 500 in San Joaquin, 1,000 in Stanislaus, 60 in Butte, and 50 in Glenn

County. Cannerys have agreed to assist growers in the financial outlay which will be required to make the maximum effort to recruit workers interstate.

Delivery percentage defects and load rejections

	Delivery percentage defects			Load rejections ¹		
	Previous week, ending Aug. 7	Past week ending Aug. 14	Cumulative, ending Aug. 14	Previous week, ending Aug. 7	Past week, ending Aug. 14	Cumulative, ending Aug. 14
1964.....	(s) 9.4	(s) 8.6	8.3	3.4	1.7	2.3
1965.....			8.8	3.6	4.0	3.8

¹ Loads having total defects in excess of 15 percent.

² Not available.

³ Season average percentage total defects.

⁴ Sample of 100 loads delivered and passed for each major district.

In summary, I would comment that the California growers are breaking their backs to satisfy the Secretary of Labor's criteria. First, they're paying 25 to 30 cents a box to pick the fruit as compared to a criteria of near half that amount to produce \$1.40 per hour. Second, the industry has created a \$¼ million fund to assist the growers in interstate recruitment. Third, the current labor shortage is patent with women, children, automatic machines and some military personnel and green card workers satisfying the primary labor demands. This work force is today inadequate. If foreign workers are not available in California this week, millions of dollars of damage will needlessly be caused to the producers. Fourth, the Tomato Harvesting School in California has been ill-timed and is destined to be unproductive since only 40 percent of those 500 authorized have ever reported to the school. Fifth, in a week or so the many youths who are now effecting partially the harvest will be back in school. I have asked the schools to abate opening. Sixth, the Secretary of Labor, I believe, has been cooperative as is indicated by the following exchange of correspondence with my office. The problem is that the Secretary has placed a local academic certification board between his office and the growers. The current dogmatic action of this board in certifying 8,000 workers for September 1 will be too little and too late. The Secretary should forthwith assume responsibility in this matter. Immediately he should tour the Central Valley Districts of California with the Congressmen concerned and view the compliance of growers with criteria, see first-hand the wages paid and quality of the domestic harvest hands, gain some feeling of the pending peril to this industry.

I submit that he would then use every dollar of this appropriation to accelerate the Public Law 414 recruitment program, both in time and numbers.

A portion of the letter exchange follows:

AUGUST 10, 1965.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I know you value opinions of the academic community with respect to agricultural labor utilization in the current California labor crisis. Pursuant thereto, I am pleased to supply you with a copy of a report compiled by Prof. Eric Thor and John Mamer of the University of Cali-

fornia's Berkeley campus. I particularly call your attention to pages 46 through 49 confirming a labor deficiency in tomatoes of from 23,000 to 26,500 laborers in the current harvest.

I understand the panel is meeting today to make recommendations to your Department. I reemphasize that the problem is critical.

I also enclose copies of the Department of Agriculture's weekly analyses which will verify the deficiency with respect to tomatoes and spells out in poundage lost our strawberry experience.

On another matter, I am pleased to note today the pioneering of training programs in my district to harvest tomatoes with the subsistence and wage supplement provided. I would think that based on this experience, we will be able to draw reasonable conclusions as to whether urban unemployed in large numbers can perform agricultural labor.

I enclose also an article from the local Filipino newspaper indicating the current provocative agricultural wages prevailing in California of which I am not ashamed.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1965.

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter of August 10, and the accompanying material.

As you know, the California Farm Labor Panel has met, and recommended the admission of 8,000 braceros. I have accepted that recommendation. The Thor report, which you sent to me, played a key role in those deliberations.

I might add in passing, however, that the report spoke of a labor need (to be satisfied from all sources) of between 23,000 and 26,500, rather than a labor deficiency of this size. The authors of the report did not make any estimates of the labor supply available for the crop.

The tomato harvest and the training programs connected with it will have my constant attention during the weeks to come. If I can provide any help, of any kind, please call me.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

AUGUST 16, 1965.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For your review, I enclose herewith a weekly crop report in California prepared by the California Department of Agriculture, together with two news articles pertaining to the tomato harvest.

While all crops look good with the exception of tomatoes, the tomato harvest appears to be critical and an 1,800 worker shortage has been projected for my district in Yolo and Solano Counties this week.

Our recruitment efforts are at maximum. It appears that the total number of certified workers for the peak season for our area could be used a full month before the peak.

Will Mexico provide the 8,000 as certified last week? My growers are near panic. I would hope that you would have people in the field who are continually re-appraising this matter.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 18, 1965.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The matter continues critical.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

RELEASE FROM IVORY ASSOCIATES, MARYSVILLE, CALIF., AUGUST 15, 1965, FOR NORTHERN CALIFORNIA GROWERS ASSOCIATION

YUBA CITY, CALIF.—Loss of 2,550 tons of tomatoes has been labeled a "rotten monument" to the bracero labor policy of U.S. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, as growers blame incompetent workers for the bulk of a \$90,000 loss to Wright Farms of Chico.

Leslie Salmonson, a partner in the farm firm, said today that domestic labor had proved to be completely incapable of harvesting the crop.

"Of the 8 loads which we shipped to the grading station these past 2 days, 5 were returned because they didn't meet grading standards," Salmonson said.

"Graders said 13 percent of each load was green, 3 percent had mold damage and 4½ percent was sunburned," the grower reported.

After using 300 workers for harvesting a field that would have normally required 30 competent workers, the farm firm had to dump over 100 tons of rejected tomatoes and then abandoned the entire 85 acres now ready for harvest.

Edward Dennis, manager of the Northern California Growers Association in Yuba City, described the dumping of the crop this morning: "There were beautiful, prime tomatoes as far as you could see. The fruit, which was dumped into the tomato field so crop and plants both could be plowed under, covered 150-foot areas on both sides of the road.

"It made me sick to see all that fruit going to waste," Dennis said.

Wright Farms said it was paying 25 cents a box, with a \$1.40-an-hour guarantee, at the time of hiring this morning. Pickers were given instructions on how to select the ripe fruit and how to handle the vines for picking and were closely supervised throughout the entire operation, Salmonson said.

He also pointed out that he had a small number of Mexican green-card workers, who are in this country under regular immigration permits. These workers were picking 45 boxes per claim, or at a rate of 30 tons per acre, while the average domestic worker was picking from 7 to 20 boxes per claim, less than half that rate per acre. The claim is the section of tomato plants assigned to each picker.

"We went ahead with our planting on the basis of assurances from Wirtz that there would be qualified workers to pick the crop," Salmonson said. "I guess we're just the suckers on the whole deal."

Harvest of the \$7 million tomato crop in the five-county area represented by the asso-

ciation is just getting started. Approximately 6,250 acres must be handpicked, while a relatively small acreage is being harvested mechanically.

Dennis said that about four other growers are picking today and that one of them reported he lost 20 tons of tomatoes, principally because of green and overripe fruit that was rejected because of basically the same conditions blamed for the Wright farm loss.

The association had requested 2,340 braceros, but the recent decision from Wirtz allows only for 655 pickers for the association's grower-members.

Wright Farms estimated today that it has already spent \$10,000 in preharvest costs and has spent \$2,500 in 3 days on picking costs. The 85 acres would normally produce 30 tons per acre and the crop is valued at \$35 per ton, or \$89,250.

Dennis said, "I'm afraid if this situation doesn't improve all of our growers will go off the Department of Labor criteria and begin employing wetbacks, as the country is full of them."

"If the braceros find out the tomato growers are willing to hire them, there are not enough immigration officers in the country to stop them at the border," Dennis declared.

"The entire situation is a rotten monument to a rotten deal for the farmers," the association manager said.

The criteria he referred to are the standards set up by Wirtz, which a grower must meet before he can qualify for supplementary foreign workers.

Association officials make it clear that they lay the blame for today's loss on these requirements, since many of the domestic workers refuse to pick selectively or to stay on the job for any length of time.

Speaking for himself, Salmonson said, "We don't know what we are going to do in the future, but without qualified pickers, we are going to lose our whole crop." Wright Farms planted a total of around 300 acres of tomatoes.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter of August 16 regarding the tomato harvest.

You asked, "Will Mexico provide the 8,000 as certified last week?" Our understanding is that the Mexican Government has accepted the order, and that no problems are expected from that quarter.

A more pressing question at the moment is this: Do the growers want the 8,000 certified braceros? A full week has passed since the certification decision was announced, and the growers have taken no steps to ask the Immigration and Naturalization Service to admit 8,000 workers. The Immigration and Naturalization Service will react favorably, as will the Mexican Government, but in the meantime a week's time has been lost.

We understand that some of the growers are reluctant to recruit Americans beyond the California borders; this activity would be required of all growers who seek foreign workers.

We are hoping for an early resolution of this question.

If I can offer you additional information, I would be happy to do so.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1965.
Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: By hook or by crook, our tomato growers are getting in some of

the crop. I believe it is possible to be mesmerized however, by the numbers gained with respect to the harvest. Certainly we should keep in mind who's doing the job. The letter I sent to you yesterday showed primarily women and children working. Enclosed herewith is a press release indicating that 200 men from Beale Air Force Base are helping with the harvest there.

As you know, in spite of the fact that we have 400,000 unemployed in California, recruitment efforts are substantially unfruitful. We are now going outside the State to recruit. This, as you know, would be almost impossible for our growers were it not for the canning industry putting up \$750,000.

The State recruiters are leaving over the weekend. Ruben Lopes from Woodland, about whom I have written before from my district, will go to Louisiana. In 10 days we will assess his efforts along with the others and make a report. Meanwhile, our school recruitment efforts continue.

Your numbers said we had 900 young people in Sacramento schools who wanted to work. Our recruitment efforts on Monday could only produce four crews and 120 workers. On Wednesday we picked up 50 more. The local Woodland office could get none. In Vallejo, there was a reported 200 available and we picked up 35. This one association of Yolo growers was short 300 workers yesterday. They are paying 25 cents and up a box for picking which works out at an average rate for a qualified worker almost twice your \$1.40 criteria. In spite of the fact of the shortages prevalent in the association, your tomato school persists.

I understand you attempted to recruit 500 for the school. I believe two-thirds of this number showed up. Where these workers will go after the harvest, no one knows.

I also enclose a statement from western growers which contains a number of conclusions which I have not verified of date. I reiterate the matter continues critical.

I believe more workers should be certified and their introduction into the labor market should be maintained forthwith.

Can you really say that farmers are not cooperating at maximum at this time.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

[From the Appeal-Democrat, Aug. 14, 1965]

HARVEST HELP SOUGHT HERE

Two hundred men from Beale Air Force Base turned out this morning to help harvest Yuba-Sutter area peach and tomato crops and officials and growers still are seeking hundreds more farmworkers for tomorrow and later.

The Marysville office of the State Department of Employment's Farm Labor Service also is seeking applicants for the tomato picker training schools at Davis and will register candidates at 2 p.m. Monday at the office at 301 G Street, Marysville.

Abe Leal, farm labor office manager, said a total of 300 workers were sent out to harvest jobs here this morning and he could have used another 100 to fill harvest crew orders.

Orders from growers have more than doubled since rains brought a variety of problems to ripening crops and Leal said he needs at least 100 peach pickers and 100 tomato pickers for tomorrow morning.

The office will be open from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. tomorrow.

Meanwhile, officials hope to get 100 people from Sacramento Valley areas to participate in the State Department of Employment's training school for tomato pickers. Recruiting also is underway in the bay area for the school, which is designed to provide physically capable pickers for the peak tomato harvest in September.

Leal said registration at 2 p.m. Monday for the school will be for men at least 18 years of age who are self-supporting. Participants

must be ready to leave after registration to stay 2 weeks in Davis. Transportation will be available at the labor office and tomato harvest jobs will be provided at the finish of training, Leal said.

PAY SCALE

The men will be paid \$45 to \$75 per week under the Federal manpower development and training program conducted by Davis School District physical education instructors.

In addition to their salaries while undergoing physical conditioning, the men will receive housing, meals, free transportation and \$1 per day for incidental expenses. The basic salary will depend on the number of dependents each worker has and his work experience over the past 2 years.

The Beale airmen who turned out this morning were assigned principally to Yuba-Sutter area peach-picking jobs, but a few went to the Colusa and Gridley areas to pick tomatoes, Leal said.

Base officials said yesterday that requests for leave would be granted the airmen in an effort to help in the community's efforts to save crops after the unseasonable rain.

[From the Appeal-Democrat, Aug. 14, 1965]

ANOTHER TRY FOR BRACEROS

SACRAMENTO.—California tomato growers have decided to seek new evidence to support their claim that 24,000 Mexican nationals are needed for this season's harvest.

A growers' spokesman said the evidence would be presented to a special three-man advisory panel set up by U.S. Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz to examine petitions for foreign workers.

(The decision was made at a meeting here yesterday attended by representatives of the Northern California Growers Association, Yuba City, and nine other growers associations.)

Wirtz, on recommendation of the panel earlier this week, authorized the importation of 8,000 braceros next month for the harvest.

The growers had sought 24,000 foreign workers while the California Employment Department had suggested to the panel that 16,500 braceros would be sufficient.

The California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, had told the panel that no foreign workers were needed because there was an abundance of domestic workers.

The growers' decision to seek new evidence was reached Friday at a 2-hour meeting attended by officials representing more than 75 percent of the tomato crop.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the Growers Farm Labor Association, Salinas; Watsonville Growers Association; Agricultural Labor Bureau, Fresno; San Joaquin Farm Production Association, Stockton; Dixon Growers Association.

Valley Farm Labor Association, Fairfield; Sacramento Valley Growers Association, Woodland; Yolo Growers, Inc., Woodland; Northern California Growers Association, Yuba City; and the California Tomato Growers' Association, Stockton.

The council of California growers said farm leaders would now hold a series of local strategy meetings to determine the best way to convince the Federal Government that more foreign workers were needed.

WESTERN GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 17, 1965.

Senator GEORGE L. MURPHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Pursuant to your request for factual data, and to an appeal from Merced County tomato growers, we sent an experienced survey team into the area yesterday to make a field check to determine the extent of crop loss due to the shortage of harvest labor.

Our team found that approximately 25 million pounds of ripe tomatoes have already been lost, and that growers will lose at least 60 million pounds before the end of the season.

The survey also disclosed the fact that with almost 4,000 acres of tomatoes ready for cannery harvest in the area, there are only 750 pickers at work. They confirmed the estimate of Vincent Grieco, manager of the Central California Tomato Growers Association, a growers' cooperative, that a total of 3,750 pickers of the inexperienced type now in the field, or about 1,300 braceros, are needed to salvage the crop.

As Mr. Grieco has probably advised you, Merced growers have exhausted all sources of domestic labor recruitment without success, and to make matters worse, they are suffering a daily reduction in their work force. Our team estimates that at the present rate of attrition, their work force will number less than 500 by the end of the week.

Our representatives also found that Merced tomato growers are paying 25 to 30 cents a box, and are meeting Secretary of Labor Wirtz' criteria in every way. But in spite of their appeal to the Department, and to all State and Federal agencies which have repeatedly assured California growers that an adequate supply of domestic labor is available for harvesting our crops, they have had no assistance whatsoever, and this appalling loss of crops continues.

As you perhaps know, the Merced district ships both fresh market and processing tomatoes from the same fields. They are in their cannery pick now, the first district to supply California's huge canning industry.

The cannery price to Merced growers for tomatoes this year is \$34.50 a ton. Our representatives found that including the cost of "back-up" men in the field, such as box spreaders, loaders, truckdrivers and field supervisors, the cost of harvesting is averaging about \$16.00 a ton, leaving but \$18.50 a ton toward the \$350.00 an acre production cost. Ordinarily, these growers depend on their green pick to take care of most of their production costs, but this year the green pick was not substantial.

The Merced district tomato deal is in the hands of small growers, most of them members of a growers' cooperative. The largest grower has a total of 140 acres but most of the growers plant 40 to 80 acres. Last year, from the same acreage and a lower average yield, the 140-acre grower had harvested 2,308 tons of tomatoes up to August 16, while this year, with fields no further advanced, he has harvested but 849 tons. He expects to lose about one-half his crop. His experience is typical among the smaller growers in the district.

In one area, where 4 growers had adjoining fields, our survey team found grower John Giani with 7 pickers for his 50 acres of ripe tomatoes, Leonard Martinelli, with no pickers and 80 acres spoiling fast; John Pesarino with 50 acres and 9 pickers, and Ben Gonella, with a contractor's crew of 40 men and women on 75 acres. However, Gonella's crew were picking only 20-30 tons a day while his records show that last year, with his bracero crew of 25 men, he picked 70 to 80 tons a day, and his field losses due to inexperienced handling of vines and fruit were practically nothing. This year, with domestic labor, most of whom have never been in a tomato field, such losses to all growers have been extremely heavy.

Secretary Wirtz was advised of the Merced tomato growers' needs several weeks ago, and the local farm labor office has had an unfilled order for 1,000 workers for over a month. With no domestic labor available, and growers meeting the criteria, the Labor Department has ignored their request for supplemental labor with the first foreign labor not authorized until September 1. Apparently, Secretary Wirtz has not as yet learned that

perishable crops cannot be turned on and off with an electric switch like a machine.

It was the opinion of our representatives that only immediate action—action this week—can save the Merced growers from further devastating losses. Such assistance can only be authorized from the top. Therefore, your continued interest in this matter is vital.

Warmest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

FRANK W. CASTIGLIONE,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state that in the regular bill, funds were made available to the Employment Service for farm labor activities so that today expenditures can be made in this area of seeking agricultural help. The gentleman from California gave the impression that there were no funds available at the present time. This is not correct. The regular appropriation bill which cleared both Houses last week contains sufficient funds for this purpose.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the colloquy between the two gentlemen from California indicating the seriousness of the agricultural problem in the State of California. I want to reemphasize again that we have the same problem in the State of Michigan and it is also true in many States. However I cannot help but to point out it is quite interesting that this problem results from repeal of Public Law 78 which was advocated by this administration. This was brought on by the policies of this administration. Agriculture is in a very serious condition in many areas of the country just because we failed to extend Public Law 78, a law that had been working well. Any law can be improved in certain areas but we should never, we should never, have repealed Public Law 78. It was a serious mistake. Now, when you make a serious mistake like this, the next thing to do is to try to remedy it. I would certainly hope that the Secretary of Labor has had enough experience with this experiment of trying to use civilian workers, and I am all for using civilian workers as much as possible, but we all knew, those of us who had any experience at all in this field, that it just would not work. As a result of that program, crops have spoiled in California and they are spoiling in Michigan and other areas. What happens? This not only affects the farmer but it affects the packing company employees, and affects the price to the consumer. It is a sad situation which American agriculture finds itself in because Public Law 78 was needlessly repealed.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Has not the Secretary of Labor had the power all year to anticipate this situation and certify a sufficient number of people to harvest these crops?

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman is

exactly correct. The sad situation is the Secretary of Labor appears to be reluctant to use his authority. I talked to his office just yesterday and today, hoping that maybe we could get some foreign labor to come in to do the job. I was advised this morning that the Heinz Pickle Co. does have, coming in tomorrow, some recruits from Puerto Rico, but it is all on an emergency basis. The pickles are on the vines and some of them are too ripe now. This matter has created a very chaotic situation.

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

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

Mr. McFALL. I wish to point out to the gentleman that the problem with the bracero law that we had here was not really a party line matter. I supported the extension of the program, as many of us did and I would like to agree with many of the things that the gentleman has said.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman agree with me now that this experiment has been going on this year and we now find ourselves in this situation, it might be a good idea for the proper committee of the House to reevaluate the necessity of reinstating that law?

Mr. McFALL. I think what is going on now is evidence that some sort of a legislative program is necessary. The Secretary has a very difficult job to try to make a makeshift program on his own initiative.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can appreciate that.

Mr. McFALL. He is trying to do a good job under difficult circumstances.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can appreciate that. I think now that we have had this experience this year, after Congress adjourns it might be advisable for the proper committee of this Congress to go into the field and hold some hearings on the subject and discuss the matter with the packers and with the farmers and with the labor people who have been involved in the program—all of them. So that we can come out with a sensible program, so that the farmers will not have to go through this again. I am afraid of this situation continuing. I know it is happening in my area. Some of the farmers say they will not plant pickles again. This is a \$200-million-plus crop in Michigan. If we lose this crop it will be a very important factor in our economy.

Mr. McFALL. I would support the gentleman in that.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that I disagree strongly with the gentleman from Michigan, who preceded me in the well. I want to announce to the House that at the close of this session of Congress I intend to give a full report on exactly how we stand as far as agricultural labor in this country is concerned, just as I gave a midyear report on June 28. This last report, as you will recall, made very clear that in California we were making excellent progress in recruiting domestic farmworkers and in harvesting the crops, as we were in the rest of the country, in the absence of Public Law 78.

I merely want to say again that I would strongly oppose any renewal of Public Law 78. I have every reason to feel quite optimistic as to what the outcome will be at the end of the year, and I promise the House that in due course, in mid-September or late September, if we are still here, I shall take the opportunity to make known the figures of the September harvest; and I am fully confident that they are going to reflect the same trends that were reflected by the mid-year figures.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I wish I could be as optimistic as is my good friend from California. I think the facts do not bear that out. Let me give you an example of one grower of pickles in that area. He said by August 7, 1964, they had picked 231,000 bushels-plus. On August 7, 1965, they had picked 31,000 bushels-plus. The farmers just cannot stand these so-called good reports.

Mr. COHELAN. I do not know the details of the specific area the gentleman is talking about. I can only tell you that I shall be very glad to analyze any problem in Michigan and go into the utmost detail. We will have the cold facts and figures. But I say to the gentleman again that the figures we last reported in the well of this House, in a full hour colloquy in which we invited all Members to come and criticize if they could; show very clearly that there were only two crops where we had difficulties and they were in California. In these two crops, strawberries and asparagus, the reasons for the difficulties were not entirely over the question of the recruitment of labor. There was some very poor management involved. We also experienced one of the wettest Aprils on record and this knocked out the early crop of strawberries and delayed the asparagus crop. So even if we had not been making a transition in our labor supply there would have been some pretty difficult problems.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have been very close to this problem. I say also for the benefit of my colleagues from California, that I have every confidence in the Secretary of Labor, that he is doing all he possibly can to see that crops do not spoil in the fields. He has said repeatedly that any request for supplementary labor which meets reasonable and established criteria is going to be complied with.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman had some of these farmers in his district he would feel a lot closer to the problem than he does now. We are feeling the heat.

Mr. COHELAN. I feel very strongly about it as well. I have canneries and other related activities in my district that the gentleman has been mentioning and I am just as sincere in my interest in solving this problem as is the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am sure that the gentleman is.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield.

Mr. JOELSON. I would merely like to suggest, that instead of urging renewal of the bracero program some of those who were urging this program would get in back of a program to apply the minimum wage law to farm labor. Then we might be doing something to make farm labor attractive enough economically to bring people into these areas.

Mr. COHELAN. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. As I understand it, we may have the opportunity to vote on such a bill this year and I have already indicated my strong support for this measure.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield.

Mr. GILBERT. May I ask the gentleman from California if he knows whether there is a labor shortage in California?

Mr. COHELAN. As a matter of fact, we have very substantial unemployment in California.

Mr. GILBERT. That is right; so there is a surplus of labor and you certainly can find an adequate number of people to work on these farms if you pay them an adequate wage.

Mr. COHELAN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I would not want to underestimate the difficulty of bringing workers into specific problem areas. But I want to emphasize, in response to the gentleman's point, that we do have an unemployment problem in California and that one of the most important factors in attracting workers to the fields is to pay them a reasonable and decent wage.

Mr. GILBERT. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. MOSS. Obviously, we have an unemployment problem in California and equally obvious is the fact that we have a shortage of agricultural labor. This shortage has been attested to by the panel named by the Secretary of Labor himself and certification upon a showing of need having been made by the Secretary to help alleviate that shortage of agricultural labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. COHELAN by unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. Moss) was granted permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. But in evaluating unemployment and in evaluating the problem of agricultural labor, there are other factors than just rates of salary or wages; would not the gentleman from California agree?

Mr. COHELAN. I agree with the gentleman and I will say to him again that

what he has recited, as far as the California situation is concerned, is accurate. I would merely add that to the very best of my knowledge the labor requirements for California are being monitored on a daily basis, and if the requirements are such that further supplementary labor is needed, I feel very confident that this will be recognized and acted on promptly by the proper authorities.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. The question of minimum wages has been raised, and I shall support, and will at the first opportunity, an extension of a national minimum wage to agriculture. I believe it is long overdue. But it is not going to solve the problems of agricultural labor.

There is no more relevancy to general industrial unemployment as applied to agricultural labor than the injection of the Los Angeles riots by the gentleman from Iowa into the question of agricultural labor. The problems of Los Angeles are many. There are the social problems, the economic problems leading to those riots which are far more complex than simply moving those people out on farms where they are totally unprepared to undertake this type of work.

Mr. COHELAN. I would agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. A part of the reason why we should not recommit this bill is not just because there is money here to recruit labor, but because there are programs attacking some of these far more urgent problems of our day, the complex problems of a rapidly urbanizing society, and they are going to be with us whether we are under the pressure of war or in the happy land of peace.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COHELAN. May I say to the gentleman that I agree with him wholeheartedly when he suggests that the problem of a labor market in transition is a very difficult and often painful process. This bill will help in making the necessary adjustment.

May I say, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, that I rose originally to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL], on his statement and to endorse generally what he had to say. In addition, I wanted to make clear my position in regard to farm labor and to reiterate some of the facts. Certainly, I am opposed to the recommitment of this bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get this away from the pickle-pluckers and the tomato-pickers and back to basic considerations with the simple closing remark that perhaps there are some apple-knockers needed by people either within this building or within a stone's throw thereof, from the \$60 million devastated situation that I

read about in the last Sunday's paper concerning the northern Virginia bounteous apple crop this year; and get back, Mr. Chairman, to a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

I notice in the report of the subcommittee, page 6, the second full paragraph, there is the statement:

Testimony presented during the hearings left a great deal to be desired concerning the cancer, stroke, and heart situation * * *

And this line continues further to the effect that there are four other National Institutes—and I presume that refers to the several Institutes of our National Institutes of Health—

a total of \$20,250,000 but no positions for personnel to carry out these responsibilities.

It says further that the committee was far from satisfied. I would commend the committee on its frank and overt statement about the testimony and the hearings—which I have reviewed—concerning this problem. Is there any question of jurisdiction between the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the House Committee on Education and Labor, or our Appropriations Committee, concerning the appropriation carried herein for the President's so-called stroke, cancer, and heart regional centers in view of the glowing words—supra—concerning the report of the so-called Commission, with all of which I do not agree.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no jurisdictional dispute between this committee and any legislative committee. We are only recommending in this report today what is authorized for the present. This does not take into consideration a bill that is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the so-called stroke and cancer bill that has already passed the Senate and is now before the House committee.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. The authorization he refers to is an authorization for the National Institutes of Health; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not in this bill. We do not have the authority or authorizations in some cases.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman refer to page 6 of the bill and advise me if the four institutes referred to are in the national medical centers: the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart Institute, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, and so forth.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. HALL. I presume from the report and bill that appropriations in those four instances are moneys for proper study and research, and maybe personnel, although the positions are not yet provided, with the intent to set up at a later date further studies and spaces according to the Presidential commission recommendations; is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman feel everything herein appropriated, including that portion of such funds herein as will be used for this purpose, although before a legislative committee, is in fact

germane to this particular appropriation?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is, and when we met with the Senate about 10 days ago we had some funds in their bill that we struck out because it was carried in this bill. We could find no fault with it. The only fault I found was that the administration did not ask for sufficient funds—one hundred and twenty-five million dollars was recommended by the committee, and the President only requested \$43 million. That is the only fault I found, or that I could make.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman knows that in many instances he and I have a common eye toward health service to the people on a quality basis in these activities. Does not the gentleman feel the reason that so-called adequate amounts were not asked for by the administration in the budget was pending the legislative committee establishing what may or may not be necessary in keeping with current medical practice, as far as regional centers and the stroke and cancer propositions are concerned?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. HALL. I am glad to know that this is germane, authorized, and that part of it has been reduced in conference with the other body. I would certainly hope that before this committee comes to the point of appropriating for the other, it takes into complete consideration the statements that might be made by whichever jurisdictional committee authorizes the legislation, in view of having testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the subject, and soon thereafter the chairman was appointed a Federal judge and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service's resignation was accepted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. I would like to say that in all the years the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has been chairman of that committee, and I have had the privilege of being the chairman of this committee, we have never had any difference of opinion as to matters of jurisdiction either on this side or on Mr. HARRIS' side, so far as I know.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say I am very proud of the fact that there has never arisen an occasion where it was necessary for me or other members of our committee to raise a point of order against an item in an appropriation bill due to jurisdictional questions. But I do think probably in view of the questions raised by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri it would be appropriate to advise the House that our committee is considering what is referred to as complexes of the dreaded and deadly diseases of heart, cancer, and stroke. We will probably in the early part of next week, if not on Thursday of this week, start executive sessions on the proposal. I think it should be pointed out that thorough,

careful, and complete hearings have been developed on this proposal. It is an important one and I think you should know that, contrary to the implications that are given by some people, this is not at all a crash program. It will be recalled that in 1937 a Cancer Institute was established for research in this field. In 1946 another institute was set up in connection with heart diseases. Subsequent thereto in 1947 or 1948 other institutes were set up under the NIH. These programs have been going on for the last 15, 18, and 20 years and longer. Remarkable results have been achieved.

What is contemplated now with this proposal is to utilize existing medical schools and institutions in the United States together with categorical centers, together with treatment centers as a complex working together within a unit in order to provide the medical techniques and the new processes that have resulted out of these many, many years of study and research with the medical profession in this country in order to fill this gap from its discovery to its application. That is the purpose of it and I think, notwithstanding the fact that there is some controversy, when it is all accomplished it will be worked out in my judgment on a basis under the regular traditional procedures that the medical profession as well as this Congress have long since adopted. I thought the House should have the benefit of this information.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that I think under the 1937 legislation and under the 1946 legislation creating the Cancer Institute and the Heart Institute respectively, sufficient authority does now exist to establish these complexes. I do not believe our committee would be fully justified in going forward in the establishment of these complexes, however, in view of the bill pending before the legislative committee. But no further legislation is needed since we have several quite similar complexes in existence at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a motion will be made by the gentleman from Wisconsin to return this bill to the full Appropriations Committee.

I submit that nothing will be gained and a great deal will be lost by so doing.

It is not unusual to bring in a supplemental bill like this. The first supplemental bill passed this year was passed January 26. We have had another supplemental bill since then. We will get another one, and it is possible we will get two, if Congress does not adjourn by the end of September. Every

year we have at least two or three supplemental bills, and usually more.

The Manpower Development and Training Act passed the Congress by a substantial margin. It was passed by unanimous vote of the Members of the House. In that way we certainly make some commitment, or make some promise to the people who are interested in programs like this, that the program will be funded. The people have a perfect right to expect the funds and set up machinery to get ready to receive the Federal help.

When we passed the act for elementary and secondary education this year, which was one of the great milestones in Federal aid to education in our country, the House passed it by a majority of 110 votes. It passed the Senate, I believe, by a vote of 73 to 18.

That is a clear mandate upon the members of the Appropriations Committee to handle this bill as promptly as circumstances will permit.

These pieces of legislation were passed in March and April of this year. The requests have been around for a long time. Our committee would have taken care of this before, if the other body had acted more quickly on the regular appropriation bill for 1966. That is the reason why we are here now.

There is nothing not orderly about this.

So far as establishing priorities is concerned, are we going to say now that manpower training is not one of the top priorities in this country? Are we going to say now, and we would be if we send this bill back to the committee, we do not believe that elementary and secondary education is one of the top priorities in this country? Are we going to say now that we will turn our backs on the heart, cancer, and stroke program?

Are we going to say to these people, "We will make you wait just a little longer."

Are we going to say to the superintendents of school systems all over the country, "We are going to make you wait another 5 or 6 or 7 weeks, rather than get this money next week."

The hearings on this bill will start in the Senate tomorrow morning if we pass it today, and it is expected that the bill will be reported to the Senate this week. So these programs for the schools could be funded sometime next week and they would not have to wait until the end of September or sometime in October, when the Congress adjourns.

I have at the desk a county-by-county breakdown of what is going to happen if we return this bill to the full Appropriations Committee. We will not gain a single, solitary thing by recommitting this bill except to delay getting the funds to all of them.

Those who vote to recommit this bill to the full Appropriations Committee will be saying to the people that they doubt the wisdom of the action of the House when it passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They will be saying to the people of the country, "We do not know whether men who are out of work ought to be trained as soon

as possible to fill the jobs that are going unfilled at this time."

This will just delay things. You say, on that side of the aisle, that you have nothing against these programs. Well, if you have nothing against them, why delay the funding for these programs some 5 or 6 weeks? Why waste all this time? Why return this supplemental bill to the full Appropriations Committee?

You know as well as I do, the votes on the subcommittee, and how they would be, 2, 3, 4, or 5 weeks from now. You know what they will be in the full committee. You will not change one vote by returning this supplemental bill to the full Committee on Appropriations. The only thing you are going to accomplish is to cut down on some of the results that we are trying to make available to the people of our country. When we talk about training of manpower, when we talk about health, and when we talk about education, I ask anyone to get on this floor and tell the Members of this House and, yes, the country and the world, what should have greater priority.

Mr. Chairman, recommitting this bill to the Committee on Appropriations would do nothing but delay these programs which provide so basically for our national strength—the education of our people, training of our manpower, and better health for all. The delay might save a few dollars but they would be some of the most costly dollars ever saved. This would be one of the most classic examples of false economy we have ever seen. Everyone expert in the area—the Office of Education, the Department of Labor, one of the leading financial institutions in New York, and so forth—agrees that better education is the major contributor to the increase in our productivity. There can be no less doubt concerning manpower training and the health of our people contributing to our economic advancement.

So anyway you look at it, recommitment of this bill would result in nothing gained and a great deal lost.

I trust that the motion to recommit will be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island is correct. I do intend to offer a straight motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations when the committee rises in just a few moments. As I explained a little earlier this afternoon, the reason for this motion is to give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to consider at one time the \$7 billion—exclusive of Vietnamese war costs—which will be coming to the Committee on Appropriations in the form of supplemental requests.

We have broken the \$100 billion budget ceiling that the President set as a most important guideline for fiscal year 1966. This important guideline which was established in January is just as important, if not more so, at this time.

The gentleman from Rhode Island makes the point that to delay the action on this bill by recommitting it would somehow endanger these programs. I would like to restate for the gentleman

from Rhode Island that the request for this money has been before the Committee on Appropriations since April.

The Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, has said that a target date has been set for adjournment for sometime in September, or in the latter part of the month. I submit to you that we would be fulfilling our obligation as controllers of the purse strings of this Nation to consider all of these supplemental requests at one time so that we will know, and so that the American people will know, just how far we are going in debt in fiscal year 1966.

I point this out to you because each month we are establishing new records as far as the cost of living is concerned. We have, in effect, levied a 5 percent national sales tax in the last 2½ years against the people of this country in the form of decreased purchasing power brought about by Government policy. It seems to me incumbent on the House Committee on Appropriations to review all of these supplemental requests at one time before this Congress adjourns. The administration will continue submitting these requests to the Congress on a piecemeal basis unless we stand up and demand that the executive branch submit at one time for our consideration all of its spending requests. Tomorrow, 25 items are coming to this Congress. The next day, according to the information from the Bureau of the Budget, another 10 items are going to be submitted to this Congress. All of them have been before the Bureau of the Budget for about 3 months, and some of them longer than that.

It seems to me that we should be entitled to a full report on the overall spending proposed by our Government for the fiscal year 1966.

We have had one request for Vietnam in the amount of \$700 million. We have had another one in the amount of \$1.7 billion. We shall have another one in January of at least \$5 billion. And there are Members of the other body, including the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who estimate that this cost will run from \$10 to \$12 billion when we come back here in January.

I, for one, will support these requests of the President of the United States for funding the Vietnamese war. But it seems to me that we must fulfill our responsibility as individual citizens and as Members of Congress, to understand full well in what direction we are taking this country and what we are doing to the dollar value of the people of this Nation.

For that reason it is incumbent, I think, upon every Member to weigh carefully in his own mind whether or not an overall review of spending and of the supplemental requests for 1966 are not called for at this time.

For that reason the motion which I shall make will be a straight motion to recommit, and I solicit your support of this motion.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been able to understand the opposition that we always run into when we have a program that meets the needs of people. I would think that all men and all women would wish the thrill of adventure and the sweet sense of satisfaction in being participants in a climb to the heights of human contentment.

I have been reading the minority report signed by 16 members of the minority, for all of whom I have respect and a large measure of affection. In this minority report we are told to halt the campaign on disease, the campaign for sound bodies and sound minds, the campaign for the things that are most precious and we need the most. We are told to halt all of that because we must give our money to the making of guns and ammunition, and the waging of war.

I am not willing to accept that. I am not willing to surrender the pursuit for happiness and health, and education and employment for everyone, in the Great Society of our dreams and determinations.

It amazes me that 16 men as able—and certainly they all are able—should have advanced the thought that we cannot go forward in the ways of peace because all our money we need for war, which, say they, calls for sacrifices and comes first in our concern.

If all our thoughts we give to war, and all our means we spend in waging and preparing for war, then, Mr. Chairman, I see no hope for the human race in the time of any in this Chamber, of their children and their grandchildren. But if we continue, unafraid and with faith, as we have started, on our war on poverty, ignorance, and disease, then, Mr. Chairman, the peace; the lasting peace, will come as surely as day follows the night.

To turn back now, to beat a hasty retreat from our quest for the blessings of the Great Society, would be the abandonment of the purpose of our national being, for this country of ours was made by hard work and sacrifice and with the blessing and purpose of God to give a richness in man's happiness and welfare and dignity in greater measure than ever had been known.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I can conceive no greater delight than to yield to my respected and beloved friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I hate war and regret that we must be involved in a war in Vietnam. The facts are however that we are and I believe the American people are ready and willing to face up to the terrific costs of this war.

I would like to point out to my friend from Illinois that in the regular appropriation bill which we passed here just 10 days ago, your Committee on Conference increased the President's budget for heart and cancer and dread diseases research by over \$30 million. I believe the Congress has acted wisely in this area. We went beyond the request that the President thought was a prudent one for medical research. And I believe that the

gentleman from Illinois supported these increases recommended by the gentleman from Rhode Island and myself.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my time is running out, and before I am quite out of time I would like to say to my dear friend from Wisconsin that, great as is my respect for him, I prefer to go forward with the gentleman from Rhode Island toward the goals for which we reach rather than to beat a retreat with the gentleman from Wisconsin to the mountains of hollow echoing and the plains of burned out fertility.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who is one of the Republican leaders, are the strangest I have heard in my many years as a Member of this body. The gentleman admits he is for these programs but he is against appropriating for them at the present time. The gentleman is trying to ride two horses going in opposite directions at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, 97 percent of the amount of appropriations provided for in this bill are to carry out commitments that we have made by legislative action, and they are to carry out commitments we have made to the American people. For example, \$126 million is to carry out the manpower training program. About \$1 billion is to carry out the funding of the elementary and secondary school programs that this Congress has passed.

Mr. Chairman, what is more meritorious than those two programs?

What about the other program of heart and cancer research involving about \$43 million?

Mr. Chairman, it is beyond my power of understanding to comprehend any Member who voted for these authorizations in the past voting to postpone the appropriations now.

We are starting a school year within a short while. The appropriation here involve elementary and secondary school systems of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it is just impossible for me to understand how the gentleman from Wisconsin can put himself in the inconsistent position that he has and expect intelligent Members of this body to follow him.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ULLMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10586) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LAIRD. I am at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAIRD moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 263, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

YEAS—139

Abbitt	Elleworth	Minshall
Abernethy	Erlenborn	Moore
Adair	Findley	Morton
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher
Andrews,	Fountain	Nelsen
Glenn	Frelinghuysen	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews,	Fulton, Pa.	Passman
N. Dak.	Fuqua	Pelly
Arends	Gathings	Poff
Ashbrook	Gettys	Pool
Ashmore	Goodell	Quile
Ayres	Gross	Quillen
Bates	Grover	Reid, Ill.
Battin	Gubser	Reifel
Belcher	Gurney	Reinecke
Berry	Haley	Rhodes, Ariz.
Betts	Hall	Rivers, S.C.
Bolton	Halleck	Robison
Bow	Hansen, Idaho	Roudebush
Bray	Harsha	Satterfield
Brock	Harvey, Ind.	Saylor
Broyhill, N.C.	Hébert	Schneebeil
Broyhill, Va.	Henderson	Scott
Buchanan	Herlong	Selden
Byrnes, Wis.	Hutchinson	Shriver
Callaway	Jarman	Skubitz
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Jonas	Smith, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Keith	Smith, Va.
Clancy	King, N.Y.	Springer
Clawson, Del.	Kunkel	Stanton
Collier	Laird	Talcott
Colmer	Langen	Taylor
Conable	Latta	Teague, Calif.
Conte	Lennon	Thomson, Wis.
Corbett	Lipscomb	Tuck
Curtin	Long, La.	Utt
Curtis	McClory	Waggonner
Dague	McCulloch	Walker, Miss.
Davis, Wis.	McDade	Watson
Derwinski	McEwen	Whalley
Devine	McMillan	Whitener
Dickinson	MacGregor	Williams
Dorn	Martin, Ala.	Wilson, Bob
Dowdy	Martin, Nebr.	Wyatt
Duncan, Tenn.	May	Wydler
Edwards, Ala.	Michel	Younger

NAYS—263

Adams	Barrett	Broomfield
Addabbo	Beckworth	Brown, Calif.
Albert	Bel	Burke
Anderson,	Behnett	Burleson
Tenn.	Bingham	Burton, Calif.
Annunzio	Blatnik	Byrne, Pa.
Ashley	Boggs	Callan
Aspinall	Boland	Cameron
Baldwin	Brademas	Carey
Bandstra	Brooks	Casey

Celler	Hollifield	Philbin
Cheif	Horton	Pickle
Clausen,	Hosmer	Pike
Don H.	Howard	Pirnie
Cleveland	Hull	Poage
Cleaver	Hungate	Powell
Cohelan	Huot	Price
Cooley	Ichord	Pucinski
Corman	Irwin	Purcell
Craley	Jacobs	Race
Culver	Jennings	Randall
Cunningham	Joelson	Redlin
Daddario	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Daniels	Johnson, Okla.	Reuss
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Dawson	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, Alaska
de la Garza	Karsten	Roberts
Delaney	Karth	Rodino
Dent	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Colo.
Denton	Kelly	Rogers, Fla.
Diggs	Keogh	Rogers, Tex.
Dingell	King, Calif.	Ronan
Donohue	King, Utah	Roncallo
Dow	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Downing	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Duiski	Krebs	Roosevelt
Duncan, Oreg.	Leggett	Rosenthal
Dwyer	Long, Md.	Rostenkowski
Dyal	Love	Roush
Edmondson	McCarthy	Roysbal
Edwards, Calif.	McDowell	St Germain
Evans, Colo.	McFall	St. Onge
Everett	McGrath	Scheuer
Evins, Tenn.	McVicker	Schisler
Fallon	Macdonald	Schmidhauser
Farbstein	Mackay	Schweiker
Farnley	Mackie	Seerest
Farnum	Madden	Senner
Fasell	Mahon	Shiple
Feighan	Mallard	Sickles
Fino	Marsh	Sikes
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Slack
Flood	Mathias	Smith, Iowa
Fogarty	Matsunaga	Stafford
Foley	Matthews	Staggers
Ford,	Meeds	Stalbaum
William D.	Miller	Steed
Fraser	Mills	Stephens
Friedel	Minish	Stratton
Fulton, Tenn.	Mink	Stubblefield
Gallagher	Mize	Sullivan
Garmatz	Moeller	Sweeney
Giamo	Monagan	Teague, Tex.
Gibbons	Moorhead	Tenzer
Gilligan	Morgan	Thompson, Tex.
Gilbert	Morris	Trimble
Gonzalez	Morrison	Tunney
Grabowski	Morse	Tupper
Gray	Moss	Tufen
Green, Pa.	Multer	Udall
Greigg	Murphy, Ill.	Ullman
Griener	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deertin
Griffin	Murray	Vank
Griffiths	Natcher	Vigorito
Hagen, Calif.	Nedzi	Vivian
Halpern	Nix	Walker, N. Mex.
Hamilton	O'Brien	Watts
Hanley	O'Hara, Ill.	Weltner
Hansen, Iowa	O'Hara, Mich.	White, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski	White, Tex.
Hardy	Olsen, Mont.	Whitten
Harris	Olson, Minn.	Widnall
Harvey, Mich.	O'Neill, Mass.	Willis
Hathaway	Ottinger	Wilson,
Hawkins	Patman	Charles H.
Hays	Patte	Wolf
Hechler	Pepper	Wright
Helstoski	Perkins	Young
Hicks		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—32

Andrews,	Dole	Rumsfeld
George W.	Flynt	Ryan
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Sisk
Bolling	Hagan, Ga.	Thomas
Bonner	Hanna	Thompson, N.J.
Burton, Utah	Holland	Todd
Cabell	Kee	Toll
Cahill	Kornegay	Watkins
Clark	Landrum	Yates
Conyers	Lindsay	
Cramer	Resnick	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Rumsfeld.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Holland with Mr. Dole.
 Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Kee with Mr. George W. Andrews.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Todd.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused. So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 533 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 533

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move 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. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 533 provides for consideration of H.R. 2580,

a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 5 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 2580 is the elimination of the national origins quota system as a basis for selection of immigrants into the United States. This is a substantial change in the present law.

H.R. 2580 establishes a new system of selection for immigrants which is designed to be fair, rational, humane, and in the national interests. Under this system primary preference is based upon the existence of a close family relationship to U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens, and not on the existing basis of birthplace or ancestry. Preference is also provided for those professional people whose services are urgently needed in the United States. Lesser preference is given to aliens capable of filling labor needs. The annual numerical ceiling for all immigrants is 170,000 with a limitation of 20,000 to any 1 country, on a first come, first served basis.

There was no objection to this bill during hearings before the Committee on Rules, although there are differing views on how to accomplish the purposes of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 533.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as explained by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], House Resolution 533 will make in order the consideration of H.R. 2580, an act amending the Immigration and Nationality Act under an open rule, with 5 hours of debate. The committee substitute will be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule.

To replace the quota system, a ceiling of 170,000 immigrants per year from non-Western Hemisphere nations is established. Of this total, no nation may have more than 20,000 places. Exempted from the need to qualify under the requirements placed on these immigrants are parents, spouses, and unmarried minor children of citizens. All others will be accepted on a preference basis which stresses the reuniting of families and the desire to accept professionally qualified individuals such as doctors, scientists, lawyers, artists, and so forth, and other workers skilled and unskilled, whose abilities are needed.

This selection system takes effect on July 1, 1968, when the national origins system is abolished.

Between the enactment of this bill and July 1, 1968, all unused visas will be placed in a pool to allow immigration from countries with oversubscribed quotas. These pool immigrants will be selected under the new preference rules and on July 1, 1968, with the end of the national origins system, the pool will be abolished and all immigrants will then

enter under the preference lists of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is no ceiling on immigration from free Western Hemisphere nations and two new countries are added to that total—Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago.

I expect that an amendment will be offered placing a reasonable ceiling, based upon immigration figures on such immigration.

Testimony before the Committee on Rules indicated how rapidly this immigration is growing. One witness stated that he expected to see in the near future as many as 200,000 per year if some reasonable and fair ceiling is not added.

We have placed such a ceiling on our friends in the rest of the world.

New labor controls are enacted which apply to all immigrants except relative preference and refugees.

The Secretary of Labor under the language in the bill will be required to make a finding in the case individually that immigrants will not take a job for which there is a willing American worker nor upset the wage scales in the area.

Finally, the bill provides that of the 170,000 immigrants, up to 10,200 may be refugees. Thus continuing our policy of accepting those fleeing oppression by totalitarian governments.

My understanding is that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] will offer the amendment I have referred to in connection with the Western Hemisphere to place a maximum ceiling of 115,000 immigrants from these particular Western Hemisphere countries, such ceiling to be exclusive of immediate family members of citizens as is the ceiling for the Eastern Hemisphere.

Before the Rules Committee the testimony was rather joint at that time, the three distinguished gentlemen on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] more or less testified jointly.

Mr. FEIGHAN read a 7-page statement to us which I personally think was excellent. I will not try to take the time to review it, but I would commend it to every Member or at least to listen to the gentleman's testimony as they present this particular bill.

Some of us, Mr. Speaker, like myself as an example, find ourselves in a rather peculiar position here today. Two years ago in the 88th Congress an immigration bill was offered which I read and studied and which I thought was very bad legislation. I so informed my organizations, and people and constituency and I opposed that legislation. The bill introduced originally in this particular Congress, the administration bill as it is so called, was in my opinion likewise as bad as the bill which was introduced in the last Congress. I mentioned my opposition at that time in the news releases and statements before chambers of commerce and other organizations. I now find in reading this particular bill somehow or other this seems to be a reversal. This bill is not much like the originally introduced bad bill I referred to.

Members will notice that the rule provides for substituting this bill as an amendment for the other bill. I believe, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], said to me the other day, this is somewhat like having an automobile and then jacking it up and taking the motor and everything else off it, simply leaving the body or the name of the original, when we compare the difference between the administration bill and this bill.

In fact, I will have to say to the distinguished gentlemen that I am amazed they were able to get together and agree and to be so happy when they came before the Rules Committee.

Particularly I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] who I know have worked extremely hard in trying to bring about this bill and present it to the House.

So far as I am concerned, I would be more than happy to have this bill go over until January, after the recess, so that I personally could go home to explain to my constituents why this bill, in my opinion, is a reasonably good bill; and, if the MacGregor amendment is adopted, with restrictions on the Western Hemisphere, I anticipate that I will vote for the bill.

This is a bill they wish to get through. They have asked for the rule. The rule is before the House today. I know of no objection to the rule.

I personally will support the MacGregor amendment, with regard to restrictions on the Western Hemisphere. I do not see any reason why we should not have restrictions. There has been some indication that we should not hurt the feelings of our friends, but America comes first. We ought to know how many people are coming in, if we are to change our immigration laws at the present time.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I commend the gentleman from California for a very excellent and precise statement covering the present content of the bill, H.R. 2580.

I also thank the gentleman for his references, which were entirely accurate, to the amendment which I will propose during the course of the debate.

This is an amendment which was proposed in the subcommittee and which was adopted in the subcommittee when the subcommittee members were registering their own independent judgments on the matter. But at the 11th hour and 59th minute before the subcommittee approved the bill, my amendment was defeated on a motion to reconsider.

The gentleman is entirely correct when he refers to the fact that without my amendment the bill would continue substantially as is the immigration patterns from the Western Hemisphere with the exception of the Caribbean area.

The gentleman did refer to Jamaica and to Trinidad-Tobago as being countries who will be placed in a highly favored position under the bill as it now

stands; yet it is urged that we put the lid on immigration from our allies such as the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries of Western Europe.

I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill as it now stands not only gives a highly preferential treatment to countries in the Caribbean which have recently acquired their independence but, if it is adopted, it would grant highly preferential treatment to all Caribbean countries which subsequently acquire their independence.

I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the country of British Guiana is certain to obtain independence in the near future. Negotiations with the United Kingdom to accomplish this end are nearly complete.

Second, the country of Barbados is expected by the United Kingdom to acquire independence soon.

Third, British Honduras wants to become independent and at the present time is initiating efforts to accomplish that status.

Further, I state to the House that each of these three countries has a heavily oversubscribed present list of those desiring to enter the United States.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I should like to propound a question which the gentleman from Minnesota might well answer.

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota if it is not true that despite what the gentleman says with reference to what happened in the subcommittee, in the full committee his amendment was decisively beaten?

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, it was obvious that the executive branch had done its work effectively in the full committee, and the members toed the line as they were requested to do by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure the gentleman knows that the members of the Judiciary Committee, of which he is one, and an honored one, usually vote according to their conscience and the dictates of their judgment.

That is invariably a rule in our committee. I do not think we bow down to any so-called superior power.

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the charming gentleman from New York that I would not impugn either his motives or those of the very distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration [Mr. FEIGHAN], nor those of anyone else. However, I simply recite the facts as they appear from the RECORD; namely, that when my motion was considered on its merits, it was adopted. Then subsequently, although the merits remained unchanged, some of the votes were switched.

The Immigration Act, H.R. 2580, makes significant progress in emphasizing our