

HR 10586

night to file a report on the bill (H.R. 10874) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce spouses' annuities by the amount of certain monthly benefits, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the rates of tax under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT ANNUITIES INCREASE

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 14, strike out "Effective" and insert "Effective".

Page 3, line 22, strike out "centum." and insert "centum."

Page 5, strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive.

Page 5, line 16, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert "Sec. 2."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was called up yesterday on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. DANIELS. No, this is an entirely different bill. This bill was passed by the House a couple of weeks ago by a unanimous vote of 394 to 0.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD LAW DAY

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 468.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 468

Whereas 1965 is International Cooperation Year as proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly and the President of the United States;

Whereas this Congress has enacted S. Con. Res. 36 to encourage international cooperation within the framework of law and order; and

Whereas the President has designated September 13, 1965, as World Law Day, a special day for emphasizing the need to strengthen international cooperation through law and legal institutions; and

Whereas September 13, 1965, marks the opening of the Washington World Conference on World Peace Through Law with leading jurists, lawyers, and legal scholars from one hundred and twenty nations meeting in Washington to discuss the development of legal rules and judicial systems for the maintenance of world peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States welcome to their shores the jurists and members of the legal profession of these many nations and will join with them in this important effort to build world peace.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, more than 2,000 judges and lawyers from all over the world will be gathering next week in Washington to explore the possibilities of securing peace through the application of legal principles.

House Concurrent Resolution 468, and 30 identical resolutions introduced by other Members of the House, express the sense of Congress welcoming the conference in its important effort to build world peace.

We cannot hope to fully extend the rule of law into international dealings with a single conference. Yet, the problem of securing world peace is too grave to permit the luxury of skepticism.

A commitment on our part to the principle of world peace through law will not go unnoticed by lawyers and judges of the unaligned nations. We must look forward to the day when all people will recognize the need for law.

It is difficult to imagine our society operating without its prior commitment to law. Yet the rule of law which we have found so essential in our daily affairs is not present in international dealings. The nations of the world, many of whom have the power to destroy civilization, now operate under the rule of force.

Thoughtful people all over the world have recognized the necessity of applying legal principles to international problems. These people now look forward to the Washington conference in hopes that it can advance the cause of international security for the rights of individuals.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the resolution agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1966

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Sept. 8, 1965.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather simple conference report. There are only eight Senate amendments and four of these just involve a rearrangement of the funds for the National Institutes of Health with the increases and decreases exactly balancing each other. With regard to these four, the House had approved the budget as submitted. Actually, our committee had considered a rearrangement somewhat similar to that made by the Senate, but since additional supplementals will likely be considered in connection with the new legislation on heart disease, cancer, and stroke, we decided to reconsider this matter at that time. On the basis of what we considered originally, and additional information the Senate secured during their hearings, we thought that the rearrangement they made was quite logical and the House receded on the four amendments involved.

There were three amendments affecting the appropriation for carrying out the first year under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Senate increase the total by \$184 million over the House allowance, and earmarked this for the basic part of the program under title II of the act of September 30, 1950, as amended by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The third amendment was to provide that payments under this part of the program would be made on the basis of a definite sum, \$1,070,684,000, rather than on the basis of the total amount authorized to be appropriated. The Senate receded on all of these three amendments.

The only other amendment was a general provision that the Senate added to make a restriction on the employment of Federal personnel in the District of Columbia area, which is in the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill for 1966, applicable to the appropriations carried in this supplemental. Since the House had agreed to this proposition in connection with the regular bill the conferees agreed to bring this back in technical disagreement but with the recommendation that the House recede from disagreement to this Senate amendment and concur therein.

Thus Mr. Speaker, if this conference report is adopted the bill will be exactly as it passed the House originally, except for the rearrangement of funds appropriated to the National Institutes of Health and the addition of the general provision that I have just referred to. The conference agreement, in total, is in

the exact amount by which the bill passed the House, \$1,223,181,500, and is \$184 million less than the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report was agreed to unanimously by the managers on the part of the House and I trust will also be agreed to unanimously by the full House.

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

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

Mr. LAIRD. I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Rhode Island. The figures in the conference report are exactly the same, in total, as those in the appropriation bill passed by the House.

The only difference is a reallocation of funds among the National Institutes of Health. That reallocation was made in accordance with a recommendation received from the Director of the National Institutes of Health.

The conference report is a good conference report. The conferees on the part of the House maintained the position of the House on the significant items in disagreement.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and chairman of the managers on the part of the House would explain to the Members in a little more detail the shift in the allocation of public health service funds. It is obvious from the report, referring to amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 6, to saying nothing of No. 7, that there has been a shift in funds. Funds for the National Institute of General Medical Sciences and the Heart Institute have been reduced on the recommendation of the Senate, and funds for the National Cancer Institute have been increased. What is the explanation of that change?

Mr. FOGARTY. The reallocation was based upon the professional judgment of the director, Dr. Shannon. The original budget estimate was submitted some months ago, and since that time we find that one Institute will turn back some 1965 money, and other Institutes were short of money. So there is a shifting of funds in the Institutes.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman advise the Members as to whether, for example, the action of the conferees would involve the curtailment of the work on the artificial heart in the National Institutes of Health?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, it would have no effect on that program at all.

Mr. HALL. For all intents and purposes, it is merely a bookkeeping arrangement based upon carryover funds. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is a major factor.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. I want to assure the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] that it has nothing to do with any curtailment of the artificial heart program. This program has been increased even above the President's budget in our 1966 labor-HEW bill that passed just a few weeks ago. There is no curtailment of that program whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to make the statement that I am not carrying any particular ball for the artificial heart program, but I used it as an example in point, to try to indicate this matter inasmuch as I have been versed on this particular problem.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I could very well in the course of my remarks take 20 or 30 minutes for the things I would like to bring to the attention of the House, but I will let it go at 5 minutes.

THE CLOAK OF SECRECY OR KEPPEL'S CABAL

Mr. Speaker, Federal control of education is here. Not with my vote, but be that as it may, it is here. The foot is in the door and from here on we can expect the door to open wider toward Federal control. One of these years we may wake up and see the only school board member is Uncle Sam, with a Federal check.

We are here today to fund the biggest step yet taken in this direction. Obviously, now that this law is on the books, we have to appropriate money to implement its provisions, but I want to put my colleagues on notice that from here on out, we are going down the road of nationalizing our education system from kindergarten through college.

I have here today proof of how the U.S. Office of Education is insidiously planning complete takeover of the education of our children. Once again the Federal Government has decided it knows how to run our lives better than we do, including the parental responsibility of the education of our children.

There is a cloak of secrecy surrounding the Federal education movement. This represents a departure from the American philosophy of open discussions of problems and plans affecting our people. Supporters of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 have expressed concern over what they call a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement.

This act is flagrantly dishonest in its language and deliberately conceals the extent of the authority it grants. It is a delusion, a mockery, and a snare. The true intent of the Office of Education has been concealed from the public by the use of subtle verbiage.

The evidence I have here today points to the formation of a carefully laid, camouflaged plan to replace the present State-local administration of American

education with Federal direction and control.

The ideology back of this plan has primarily been in the form of hushed-up, off-the-record secret meetings and reports. For example:

First. The proposal by Homer D. Babidge which was published by accident as a Government document entitled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future" and then hastily buried when Congress asked questions.

Second. The off-the-record seminars conducted by Ralph W. Tyler, chairman of the exploratory committee on assessing the progress of education, financed by the Carnegie Corp., held at Mr. Keppel's suggestion—the secretary of this operation, Stephen B. Withey, has refused to answer questions from education writers on the theme and nature of these discussions.

Third. The two task force reports on education headed by John W. Gardner, who has been appointed the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have been withheld from the public by President Johnson.

Why are these kept locked up in some safe, hidden from the eyes of the press and the public? Even the names of the people who worked on these reports are being withheld. One of these reports was done for the Kennedy administration and the other for President Johnson. In the remarks of President Johnson upon the nomination of John W. Gardner to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, he said that:

He was the leader of the President's special task force on education last year that proved the Nation's need with a bold spirit of innovation and imagination. He helped to plant the seedbed of the educational harvest that has been produced by the 89th Congress.

I believe the Congress ought to know what kinds of seeds of "innovation and imagination" have been planted in President Johnson's educational rose garden. I have therefore introduced the following resolution of inquiry:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to transmit to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to the White House Task Force Report on Education written by the committee chaired by John W. Gardner during the Kennedy administration, and the White House Task Force Report on Education written by the committee chaired by John W. Gardner during the present administration.

This background information would permit a more effective examination of the new education legislative proposals and the Federal Government's growing intrusion into education. One of the first important steps toward Federal intrusion into education came through the National Science Foundation, financing curriculum revision. To quote Robert Boyd, Detroit Free Press, January 31, 1965:

Federally financed researchers have developed whole new courses of study-textbooks, education films, teaching guides.

Federal funds are being used to spread these new curricula throughout the public school system with surprising swiftness.

Two in every five high school physics students this year, for example, are using textbooks prepared under Federal auspices.

In mathematics, 1 in 6 students takes federally sponsored courses. In biology, 1 in 10 students is using federally financed texts.

This process of "federalizing" the subject matter of education—not just the bricks and boards that house teachers and pupils—began about the time the Russians orbited their first sputnik.

Like a rocket, it started slowly and at first was limited to "defense" subjects like science, math, and foreign languages.

In the last 2 or 3 years, however, federalization has picked up speed and spread to courses in English, history, social studies and the humanities.

One goal for the future is to design "total English curriculum from kindergarten through college years," according to Dr. Francis Ianni, Chief of Educational Research for the Office of Education.

The plans of those interested in more Federal direction—the centralists—have been greatly advanced by the President's education program already passed by this Congress. Unfortunately for the country, the church-state issue has obscured education proposals in the speeches given by the administration and implemented by these acts—proposals of far greater significance.

Recalling the contributions of the agriculture extension service, Commissioner Keppel advocates an "education extension service." During the Education and Labor Committee hearings in 1965, Mr. Keppel said:

Supplementary services are in a way of spreading—I am tempted to use the agricultural analogy, Mr. Chairman—a way of spreading the new practices that have been developed in these centers throughout school systems in the United States. These are new ideas, sir. Not only are the educational laboratories devised with the purpose of creating new ideas but the laboratories and the supplementary centers are in themselves a sense a new administrative conception being put before this committee for consideration. The Secretary, I know because of our long talks about this, and I have the highest hopes that they will provide the instrument for orderly change built into the public school system, because as you will recall from the Secretary's presentation, every such center must have a public school system at its heart.

Mr. Speaker, this is a veiled attempt to strike at the heartbeat of the local-State control of our education system by putting a tourniquet of Federal direction on our educators. Direction of education, including the making of curricula and curriculum materials will be in the hands of "regional education laboratories" and "model demonstration centers." They will be liberally funded. Government funds will be—and are being—supplemented with funds from foundations staffed with centralist-minded officers.

The "model" for American education will be spun, not out of the minds of men, but out of computers in Washington, D.C. Computers will design what kind of education is needed for the kind of society which the computers say we will have by 1984.

In an address in New York City, William D. Boutwell, editorial vice president of Scholastic Magazines, Inc., described how this is to be done:

Into the computers will be fed large chunks of basic statistics—birth rates, life expectancy, production trends, data on urbanization, cost of living, employment, etc., etc. The computers will spin and out will come data for a "model." The "model" will describe conditions of life in the United States in the future and with this data Commission Keppel and his associates will draft a trial "model" for American education. Using the resources of a number of satellite universities and some State education departments, the Office of Education will then refine this trial "model" or "design" into a firm national model. And then Federal money for subsidies and research plus persuasion will be used to lead or push American schools into a pattern to fit the model.

In the 1966 House HEW appropriations hearings Mr. Mood, Assistant Commissioner of Educational Statistics—page 620 and 621—discussed the statistical model proposal:

This model is simply an arithmetic representation of the educational system, referred to as a model because it hangs together in a multiple-entry bookkeeping sort of system to try to give a comprehensive description of the educational system in such a way that it can be checked and rechecked.

We need all kinds of staff type information about how the (education) system operates in this country in order to make sensible decisions about it.

Ralph W. Tyler, whom I mentioned before, has made an observation about national testing or assessment that is required for such a model in the following manner:

People are evaluating the work of the schools in inadequate fashion and I think a careful effort to make an assessment is a necessary way to provide sound information on which intelligent decisions may be based.

In this regard Mr. Mood refers to "sensible decisions" and Mr. Tyler to "intelligent decisions." Well, I just thought that it might interest the Congress that Mr. Keppel has discussed the "making of decisions" before in the 1966 HEW Appropriations Committee hearings on page 327 as follows:

Clearly every area in which the Office of Education has to make a decision, however narrow, is in that sense moving toward a form of control, of course.

At one of those secret Carnegie Corp. meetings Mr. Keppel has pointed out that although the Office over which he presides celebrates its centennial in 1967, no provision has yet been made for presenting a systematic and qualitative report to the American people on the "condition and progress of American education" as called for in the act of Congress by which the U.S. Office of Education was established in 1867. Since Mr. Keppel apparently is concerned and worried about broadening his ability to make decisions, I must conclude that he is very much interested in "moving toward a form of control, of course."

You know, on page 307 of these same hearings Mr. Keppel explores Federal control a little further. He says:

The danger of Federal control, it seems to me, is the danger of having, in a huge country like ours, 3,000 miles in breadth, centralized in one Cabinet or sub-Cabinet department, a huge enterprise. The total expenditures of the United States for the elementary

and secondary schools being of the order of \$23 billion and then higher education of the order of \$10 billion. So we have \$33 or \$34 billion annual expended.

I share equally the concern of Mr. Keppel. I, too, am worried about a huge enterprise. If we were to divide this \$23 billion among the 50 States and the over 25,000 school districts we would average a total expenditure of less than \$9.2 million for each and every unit. Now when we compare a \$9.2 million enterprise to the \$967 million Federal enterprise it becomes evident that we are talking about a 100-times greater enterprise when we talk about the Federal Government in elementary and secondary education. I doubt many Members would deny that this is a huge enterprise. Now that Mr. Keppel is obviously going to get this "limited investment of funds," if he were here today, what would he say about this? I wish to refer my colleagues to page 320 of the aforementioned hearings, in which he says:

I tend now to think, Mr. MICHEL, and this is I suppose a kind of intellectual confession—in terms of the role of the Federal Government as that of recognizing areas in the educational system, so large as to represent national problems, on which the Federal Government by limited investment of funds can get leverage.

Well, with a fiscal advantage of 100 to 1, I would say that we have given Mr. Keppel pretty good leverage.

The schools in this country have always been operated on a local level by local school boards and I want you all to know that this will soon come to an end if the Office of Education has its way. At the White House Conference on Education, whose Chairman was the now-Secretary Gardner, there were only 2 official school board representatives out of a total of 700. On May 14, in the Rose Garden, President Johnson told 350 school administrators that what this education act finally means to your country "will depend on you, and your school board," but no school board members were present to hear it.

At the Office of Education Regional Information meeting, of the 2,296 participants, only 53 school board members were present. If the administration were only interested in fiscal control, the group to have present in large numbers would be school board members. If, on the other hand, the administration is trying to get its hands involved in the control of education, the group not to have present are the school board members.

At the recent White House Conference on Education a panelist spoke of the board of education as "custodians of the past" rather than "leaders of the future." But this arrogance did not end here. Superintendents were characterized as "complacent champions of the status quo."

But this should not surprise anyone—not when a title of this act—title V—calls for what in essence is a Federal bribe of our educators. We are giving the State departments of education \$17 million to help strengthen them. This is not a matching fund, so we have automatically assured a continuing reliance

by State agencies upon the Federal subsidy after it has become a standard feature of their operation. If this should not be sufficient to induce a subservient status and strengthen further OE's leverage, the regular interchange of personnel with Washington should complete the work of making every State department of education a branch of the U.S. Office of Education. To make matters worse the chief State school officers at a meeting with OE officials, held during the White House Conference on Education, were urged to follow the organizational pattern of the Office of Education. The State departments of education officials are being urged to study the new organizational charts of the Office of Education and set up their departments in a comparable manner.

Certainly, we should all reexamine this legislation. It is my hope that the educators in the United States will take a closer look at Federal aid. I know they must have some questions. So have I.

First. Why are the reports on which planning goes forward denied the people?

Second. Why is the most important legislation affecting education ever offered Congress rushed through the House committee with a 10-day hearing?

Third. Why are there no hearings in the field?

Fourth. Why have the public and the educators not been given time to think and debate this legislation?

Fifth. Why is it that Congressmen, who are charged with the responsibility of legislation, are denied the reports authored by the man who presently heads the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon which the administration admittedly has based its legislative proposals?

Sixth. Is there something to hide?

Yes. Mr. Speaker, I have here the notes of an executive group meeting of the Office of Education, dated August 26, 1965, which fell into my hands through a circuitous route, and I would just like to call your attention to a couple of items.

If we could borrow a bit of "standard operating procedure" of the IRS and "bug" OE's meeting room, just what would we hear?

They are saying that "speculative musings about the future are to be deemphasized. Occasionally a relatively unpublicized activity should be analyzed in depth for the elucidation of all. Candor as to failings is to be just as acceptable as satisfaction with successes."

They are saying "no OE hand is to be tied by having to deal only through a backward State education agency." They are saying that no OE hand is to be tied by "not being able to deal directly with urban jurisdictions" no matter how competent the State education agency is.

I do not appreciate OE's efforts to deemphasize their "speculative musings about the future."

Mr. Speaker, I recommend the following minutes as "must" reading for all my colleagues. I wish to draw your attention particularly to the first two attachments referred to at the beginning

of these notes. I must again ask a question: Why upon request of a Congressman are these not available? Well, since I wholeheartedly agree with the Office of Education that "occasionally a relatively unpublicized activity should be analyzed in depth for the elucidation of all" and to help insure the integrity and candor of the Department on this matter, I have introduced the following resolution of inquiry:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to transmit to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, the full and complete texts of (1) the proposal for the establishment of a National Research and Training Center for State Educational Agency Development, dated August 24, 1965; and (2) a position paper re the Office of Education's future role and responsibilities with large city school districts and State education agencies, dated August 25, 1965.

I must conclude that the true purpose of this Elementary and Secondary Education Act is not to supply more money to the schools, but to give the Federal Government a decisive voice in the makeup of our local school curriculums and systems. As the amounts of Federal funds increase, State and local boards of education will be less and less able to resist the onslaught of Federal pressures.

Mr. Speaker, when I began these remarks I referred to the cloak of secrecy that surrounds the Department of Education's procedures, but perhaps I should have referred to it as "Keppel's Cabal."

The minutes referred to follow:

[Administrative confidential]

NOTES OF EXECUTIVE GROUP MEETING THURSDAY, AUGUST 26, 1965

Present: Flynt, Harris, Ianni, Loomis (chairman), Ludington, Mood, Muirhead, Mylecraine, Reed, and Wood.

Also present, briefly: Fitz Gerald and Hopper.

1. Attachments to those notes only going to people not attending EG meeting.

(1) Proposal for the establishment of a National Research and Training Center for State Educational Agency Development, August 24, 1965.

(2) Position paper re office's future role and responsibilities with large city school districts and State education agencies, August 25, 1965.

(3) Perceptive plan of affirmative actions on equal employment opportunity.

2. FitzGerald (INF) presented the problems he saw in developing OE monthly reports under current working practices. Basically, report content from bureaus was too detailed and mundane, and was arriving on too leisurely a schedule. EG discussed purpose and schedule for bureau and staff office reporting and came up with new approach to be taken effective with submissions covering month of August and ensuing months, to be delivered to INF from here on out by COB of the fifth working day of the new month (in the next instance, September 8).

Briefly, purpose of the OE monthly reporting system is to have a record of important things from outlook of each bureau and staff office, with emphasis on developments that are unique for the given month. Reporting language is to be bright and sufficiently interesting that most of the staff outside of a given bureau or staff office will want to read it. Additionally, the audience should be expected to be staff officers of Government and nongovernment levels outside of OE, such as HEW's Assistant Secretary for Legislation and elements of the NEA or ACE.

[Individual branch or other unit credits are not too necessary; activities are not to be referred to in the parochial "title x" shorthand of OE; and speculative musings about the future are to be deemphasized. Occasionally a relatively unpublicized activity should be analyzed in depth for the elucidation of all.] Candor as to failings is to be just as acceptable as satisfaction with successes. Reports submitted to INF are to bear the mark of a bureau chief's personal contribution and editing.

3. Bureau chiefs to check out status of OE segments being developed for the Secretary's Annual Report which were due to INF by August 16, with the OE package due to HEW by September 17.

4. EG approved perceptive plan of affirmative actions on equal employment opportunity (attachment 3) developed by ad hoc group under chairmanship of Reed.

5. After EG review of SAC recommendation for a National Research and Training Center for State Educational Agency Development (NRTCSEAD) (attachment 1), it was agreed that BR was to assume leadership working with SAC, BHE, and BAVE in developing specifications for curriculum development and overall concepts of training State education agency personnel.

6. General discussion ensued on SAC recommendation that OE deal with urban jurisdictions primarily through State education agencies (attachment 2). EG adopted SAC recommendation more as an eventually possible goal than as an operational decision. Certainly working through State education agencies is to be encouraged, but no OE hand is to be tied by (1) having to deal only through a backward State education agency or (2) not being able to deal directly with urban jurisdictions, however competent the State education agency, when direct relationships seem most in the public interest.

7. Commissioner to be asked to consider advisability of HEW/OE seeking exclusion language for education in authorizing legislation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. ADM (1) to work with SAC and EDH particularly on development of position paper re relationships between OE and the new Department, and (2) to recommend best administrative location in OE of liaison function with the new Department.

8. EG reviewed ADM recommendations for financial management reporting system on all OE operations. The proposals were judged first-rate and are to be adopted, with first demonstration to cover July financial figures just now becoming available.

9. EG members to take a look-see as to OE inventory of private school experience—GS-13's and above who, during the last 10 years, have had at least 2 years work assignment in a private school. Discussion at September 2 EG meeting.

10. EG members, particularly bureau chiefs, to contribute alternative suggestions on amount of operations and degree of program decisions that can be assigned to the field offices. In developing a new concept of field operations, EG is to assume availability of able people in field offices and to ignore restrictive influences that may be associated with current organization or operational procedures. ADM to set schedule leading toward EG consideration by about October 1. When desirable field allocation of resources and responsibilities is known, consideration will be developed of field assignments as a factor in the OE career service.

11. ADM to issue staff announcements covering Commissioner's designation of Paxton Price and Kathryn Bloom as his special advisers in their respective subjects of library affairs and the arts and humanities.

MR. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 7, line 13, insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"Sec. 201. The provisions of section 207 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1966, Public Law 89-156, shall apply to the items contained in this chapter."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote on the conference report and on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tomorrow, September 10, to file the report on the bill S. 2300, the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill of 1965.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 270]

Andrews,	Fuqua	Pirnie
George W.	Gathings	Powell
Ashbrook	Griffin	Purcell
Baring	Griffiths	Reifel
Berry	Hagan, Ga.	Resnick
Bolton	Hanna	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bonner	Hansen, Wash.	Roncalio
Cameron	Harris	Roosevelt
Cederberg	Harsha	Rumsfeld
Chief	Hawkins	Ryan
Clawson, Del.	Hébert	Saylor
Craley	Hungate	Schmidhauser
Culver	Jones, Mo.	Sisk
Daddario	Kee	Smith, Iowa
Derwinski	Kornegay	Smith, N.Y.
Dow	Lindsay	Thomas
Dulski	Long, Md.	Toll
Duncan, Oreg.	McClory	Utt
Farnsley	Mathias	Wilson,
Fisher	May	Charles H.
Flood	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FOREIGN SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 563 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 563

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. 6277) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and 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.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 563 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 6277, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The primary objective of H.R. 6277 is to facilitate the establishment of a single personnel system within each of the three agencies most actively engaged in foreign affairs—the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Agency for International Development. It deliberately excludes all other departments and agencies. These three agencies conduct their activities under two personnel systems—one operating under civil service laws and the other under the Foreign Service Act. The ground rules governing appointments, assignments, promotions, separation, and retirement are different for each system and, to some degree, for each of the agencies. The existence of dual personnel provisions denies the head of each agency the most effective use of the manpower and resources the Congress has voted him.

This bill adds neither jobs nor personnel to the payroll. More positions and more people will not solve administrative difficulties. This bill is based on the premise that voluntary transfer into the Foreign Service personnel system of those now employed under civil service provisions is the most equitable way to effect a transition from a dual to a single personnel structure. It also permits the development of uniform personnel policies among the three agencies while leaving to the heads of those agencies the management control of their own people. Thus it seeks uniformity without unification. In the sense that the bill enables officials to meet their enlarged and complex responsibilities with greater efficiency and a maximum use of their manpower it may be regarded as an economy measure.

H.R. 6277 also includes a small number of amendments to the Foreign Service Act and to other laws that improve the conditions of service for those assigned overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 563.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Broyhill].

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to proceed out of order.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is no subject that has been before the House of Representatives in recent years that has had as much coverage by the local press as the current home rule controversy. No subject has been misrepresented as often by the local press as that subject. I have two recent examples here which appeared in the Washington Post. One is an article of September 8, referring to the report of the House District Committee on this subject, wherein we reported that in addition to the Federal payment the Federal Government spends \$176 million here for various grants and programs, including highway construction. Here is what the Washington Post said, and I quote:

What the report does not point out is highway construction money, impact school aid funds, urban renewal, civil defense, and other funds included in the total are part of Federal aid programs available to all qualifying jurisdictions in the country.

In two places in our committee report we make reference to the fact that some of that money is similar to that which is granted in other communities of the Nation, but there is \$72 million worth of programs peculiar to the District and which does not apply to similar programs in other parts of the country. In fact, in exhibit I in the report, we actually listed the expenditures, item for item, in two categories. How could a newspaper go so far to misrepresent the facts.

Here is an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday where they said, in part, referring to the Federal payment:

The fear that this procedure will be an invitation to the city to tax the Federal Government is misplaced for two reasons. First, the Government would appraise its own property and the assessment would be entirely in Federal hands.

That is completely a downright lie, because the bill provides that the Director of the General Services Administration shall certify the District of Columbia Council's assessment of Federal property. It says nothing about their making any appraisal or assessment. Thus, the Federal Government would in no way be appraising its own property nor would the assessment be entirely in Federal hands.

This is typical of some of the lies the Post is putting out to misrepresent this problem and the pending legislation to the Members of the House of Representatives and to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the Record at this point a clipping from the Washington Post on the first matter

to which I referred and an extract from House report No. 957, which proves the type of misrepresentation about which all of us should be concerned:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 8, 1965]

In addition to the Federal payment, the Government spends \$176 million here for various grants and programs including highway construction.

What the report does not point out is that highway construction money, impact school aid funds, urban renewal, civil defense and other funds included in the total are part of Federal aid programs available to all qualifying jurisdictions in the country.

The truth, extracted from House report No. 957:

Exhibit No. 1 lists the expenditures of Federal funds in the District of Columbia, exclusive of the annual Federal contributions to the District of Columbia general fund and to the city's water and sewer funds, for fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This compilation reveals that such expenditures reached a total in excess of \$176 million in fiscal year 1965; further, while some of these payments are similar in nature to grants made to the various States, more than \$72 million of this total was spent on programs and projects which are not duplicated in any other jurisdiction. When this amount is added to the \$40 million appropriated in 1965 to the District of Columbia funds mentioned above, certainly there can be no justification for any allegation of "neglect" on the part of the Congress.

eralized, and allowances of up to 50 percent of basic pay are made available to those serving in areas subject to hostile activity or physical danger.

Mr. Speaker, this is, as I understand, an administration request. The committee informs us that they spent a long time on the hearings and have added possibly as many as 75 amendments to the bill. They openly stated in all honesty and fairness that this is not a perfect bill but that they think it is a step in the right direction to improve the Foreign Service.

I rather anticipate that many Members have received telegrams, as I have, from various veterans' organizations which object very seriously to eliminating the veterans' preference. In consideration of that, the committee members stated that the veterans' preference is not omitted so far as those in the service presently are concerned; that there is a grandfather clause, and if Members would like to refer to that, it is set forth at the bottom of page 16 and the top of page 17: "except that no officer or employee shall, without his written consent, be transferred under this section."

As I understand that, Mr. Speaker, nobody in the service at the present time may be required to go overseas or give up his preference unless he so requests in writing and desires to do so. It will apply, however, to those in the future who are hired. They may all then be sent overseas.

The committee states that this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman I am sure must know that the reason for this bill is to abolish the Class Act within the State Department and practically all the protective provisions that go with the Class Act. I am sure the gentleman must know that there will be pressure exerted to get employees out of the Class Act and into the Foreign Service. Knowing some of the workings of the State Department, and I am sure the gentleman knows them, too, they are going to get this move made just as rapidly as they can and use all the pressure they can to accomplish that end.

So that whatever indirect and alleged protection there is I say to you that it has little or no meaning.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this observation to those who are present. This is going to be a very controversial piece of legislation. I happen to be proud to be a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am proud of the civil service system that we have. In my opinion and in the opinion of members of our committee on both sides of the aisle, who will speak later, this is a direct slap at our civil service system and it can have very dire consequences.

EXHIBIT 1. FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Expenditures of Federal funds in the District of Columbia, exclusive of Federal payment of the District of Columbia general fund, fiscal years 1964 and 1965

[In thousands of dollars]

	1964 actual	1965 estimate
I. PAYMENTS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO OR FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
Grants for redevelopment and renewal (HHFA).....	8,998	18,186
Urban renewal demonstration project (HHFA).....	206	256
Mass transportation demonstration project (HHFA).....	41	87
Administrative expenses, District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board (Labor).....	1,806	1,900
Civil defense procurement (DOD).....	85	118
Cooperative vocational education allotments (HEW).....	186	137
Advances for disability determinations (HEW).....	116	96
Grants for services for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare (HEW).....	681	782
Grants for programs in disease prevention, treatment, and control, mental health activities, and other public health work (HEW).....	780	1,384
Grant for demonstration project for community mental health centers (NIH).....		400
Grants under Social Security Act for aid to the disabled, dependent children, the blind, and for old-age assistance (HEW).....	10,909	10,268
Grants for manpower development and training activities (HEW).....	647	514
National Defense Education loans and grants (HEW).....	124	100
Advances under vocational rehabilitation program (HEW).....	621	596
Advances for school lunch and milk programs (Agriculture).....	709	802
Federal-aid highway program (Commerce).....	30,402	60,110
Aid to federally impacted school districts.....		4,100
Grant to Neighborhood Youth Corps (Labor).....		2,214
Grants to juvenile delinquency control program: To United Planning Organization (HEW).....	225	1,500
To model school program (Office of Economic Opportunity).....		600
Total.....	56,576	104,150
H. SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA THAT ARE ESSENTIALLY LOCAL IN NATURE		
NCTA (approximately 75 percent of currently proposed transit system is in the District of Columbia).....	750	375
Freedmen's Hospital.....	3,880	4,038
Commission of Fine Arts (approximately 50 percent of workload relates to the District of Columbia generated projects).....	45	60
National Capital Housing Authority.....	43	37
National Capital Planning Commission (approximately 25 percent of workload relates to the District of Columbia generated projects).....	137	155
St. Elizabeths Hospital (difference between cost of service to the District of Columbia residents and amount reimbursed by the District of Columbia).....	3,729	5,510
George Washington University Hospital (construction).....	2,500	
Gallaudet College.....	4,641	2,293
Howard University.....	15,064	11,653
Smithsonian Institution.....	43,367	45,091
U.S. National Park Service (expended in the District of Columbia only).....	2,700	2,950
Total.....	76,856	72,162
Grand total.....	133,432	176,312

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Budget, U.S. National Park Service, and United Planning Organization.

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 stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], House Resolution 563 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 6277, Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the explanation of the rule by the gentleman

from Indiana. I concur and agree with the statements the gentleman made and associate myself with them. In addition, may I add the following information, Mr. Speaker.

H.R. 6277 includes certain amendments which will improve conditions of service for those assigned overseas. These include continuation of medical services beyond the date of death or separation. A 120-day period of treatment for employees and their dependents is permitted from his death or separation. Annual and sick leave benefits are lib-

labor. Appeals were made to the Department of Labor. There was little or no response.

The committee felt that if the farmers of the Nation are to continue to produce their crops, they should be assured of sufficient labor to gather them, particularly when the crops to be gathered cannot be gathered by machine but require hand labor.

It seems to me that is a good provision. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Another proposal that was put in the bill by my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] provides, in effect, that it is the sense of the Congress that if wheat or any of our agricultural products sold abroad on regular commercial terms to anyone, the purchaser should have the privilege of using any bottoms he chooses in order to have the products carried abroad. That provision applies to all commodities. When steel or any other manufactured product is sent abroad, the purchaser usually chooses the ships upon which the goods are carried.

All that the provision does, as I understand, is to make a declaration that it is the sense of Congress that any country abroad that purchases any of our goods, particularly surplus products like wheat, shall be permitted to use such bottoms as it chooses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For purposes of information, are any of the producers of industrial products of this Nation bound by the same obligation to use American bottoms in shipping the goods when sold to foreign countries that is imposed upon the food products of the farmers?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, except that under Public Law 480, there is a provision that 50 percent of all Public Law 480 goods must be shipped in American bottoms. That is the only provision.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So none of the other goods which we manufacture are required to be shipped on American bottoms, except the farmers' products, under Public Law 480?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recall that recently discussions were had on the floor of the Senate concerning the fact that the requirement of shipping in American bottoms raises the cost of our farm products in some instances—of grain, for example—by about 12 to 13 cents a bushel.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that increased price has in some instances placed us in a noncompetitive position.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have lost many sales because of that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The provision about which the Senator is speaking declares it to be the sense of Congress that the President should release farm products from this burden of being carried at an increased cost in American bottoms.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

There is another provision in the miscellaneous portion of the bill, title VII,

which spells out a formula for the distribution of allotted acres in the event of the sale of the farm. That was a provision suggested by my good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I think it is a good provision, and I am sure that my good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will press for it should any opposition develop.

There is another provision that was added, I think by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], which gives authority—it is not mandatory, but gives authority to the Secretary of Agriculture—to purchase dairy products at market prices to meet program requirements for schools, domestic relief distribution, community action, foreign distribution, and other programs, when Commodity Credit Corporation stocks are insufficient.

That, Mr. President, concludes my presentation, and unless there are further questions, I shall yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend to receive a message from the House of Representatives?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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 that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 to the bill and concurred therein.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10586) making supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of September 8, 1965, p. 22278, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the total of the bill as it comes from the committee of conference is \$1,223,181,500, a reduction of \$184 million from the Senate allowance, but the same amount is allowed by the House.

For "Elementary and secondary educational activities" the budget estimate was \$1,295,684,000, of which \$1,070,684,000 was for the basic grants under title I to provide financial assistance to State educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families. The House allowed for the purposes of title I, \$775 million, a reduction of \$295,684,000, but provided that determinations and payments under such title would be made on the basis of the amount authorized to be appropriated, the full entitlements, which is currently estimated to be \$1,170,790,000.

The Senate restored \$184 million of the reduction in funds for title I and provided that the determinations and payments under such title would be made on the basis of the budget request, \$1,070,684,000, with the consequent reduction in the ultimate obligatory authority of approximately \$100 million. The House version was agreed upon by the conference and the managers on the part of the Senate yielded on amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

The Senate had redistributed the funds, \$20,250,000, requested and allowed by the House for the National Institutes of Health for an intensification of work dealing with the problems set out in the report of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. The conferees accepted these four amendments.

The amendment, No. 8, offered by the senior Senator from New Hampshire, adding a general provision making applicable to the HEW items in the pending bill, section 207 of the 1966 general bill is reported in disagreement, but the House managers have moved to recede and concur in the amendment.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to state, as I think the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island, knows, when I signed this conference report on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I did it because I believed the bill must go through, and that perhaps ultimately all the money will be appropriated within the terms of the authorization.

The Senate struck out the proviso that payments under such title shall be on the basis of the amount authorized to be appropriated for such title. The conferees agreed that the House proviso should remain.

As I have stated, I signed the conference report on behalf of myself and my colleagues because I believed the bill had to go through, though I do not personally approve of that provision, because

what it amounts to is contract authority for the administration to spend, in this instance, \$395 million more than the amount appropriated.

If they do, they come back to Congress, and Congress must appropriate what they have spent. I would much prefer to see a larger appropriation, as authorized by the Senate originally, and have the administration come back for any additional money which might properly be spent under the authority. But it is

a technical point, and while I believe in the position of the Senate rather than that of the House, I signed the conference report because I believed that the bill should become law promptly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I might say, not in refutation of what the Senator from Massachusetts has already said, that I, too, would have preferred the version adopted by the Senate. But after all, in conference, we had to reach an agreement, and I understand that the

bill as it now stands is acceptable to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a table showing the supplemental estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference agreement on each item in the bill, H.R. 10586.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, H.R. 10586

H. Doc. No.	Department or agency	Estimates	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference agreement
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION					
211	Manpower development and training activities.....	\$126,070,000	\$126,070,000	\$126,070,000	\$126,070,000
211	Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses.....	27,635,800	27,535,800	27,535,800	27,535,800
211	Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses.....	413,000	363,000	363,000	363,000
211	Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses.....	881,200	844,200	844,200	844,200
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
211	Activities relating to admission and employment in agriculture of nonimmigrant aliens, salaries and expenses.....	1,968,000	1,723,000	1,723,000	1,723,000
Total, Department of Labor.....		156,968,000	156,526,000	156,526,000	156,526,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
149	Elementary and secondary educational activities.....	1,295,684,000	967,000,000	1,151,000,000	967,000,000
149	Research and training.....	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
149	Salaries and expenses.....	4,500,000	4,050,000	4,050,000	4,050,000
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION					
147	Research and training.....	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
147	Salaries and expenses.....	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
147	Chronic diseases and health of the aged.....	14,000,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000
147	Communicable disease activities.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
147	Community health practice and research.....	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
147	National Institute of General Medical Sciences.....	2,200,000	2,200,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
147	National Cancer Institute.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	5,150,000	5,150,000
147	National Heart Institute.....	9,800,000	9,800,000	5,050,000	5,050,000
147	National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.....	4,250,000	4,250,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
ADMINISTRATION ON AGING					
220	Salaries and expenses.....	6,931,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
149	Office of Audit, salaries and expenses.....	200,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
149	Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses.....	95,000	85,500	85,500	85,500
220	National Technical Institute for the Deaf.....	420,000	420,000	420,000	420,000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....		1,396,950,000	1,066,655,500	1,250,655,500	1,066,655,500
Total of the bill.....		1,553,918,000	1,223,181,500	1,407,181,500	1,223,181,500

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the pending farm bill will mean a considerable improvement in existing farm price support programs. However, it leaves much to be desired.

The price support programs, particularly for wheat, feed grains, and cotton, are still more complicated and difficult

for farmers as well as others to understand than they should be.

The level of price support, too, should be higher to help farmers meet the serious situation they find themselves in—that of constant and sharp increases in the cost of operation while farm prices, particularly for wheat and feed grains, are lower today than they were 20 years ago.

I believe most people would like to see some farm price support programs terminated sometime in the future. With our ever-increasing population here in the United States and around the world, the need for food will be so great that some of these programs could be eliminated—that is, if farmers would be provided some protection against the dumping of foreign agricultural commodities in this country.

This is particularly true with reference to sugar and wool of which we import approximately half of our requirements.

The producers of wheat find themselves in perhaps the most difficult position of all producers. Russia and its

satellite countries have a serious wheat deficit and are purchasing huge quantities from Canada and every other surplus-producing country in the world. They are paying for this wheat in hard currencies—including dollars.

If the wheat producers in the United States had access to these markets, as do the Canadians, then the need for wheat price support programs would become far less urgent. Canada recently sold Russia \$450 million worth of wheat at \$1.93 a bushel.

Unfortunately, because of a Presidential order, half of all the wheat shipped to Russia or Russian-bloc countries must be carried in U.S. bottoms. This means a shipping rate for United States produced wheat of from 20 to 30 cents a bushel higher than Canadian wheat. This is enough of a price differential to prevent any U.S. sales.

Mr. President, I can never understand why all of these protests are made against selling wheat to Russia when there is no impediment on any other farm commodity, or most industrial