



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 15, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*You will seek Me and find Me; when you seek Me with all your heart.*—Jeremiah 29: 13.

O Lord, our God, who art ever calling upon us to walk in Thy way, to try Thy truth and to live Thy life, grant that the spirit of our prayer this moment may be acceptable to Thee and our hearts be in harmony with Thy holy will.

Help us to consider carefully our pilgrimage upon this planet, to measure the deeds of the past by our devotion to the present and our dedication for the future. When we think of what we could have done had we given ourselves wholly to Thee we feel humble and are heartily sorry for our misdoings.

In reverence we come to Thee again and lay our supplications before Thee. Help us to right the wrongs we have done to others and give us grace to forgive those who wrong us. Enlighten our minds with truth, enlarge our hearts with love and enlist us in the struggle for justice in our Nation and peace in our world.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles.

H.R. 33. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8794. An act to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1287. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 to carry out the metric system study.

### PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAM SPEECH

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the

OCV—796—Part 10

House for 1 minute and to include the remarks of the President on Vietnam.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's Vietnam speech will stimulate progress toward a peace settlement.

It should convince North Vietnam's leaders that they have nothing to gain by delay or by new military offensives.

Americans have always united behind their President in time of war; now we have the nobler privilege of uniting for peace.

President Nixon has taken his countrymen into his confidence in the great tradition of other American Presidents in time of crisis. President Franklin D. Roosevelt in World War II, President Dwight D. Eisenhower in Korea, and President John F. Kennedy in the Cuban missile crisis rallied the American people.

The President made a number of facts plain—and his firmness in stating these facts should not be lost on North Vietnam and the Vietcong. Those facts are: There will be no large-scale unilateral withdrawal of American troops in the absence of a peace settlement. Peace in South Vietnam must be based on a free choice by the South Vietnamese people of the government they will live under. The Nixon administration has ruled out any idea of seeking a military solution in Vietnam. The other side cannot possibly succeed in imposing a military solution in Vietnam. The United States will not sell out South Vietnam.

President Nixon has set forth a simple formula for peace. He has made it obvious to the other side that there is really only one avenue to peace in South Vietnam—that of national self-determination through free elections.

The President showed himself firm on principle but flexible on means, determined to do all that can be done to bring peace closer and at the same time to do all that must be done to insure that peace, when achieved, is a peace that will last.

This should make "believers" of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

The President's speech was a report to the American people, to North Vietnam, to South Vietnam, and indeed to the world. I believe the American people will respond favorably to the President's quiet appeal for time to build peace on a lasting basis.

I trust Hanoi will show the good sense to negotiate for peace without delay to avoid further destruction and loss of life.

The text of President Nixon's address follows:

### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM ON NATIONWIDE RADIO AND TELEVISION

Good evening, my fellow Americans.

I have asked for this television time tonight to report to you on our most difficult and urgent problem—the war in Vietnam.

Since I took office four months ago, nothing has taken so much of my time and energy as the search for a way to bring lasting peace to Vietnam. I know that some believe I should have ended the war immediately after the inauguration by simply ordering our forces home from Vietnam.

This would have been the easy thing to do. It might have been a popular move. But I would have betrayed my solemn responsibility as President of the United States if I had done so.

I want to end this war. The American people want to end this war. The people of South Vietnam want to end this war. But we want to end it permanently so that the younger brothers of our soldiers in Vietnam will not have to fight in the future in another Vietnam someplace else in the world.

The fact that there is no easy way to end the war does not mean that we have no choice but to let the war drag on with no end in sight.

For four years American boys have been fighting and dying in Vietnam. For 12 months our negotiators have been talking with the other side in Paris. And yet the fighting goes on. The destruction continues. Brave men still die.

The time has come for some new initiatives. Repeating the old formulas and the tired rhetoric of the past is not enough. When Americans are risking their lives in war, it is the responsibility of their leaders to take some risks for peace.

I would like to report to you tonight on some of the things we have been doing in the past four months to bring true peace, and then I would like to make some concrete proposals to speed that day.

Our first step began before inauguration. This was to launch an intensive review of every aspect of the Nation's Vietnam policy. We accepted nothing on faith, we challenged every assumption and every statistic. We made a systematic, serious examination of all the alternatives open to us. We carefully considered recommendations offered both by critics and supporters of past policies.

From the review, it became clear at once that the new Administration faced a set of immediate operational problems.

The other side was preparing for a new offensive.

There was a wide gulf of distrust between Washington and Saigon.

In eight months of talks in Paris, there had been no negotiations directly concerned with a final settlement.

Therefore, we moved on several fronts at once.

We frustrated the attack which was launched in late February. As a result, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong failed to achieve their military objectives.

We restored a close working relationship with Saigon. In the resulting atmosphere of

12645

mutual confidence, President Thieu and his Government have taken important initiatives in the search for a settlement.

We speeded up the strengthening of the South Vietnamese forces. I am glad to report tonight, that as a result, General Abrams told me on Monday that progress in the training program had been excellent, and that apart from any developments that may occur in the negotiations in Paris, that time is approaching when South Vietnamese forces will be able to take over some of the fighting fronts now being manned by Americans.

In weighing alternate courses, we have had to recognize that the situation as it exists today is far different from what it was two years ago or four years ago or ten years ago.

One difference is that we no longer have the choice of not intervening. We have crossed that bridge. There are now more than a half million American troops in Vietnam and 35,000 Americans have lost their lives.

We can have honest debate about whether we should have entered the war in Vietnam. We can have honest debate about how the war has been conducted. But the urgent question today is what to do now that we are there.

Against that background, let me discuss first what we have rejected, and second, what we are prepared to accept.

We have ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield.

We have also ruled out either a one-sided withdrawal from Vietnam, or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised American defeat.

When we assumed the burden of helping defend South Vietnam, millions of South Vietnamese men, women and children placed their trust in us. To abandon them now would risk a massacre that would shock and dismay everyone in the world who values human life.

Abandoning the South Vietnamese people, however, would jeopardize more than lives in South Vietnam. It would threaten our long-term hopes for peace in the world. A great nation cannot renege on its pledges. A great nation must be worthy of trust.

When it comes to maintaining peace, "prestige" is not an empty word. I am not speaking of false pride or bravado—they should have no place in our policies. I speak, rather, of the respect that one nation has for another's integrity in defending its principles and meeting its obligations.

If we simply abandoned our effort in Vietnam, the cause of peace might not survive the damage that would be done to other nations' confidence in our reliability.

Another reason for not withdrawing unilaterally stems from debates within the Communist world between those who argue for a policy of containment or confrontation with the United States, and those who argue against it.

If Hanoi were to succeed in taking over South Vietnam by force—even after the power of the United States had been engaged—it would greatly strengthen those leaders who scorn negotiation, who advocate aggression, who minimize the risks of confrontation with the United States. It would bring peace now but it would enormously increase the danger of a bigger war later.

If we are to move successfully from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation, then we have to demonstrate—at the point at which confrontation is being tested—that confrontation with the United States is costly and unrewarding.

Almost without exception, the leaders of non-Communist Asia have told me that they would consider a one-sided American withdrawal from Vietnam to be a threat to the security of their own nations.

In determining what choices would be acceptable, we have to understand our essential objective in Vietnam: What we want is very little, but very fundamental. We seek

the opportunity for the South Vietnamese people to determine their own political future without outside interference.

Let me put it plainly: What the United States wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing. What North Vietnam wants for South Vietnam is not the important thing. What is important is what the people of South Vietnam want for South Vietnam.

The United States has suffered over a million casualties in four wars in this century. Whatever faults we may have as a nation, we have asked nothing for ourselves in return for those sacrifices. We have been generous toward those whom we have fought. We have helped our former foes as well as our friends in the task of reconstruction. We are proud of this record, and we bring the same attitude in our search for a settlement in Vietnam.

In this spirit, let me be explicit about several points:

We seek no bases in Vietnam.

We seek no military ties.

We are willing to agree to neutrality for South Vietnam if that is what the South Vietnamese people freely choose.

We believe there should be an opportunity for full participation in the political life of South Vietnam by all political elements that are prepared to do so without the use of force or intimidation.

We are prepared to accept any government in South Vietnam that results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese people themselves.

We have no intention of imposing any form of government upon the people of South Vietnam, nor will we be a party to such coercion.

We have no objection to reunification, if that turns out to be what the people of North Vietnam and the people of South Vietnam want; we ask only that the decision reflect the free choice of the people concerned.

At this point, I would like to add a personal word based on many visits to South Vietnam over the past five years. This is the most difficult war in America's history, fought against a ruthless enemy. I am proud of our men who have carried the terrible burden of this war with dignity and courage, despite the division and opposition to the war in the United States. History will record that never have America's fighting men fought more bravely for more unselfish goals than our men in Vietnam. It is our responsibility to see that they have not fought in vain.

In pursuing our limited objective, we insist on no rigid diplomatic formula. Peace could be achieved by a formal negotiated settlement. Peace could be achieved by an informal understanding, provided that the understanding is clear, and that there were adequate assurances that it would be observed. Peace on paper is not as important as peace in fact.

This brings us to the matter of negotiations.

We must recognize that peace in Vietnam cannot be achieved overnight. A war that has raged for many years will require detailed negotiations and cannot be settled by a single stroke.

What kind of a settlement will permit the South Vietnamese people to determine freely their own political future? Such a settlement will require the withdrawal of all non-South Vietnamese forces, including our own, from South Vietnam, and procedures for political choice that give each significant group in South Vietnam a real opportunity to participate in the political life of the nation.

To implement these principles, I reaffirm now our willingness to withdraw our forces on a specified timetable. We ask only that North Vietnam withdraw its forces from South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos into North Vietnam, also in accordance with a timetable.

We include Cambodia and Laos to insure

that these countries would not be used as bases for a renewed war. Our offer provides for a simultaneous start on withdrawal by both sides; for agreement on a mutually acceptable timetable; and for the withdrawal to be accomplished quickly.

The North Vietnamese delegates have been saying in Paris that political issues should be discussed along with military issues, and there must be a political settlement in the South. We do not dispute this, but the military withdrawal involves outside forces, and can, therefore, be properly negotiated by North Vietnam and the United States, with the concurrence of its allies.

The political settlement is an internal matter which ought to be decided among the South Vietnamese, themselves and not imposed by outsiders. However, if our presence at these political negotiations would be helpful, and if the South Vietnamese concerned agreed, we would be willing to participate, along with the representatives of Hanoi, if that also were desired.

Recent statements by President Thieu have gone far toward opening the way to a political settlement. He has publicly declared his government's willingness to discuss a political solution with the National Liberation Front, and has offered free elections. This was a dramatic step forward, a reasonable offer that could lead to a settlement. The South Vietnamese Government has offered to talk without preconditions. I believe the other side should also be willing to talk without preconditions.

The South Vietnamese government recognizes, as we do, that a settlement must permit all persons and groups that are prepared to renounce the use of force to participate freely in the political life of South Vietnam. To be effective, such a settlement would require two things: First, a process that would allow the South Vietnamese people to express their choice; and, second, a guarantee that this process would be a fair one.

We do not insist on a particular form of guarantee. The important thing is that the guarantees should have the confidence of the South Vietnamese people, and that they should be broad enough and strong enough to protect the interests of all major South Vietnamese groups.

This, then, is the outline of the settlement that we seek to negotiate in Paris. Its basic terms are very simple: Mutual withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam, and free choice for the people of South Vietnam. I believe that the long-term interests of peace require that we insist on no less, and that the realities of the situation require that we seek no more.

And now, to make very concrete what I have said, I propose the following specific measures, which seem to me consistent with the principles of all parties. These proposals are made on the basis of full consultation with President Thieu.

As soon as agreement can be reached, all non-South Vietnamese forces would begin withdrawals from South Vietnam.

Over a period of twelve months, by agreed-upon stages, the major portions of all U.S., Allied, and other non-South Vietnamese forces would be withdrawn. At the end of this twelve month period, the remaining U.S., Allied and other non-South Vietnamese forces would move into designated base areas and would not engage in combat operations.

The remaining U.S. and Allied forces would complete their withdrawals as the remaining North Vietnamese forces were withdrawn and returned to North Vietnam.

An international supervisory body, acceptable to both sides, would be created for the purpose of verifying withdrawals, and for any other purposes agreed upon between the two sides.

This international body would begin operating in accordance with an agreed timetable and would participate in arranging supervised cease fires in Vietnam.

As soon as possible after the international body was functioning, elections would be held under agreed procedures and under the supervision of the international body.

Arrangements would be made for the release of prisoners of war on both sides at the earliest possible time.

All parties would agree to observe the Geneva Accords of 1954 regarding South Vietnam and Cambodia, and the Laos Accords of 1962.

I believe this proposal for peace is realistic, and takes account of the legitimate interests of all concerned. It is consistent with President Thieu's six points. It can accommodate the various programs put forth by the other side. We and the Government of South Vietnam are prepared to discuss its details with the other side.

Secretary Rogers is now in Saigon and he will be discussing with President Thieu how, together, we may put forward these proposed measures most usefully in Paris. He will, as well, be consulting with our other Asian allies on these measures while on his Asian trip. However, I would stress that these proposals are not offered on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. We are quite willing to consider other approaches consistent with our principles.

We are willing to talk about anybody's program—Hanoi's four points, the NLF's 10 points—provided it can be made consistent with the very few basic principles I have set forth here.

Despite our disagreement with several of its points, we welcome the fact that the NLF has put forward its first comprehensive program. We are studying that program carefully. However, we cannot ignore the fact that immediately after the offer, the scale of enemy attacks stepped up and American casualties in Vietnam increased.

Let me make one point clear. If the enemy wants peace with the United States, that is not the way to get it.

I have set forth a peace program tonight which is generous in its terms. I have indicated our willingness to consider other proposals. But no greater mistake could be made than to confuse flexibility with weakness or of being reasonable with lack of resolution. I must also make clear, in all candor, that if the needless suffering continues, this will affect other decisions. Nobody has anything to gain by delay.

Reports from Hanoi indicate that the enemy has given up hope for a military victory in South Vietnam, but is counting on a collapse of American will in the United States. There could be no greater error in judgment.

Let me be quite blunt. Our fighting men are not going to be worn down; our mediators are not going to be talked down; and our allies are not going to be let down.

My fellow Americans, I have seen the ugly face of war in Vietnam. I have seen the wounded in field hospitals—American boys, South Vietnamese boys, North Vietnamese boys. They were different in many ways—the color of their skins, their religions, their races, some were enemies; some were friends.

But the differences were small, compared with how they were alike. They were brave men, and they were so young. Their lives—their dreams for the future—had been shattered by a war over which they had no control.

With all the moral authority of the office which I hold, I say that America could have no greater and prouder role than to help to end this war in a way which will bring nearer that day in which we can have a world order in which people can live together in peace and friendship.

I do not criticize those who disagree with me on the conduct of our peace negotiations. And I do not ask unlimited patience from a people whose hopes for peace have too

often been raised and then cruelly dashed over the past four years.

I have tried to present the facts about Vietnam with complete honesty, and I shall continue to do so in my reports to the American people.

Tonight, all I ask is that you consider these facts, and, whatever our differences, that you support a program which can lead to a peace we can live with and a peace we can be proud of. Nothing could have a greater effect in convincing the enemy that he should negotiate in good faith than to see the American people united behind a generous and reasonable peace offer.

In my campaign for the Presidency, I pledged to end this war in a way that would increase our chances to win true and lasting peace in Vietnam, in the Pacific, and in the world. I am determined to keep that pledge. If I fail to do so, I expect the American people to hold me accountable for that failure.

But while I will never raise false expectations, my deepest hope, as I speak to you tonight, is that we shall be able to look back on this day, at this critical turning point when American initiative moved us off dead center and forward to the time when this war would be brought to an end and when we shall be able to devote the unlimited energies and dedication of the American people to the exciting challenges of peace.

Thank you, and good night.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished minority leader in complimenting the President on a great statement which I think will have the support of the American people. I believe also that it will improve the position of our Nation around the world. If it does not bear fruit, the world will know and certainly our own people will know where the responsibility for failure lies. While the speech enunciated certain definite principles, it left open every possible avenue of negotiation, compromise, and settlement. I would like to add—and I think the gentleman will agree with me on this—that while the President made very significant statements in this area, the speech President Johnson made when he announced his refusal to become a candidate for reelection to the Presidency last year was also an important statement and one of the major milestones on the road to an honorable settlement of this very difficult war. Both President Nixon and former President Johnson have made it clear to friend and foe alike that the commitment and the word of the United States are the bonds of the greatest nation in the world. The President is insisting that peace must be the objective of our people and the world; he is also insisting that peace does not mean surrender and that peace without honor is no peace at all.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the President and myself, may I express appreciation for the fine statement of support made by the distinguished majority leader not only on the floor today but also at a meeting held yesterday at the White House with the President. I share with the distinguished majority leader his feeling about the contribution made by former President Johnson through his own with-

drawal from the presidential election in 1968 and his actions during the last 4 years, during a very trying and difficult time. I think all Americans do owe a great debt of gratitude to former President Johnson for his patriotic service. His problems as Commander in Chief were immense but he never shirked his responsibility and I believe his basic decisions were in the best interest of the United States and the free world.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader. I listened, with most Americans and for that matter with most of the world, to the remarks made last evening by President Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, I thought that the President's statement was a very thoughtful one, that it was entirely free of threat or bombast, but he said quite firmly and without equivocation that there would be no unilateral surrender on the part of the United States and that there would be no retreat from the commitments and pledges made by us to the other nations of the world.

He also said that the door was open as wide as it could be opened, as I listened to him, for continued multilateral negotiations. He said, if I remember correctly, that this Government was perfectly willing and anxious to accept and to urge the election of a broadly based government in South Vietnam, representing all elements in that country.

I think the President made a very notable contribution to the cause of peace which is devoutly hoped for by all Americans regardless of party. I commend him upon his speech.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's speech last night was a truly historic one. It was a frank report to the American people that they might know precisely where we are, what we intend to do, and what we might expect in our untiring efforts to bring about an early and honorable settlement of the war in Vietnam.

President Nixon took the people completely into his confidence. I am sure that the people will continue to have confidence in their President.

His speech was not only a report to the American people. It was also a reaffirmation to the peoples of the world that the United States seeks nothing in the sacrifices it and its allies are making other than permanent peace and freedom for all men that they may determine for themselves the kind of government they shall have.

In explicit terms, that there can be no misunderstandings, our President has offered an honorable basis for an honorable settlement of the war in Vietnam.

It was a speech of encouragement as to the progress of the war, but offered no false expectations. We can find encouragement in the fact that the South Vietnamese are rapidly becoming able to defend themselves. Apart from the

proposed mutual withdrawal of the North Vietnamese and United States forces, there can always be a reduction in the number of forces we have there as the South Vietnamese increase in strength.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, at long last Americans have been given an honest, clearcut appraisal of U.S. policy, purpose, and intent. They have been shown a blueprint for peace no reasonable adversary could reject.

Peace, with Richard M. Nixon at the helm, no longer is a remote possibility, puffed up by half-truths and unfulfilled promises. Peace, with honor, has become a distinct probability within the foreseeable future.

I am tremendously proud of the President's courage in picking up a burden he had no responsibility in creating and in the forthright manner in which he intends to reach a solution to what he quite correctly calls "the most difficult war in America's history." I am satisfied that the course of action he presented to the Nation should be acceptable to all but the most intransigent.

For the first time in a long time Americans can take hope.

Our new Commander in Chief has cast aside the proven errors of the last administration. He revealed, last night, that he will not stubbornly cling to policies of gradualism which under the last administration resulted ultimately in the commitment of more than half a million American troops. Let me remind the House that under President Nixon there has been no further escalation of our men, and the plan he presented last night would within a year's time see the safe return home of our troops.

I am pleased with the reception the President's address has received from many on both sides of the aisle. Only a few, who have hung their political hats on immediate and total surrender, have given a reflex-action spate of criticism to the address and such criticism can be discounted by examining its source.

In point of fact, a mighty hope is sweeping the Nation that we have, in just a little less than 4 months, made more strides toward ending the war than in all the 4 years preceding. We have ceased the troop buildup in Southeast Asia. We have made great strides in mending shattered relationships with the South Vietnamese and by so doing, we are increasingly able to turn the fighting over to their military. And, we have broken through the deadlock of silence which had threatened to destroy the Paris peace talks altogether under the last Administration.

President Nixon spoke for each of us last night when he said:

I want to end this war . . . to end it permanently so that the youngest brothers of our soldiers in Vietnam will not have to fight in the future in another Vietnam some place in the world.

He has charted a course which, with the support and cooperation not only of those with whom we are negotiating but of all of us in this country, will lead us to the lasting peace we so fervently desire.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the

President in his historic speech last night demonstrated forcefully to the American people and the world that he is a man completely and passionately committed to the cause of achieving lasting peace.

His proposal for a simultaneous withdrawal of troops by both sides on a mutually acceptable timetable provides a well-reasoned and practical way for our troops and those of our allies to be withdrawn from combat under honorable conditions.

To help see meaningful peace achieved, President Nixon unequivocally stated our desire that the South Vietnamese people be able to freely choose for themselves the type of government they want for their own country.

This provides a clear challenge to Communist objectives in Vietnam and elsewhere, and all peoples of the world will be watching the Communist reaction with great interest.

President Nixon has presented a proposal which we all fervently hope will result in stopping the fighting in Vietnam and in achieving lasting peace. His efforts deserve fullest support.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the eloquent simplicity of President Nixon's address to the American people last night, stating our position in Vietnam, was most gratifying, since it extended the olive branch of peace in the one hand, while holding ready the sword of strength in the other.

The President made it clear, that although this Nation as well as the Republic of South Vietnam desire peace, that the eventual political settlement will have to be made by the South Vietnamese people themselves. I am thankful for his optimism and personal handling.

Mr. Nixon's challenge to the Hanoi government for a mutual pullout of foreign troops over a 12-month period, to be supervised by an international body, should be heartening news to all Americans, those who advocate a "pullout" of our forces and those who want our troops to stay until an honorable victory is won. It was significant that the President acknowledged that the South Vietnamese Army is fast approaching the time when it will be able to take over most of its own defense. It is equally significant that he warned the aggressors that they foil all peaceful purposes by continued attacks on civilians in South Vietnam, and may bring on retaliative measures.

Realizing that the President might have felt compelled to publicly reply to the North Vietnamese as well as keep the American people informed; his statement that he wants to end the war, coupled with the knowledge that there is no easy way to end it, should serve as a rallying point for all Americans to pull together, to let this country speak with one voice to our heartfelt desire for peace, but our determination that there not "be peace at any price."

We join the Nation and indeed the freedom and peace loving peoples of the world, in a prayer for success, justice, honor and peace.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months, the Nixon administration has pressed ahead in an effort to

secure peace in Southeast Asia. Last evening on a national television broadcast the President set forth an eight-point plan as an offer to bring about a settlement of the war. This offer of peace was made knowing full well that more than 12 months of negotiations have resulted in limited progress.

I view the President's message as a communication with two purposes or perhaps more correctly stated, a communication for two audiences. First, the President's direction is toward the negotiating table. I would suspect that some last-minute changes were made after an analysis of the Hanoi 10-point proposal. Even the President's method of delivery, a formal speech, indicates that this message may be viewed as an official statement of position to the representatives of Hanoi. Second, and probably more significant at the present time, by means of this communication, the President was leveling with the people of the United States. The White House is not interested in troop withdrawals just to satisfy the American public. It is interested in pulling out troops in order to lower the level of fighting, to cut down the casualties, and as a sign to everybody that the war is ending.

I see the President's message as a step forward. As for an indication as to what lies ahead—we know now, that the administration is pinning its chief hopes on the Paris talks.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has fulfilled his promise to provide new initiatives in seeking to bring the Vietnam war to an honorable close. The President spoke eloquently, frankly, and courageously in explaining to the American people and to the world our aims and objectives in Vietnam, as well as the means by which peace and stability can be effectively accomplished. The President's thoughtful and straightforward message has been welcomed by citizens throughout the land. It will help further to solidify our Nation's relations with our allies.

In speaking as he did, the President has emphasized a determination to stay with our friends while at the same time we can resolve differences with those nations which are unfriendly.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of our President and of the pattern for peace which he has outlined. I am confident that it merits the overwhelming support of the people of our Nation. In addition, it offers an excellent opportunity for North Vietnam and its allies to demonstrate whether they are truly seeking a peaceful solution to a war which can and should be terminated with the least possible delay.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last night President Nixon presented to the world the reassurance that the Vietnam war holds the highest priority of our Government for solution.

And, in a most positive way, he outlined the U.S. position on ending this grave problem.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud of our President as he spoke, and I was gratified to hear the commentaries that immediately followed the address. There was hardly a voice of dissent as the points for peace outlined by the President were analyzed.

There is conciliation in Mr. Nixon's program for ending the war, and this should be taken as a gesture of faith by the enemy. And, there was honesty for the American people in last night's Presidential address, and that should be accepted with gratification.

The foundation now has been laid, Mr. Speaker, and the next step is to start building for a permanent peace. I trust the wasted propaganda will be set aside in Paris tomorrow and the construction of a world without war will begin.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the President last night appealed for the support of the American people. His goal is peace with honor. He has my support.

Indeed, he will have the support of all thoughtful Americans. The method he has proposed for achieving the goal is one around which all can unite with no violence to any personal principle or standard. Honest men, patriotic men, can reasonably disagree about Vietnam. They may disagree about the cause of the conflict, about the nature of the conflict, about the motivations of the parties involved in the conflict, about the mechanisms of the conflict, about the morality of the conflict, and finally about the techniques of resolving the political aspect of the conflict. But none can disagree about the need to terminate the conflict, and I am convinced few will disagree that the method the President has proposed is at once generous, functional, feasible, and honorable.

If the other side rejects the tender the President has made, they must suffer history's eternal indictment.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's appeal for peace last night was based on realities of the situation and offer an honorable and orderly end to that conflict.

As the President noted, it is futile to argue the pros and cons of our involvement: the fact is that we are involved and have a commitment.

The President's announcement that we will accept the neutralization and unification of Vietnam as long as the South Vietnamese people have the right of self-determination, is reasonable and indicates the United States is sincere in its quest for peace.

At the same time, the President's call for withdrawal of troops within a year by both the allied and North Vietnamese is a fair offer and should be accepted by Hanoi.

It was particularly encouraging to hear President Nixon report that the time may be drawing near when U.S. troop withdrawals will be possible without regard to progress at the Paris peace talks.

I am pleased that the President has given the Nation a candid and frank appraisal of this complex situation, and did not hold out any false or overly optimistic promises such as those that regularly occurred under his predecessor at the White House.

The American people can accept the truth, even if the truth is unpleasant. But, as the President warned, peace will take time even if Hanoi is willing to cooperate.

I believe that Members of Congress and the American people appreciate the President's report and support him

wholeheartedly in the tedious and frustrating task of obtaining a settlement that will insure the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government.

The President has inherited a situation not of his own making, but is laboring with skill and determination to solve it. Let us all support him in his efforts.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended for his candid statement last night on our objectives in Vietnam, and our efforts to bring an honorable and lasting peace to Southeast Asia.

It should please and reassure those Americans who expect their President to speak with candor of this war and of the steps he is taking to, as the President said, "end it permanently so that the younger brothers of our soldiers in Vietnam will not have to fight in the future in another Vietnam someplace in the world."

This was a speech that marks a new momentum in our quest for peace. But our President cannot do the job alone. We can help him, and we must, by uniting behind the generous and reasonable peace offer he has made. If we will do this, it will help to convince the enemy that he should negotiate in good faith to end the war, and not count on a collapse of American will to achieve victory for him.

President Nixon's reasonable and timely approach is a new initiative in propelling the negotiations forward. He has pointed to many approaches that can lead to fruitful negotiations, if the other side is interested in serious negotiation. Our support of the President can demonstrate that serious negotiations are in the interest of all concerned.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the speech of the President on Vietnam last night.

Mr. Nixon's speech represented a new style in official analyses of the Vietnam situation. It was laced with candor.

I would characterize his position as tough but flexible, and he expressed this in such plain language that I believe the North Vietnamese will interpret it that way, too.

Being a longtime advocate of a bilateral staged deescalation plan for ending hostilities I certainly endorse his general outline for stopping the shooting war.

I also agree that cessation of the fighting is a necessary condition to the holding of free elections.

The President asked Americans to stand united at this crucial moment in the negotiations. I join with him in this hope.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in congratulating the President for his clear and concise presentation last night of this country's quest for peace in Vietnam.

The President emphasized what I have stated for sometime. Mainly that the South Vietnamese must assume greater military responsibility for the war. General Abrams obviously is optimistic regarding those prospects. I hope there can be substantial U.S. troop withdrawals from Vietnam in the near future.

President Nixon outlined a fair, reasonable and flexible proposal for peace which we all hope will lead to meaningful progress in the Paris negotiations. He clearly restated American objectives which simply are to guarantee self-determination by the people of South Vietnam. The President emphasized we will accept any government that the people of South Vietnam choose.

He also made it clear that the United States has rejected any attempt to impose a military solution upon Vietnam.

Most important, for the first time in many, many months the American people have received a report from their President outlining this country's objectives in Vietnam and declaring new initiatives designed to end the war.

It is time that we in the Congress and all Americans everywhere unite behind the President in his efforts to obtain an early and honorable peace in Vietnam.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, an honest man, speaking honest words, took the American people into his full confidence last night.

No one listening to his words could doubt that here was a man of peace who would through the spirit of justice bring a true accord amongst dissenting combatants.

President Nixon is striving for the only meaningful peace—one that will endure. A settlement that would encourage future aggression would be a political hoax. Such an arrangement could bring about an all-out war that would strike at our very freedom.

Our President, in his address to his people, did not brandish the sword—neither did he sheathe it. He spoke from the strength of the American forces but he also spoke of his concern for the lives of the American serviceman.

Through our words today, we should impress upon aggression-minded foreign leaders that belligerency will not lead to conquest. One can readily see that some remarks made in this country has misled the enemy into thinking that they had a substantial supporting force here.

Our Chief Executive has demonstrated his faith in the American people. Let us tell the world that we have faith in him—only in this way can we be assured that they too will heed his words.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the President is adopting the policy of taking the American people into his confidence. I have always thought the American people were tough enough and strong enough to stand the truth. I am glad the President feels the same way.

In my opinion, in this speech, the President said what he meant; and I know he means what he says. He clearly outlined to our adversaries that we wanted peace, and that he would do everything honorable to get this peace, but we were not going to surrender, and any thought they might have that America is falling apart is only wishful thinking on their part.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, at long last, the American people have been given a frank and honest appraisal of this country's involvement in Vietnam. This, in my opinion, was the most significant factor in President Nixon's address to the Nation last night. His message was

characterized by the complete candor we have so badly needed.

The President's simple and forthright prescription for peace was an extremely generous one. It was reasonable in its call for mutual withdrawal of troops and the guarantee of South Vietnamese self-determination. Surely no one can doubt, any longer, this Nation's resolve and commitment to peace when President Nixon has staked his personal future on redeeming his campaign pledge "to end this war in a way that would increase our chances to win true and lasting peace in Vietnam, in the Pacific and in the world."

To me, the President's candid and flexible proposal represents a sound basis for an accord. The position of our Government is now clear and unquestionable. We, as Americans, should be grateful for this firm but fair statement of policy by our President. It deserves our united support.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, last night President Nixon reported to the Nation the condition of our commitment to South Vietnam, and significantly, he left the overwhelming impression of his personal dedication to terminate the killing.

At the same time, President Nixon emphatically underscored the United States intent to preserve the integrity of the South Vietnamese Government as selected by those people.

We have been talking in Paris for a year. We will continue to talk, according to the message last night. But President Nixon has made it clear that there must be substantive progress in those talks along the lines set forth.

The conditions for a negotiated peace are reasonable and generous. They are conditions upon which the parties interested in a settlement surely could discuss and agree upon.

President Nixon has placed the burden of reasonableness directly upon the Communist world. Without some sincerity and some flexibility on the part of the Communists in Paris—in future negotiations—our choices will be limited. We have only three alternatives. We can win a military victory. We can pull out. Or, we can achieve a negotiated agreement. President Nixon has offered the latter option to the Communists.

One more important aspect of his speech requires comment. President Nixon set forth the overall Vietnam situation in such clear terms that emotional rhetoric, physical demonstrations, and propaganda pushes, should have no place.

A sincere commitment to peace has been expressed. The American public should unite behind the President and give this commitment sufficient time to be implemented.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and encouraged that President Nixon has provided the American people and the world with an orderly and realistic plan for opening the way to peace in Vietnam. It is something they have been without for many, many years.

It is a firm yet flexible blueprint clearly setting down what is possible and what is not possible. The President has proposed a step-by-step phaseout of the war beginning with mutual withdrawal

of all non-South Vietnamese forces, international supervision of a truce and of free and open elections. This is a coherent and workable proposal.

But even more promising is the President's insistence that we are not wedded unalterably to its details.

He said:

These proposals are not presented on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. We are quite willing to consider other proposals consistent with our principles.

Those principles are quite simple. We will not abandon the people of South Vietnam and we will insist on their right to freely and openly choose their own government. Beyond that we are flexible.

The President's words are more than a blueprint for peace in Southeast Asia. They also recognize the deep divisions the war has caused in our country. They provide an umbrella under which all of us, regardless of our past differences about the war, may come together in a common effort for peace.

In that respect the President said:

We can have honest debate about whether we should have entered the war. We can have honest debate about the past conduct of the war. But the urgent question today is what to do now that we are there, not whether we should have entered on this course, but what is required of us today.

The President's words have provided us all with an opportunity: to end the war, and to end the division that has torn our country. Our responsibility is to make the most of that long-awaited opportunity.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's report to the people on the status of the prospects for peace in Vietnam could not help but lift the hearts of all of us who are weary of this conflict and its drain upon our men and treasure. No one knows better than the President about the long, hard road to peace, and he would be the last person to want to raise any false hopes for an immediate settlement and the imminent return of our troops, but the important aspect of his report was his willingness to "level" with us. We know exactly where this country stands, and we have a better idea than ever before about the position of the North Vietnamese in these vital negotiations. The President left no doubt about the priority his administration has given to this issue. We can be encouraged over the progress which has been made. We may be only inching toward a settlement, but it is apparent there could be a significant breakthrough at any time. When it comes, we can be sure the settlement to follow will be an honorable one and the groundwork will have been laid to prevent other "Vietnams" in the future.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon last night told it like it is. And, in so doing, he leveled the ground and began construction of his pathways to peace and freedom—freedom for the South Vietnamese to live their own lives and freedom for Americans from a costly and unwanted war.

His peace plan was generous and flexible. He referred, not to an "enemy," but to "the other side."

He painted a word picture of people—

North and South Vietnamese and Americans—who are more alike than they are different.

He made perfectly clear that his peace plan was not an absolute; that it was open to negotiation.

Then, the President asked the American people to help him build these pathways to peace and freedom, by presenting a united front.

This was President Nixon's first big step on the path to peace. Let us, the American people, take that step with him.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last night the President articulated for all to hear the American position on Vietnam.

He ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield.

He ruled out a one-sided disengagement from Vietnam or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised defeat.

We seek—

The President said—

the opportunity for the South Vietnamese people to determine their own political future without outside interference.

This includes our willingness, "to agree to neutrality, if that is what the South Vietnamese people freely choose."

While setting forth the American position, including an emphasis on an honorable and lasting peace in Southeast Asia, the President indicated his flexibility. He said:

We insist on no rigid diplomatic formula . . . Peace on paper is not as important as peace in fact.

Throughout his address, the President's tone was one of reasonableness, of a willingness to be flexible in working toward an honorable objective.

Now the time has come for the other side to respond—to show the world whether it is genuinely interested in moving forward, step by step, toward a meaningful agreement that will end the war.

I urge the Members of this body—regardless of party affiliation—to show our support of the President, recognizing that our support could well be that extra ingredient that will convince the enemy that an end of the war can be found only through negotiation.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the President of the United States commit our Nation to a policy of peace, to extend our efforts to end the bloodletting in a far-off corner of Southeast Asia, and we all should be gratified by his words.

Richard M. Nixon becomes the first leader of the American people who has truly spelled out a comprehensive policy in Vietnam since the first American soldier set foot in that land.

He has said to our allies, to our enemies and to us: We are going to be reasonable, and we are going to remain strong. We want nothing for ourselves, we are prepared to give much for others.

His statement gives us the best and most firm base we could possibly have for a strong and united America, mutually determined to do whatever is necessary to leave Vietnam peacefully, leaving be-

hind us a nation capable of shepherding its own flocks.

We must unite behind him, and by ending our own divisiveness, help him to end the divisiveness of the world. Dissent at home has fostered dissent abroad; in the no-policy years behind us, we floundered and growled at each other, and the world listened. A fragmented America has been the chief stumbling block to our efforts at the peace table. Now we need be fragmented no longer.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, last night our great President, Richard M. Nixon, in his nationwide telecast, outlined a comprehensive blueprint for peace in Vietnam. The American people have been waiting for specifics in this critical area, and that is just exactly what the President proposed.

Naturally we will have the usual bland skeptics, particularly among some of the self-proclaimed "experts" in the TV commentator field, that get "nothing dramatically new," or, "same old stuff," and so forth. However, close scrutiny and objective examination of the President's overall remarks reveals a great deal of solid, meaningful policy statements.

The North Vietnamese know what the President means when he proposes mutual and simultaneous withdrawal of all non-South Vietnam troops quickly, and within a period of 12 months. It is clear that an International supervisory verification body would be created with specific functions, based on a timetable, involving a cease-fire, free elections, release of prisoners of war as well as protecting self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

Further, President Nixon removed all doubt about U.S. intentions relative to interference in policymaking or territorial desires. He recognized that the political issues are internal with the North and South Vietnamese, to be resolved by them, with no intervention by America unless requested, and that there should be no preconditions to the talks between the North and South.

Although I did not necessarily detect a "thread of threat" throughout the speech, in my opinion the President made it unmistakably clear and concise that increased attacks by the North certainly were not conducive nor encouraging to peace. As a matter of fact he stated:

If this continues, it will affect other decisions.

Much can be read into these words, and I elect to interpret them in the context of the President's sincere and earnest desire for a peace we can be proud of—negotiate in good faith, follow the blueprint in the interest of humanity, but if the North, for reasons of propaganda, face saving, bad faith, or otherwise, continues or increases military confrontation, our alternatives are limited measurably, and the North Vietnamese and NLF must accept the responsibility for whatever may be the consequences.

Finally, this comprehensive blueprint for peace, must develop immediately from the words to affirmative action and results. No useful purpose can be served by delaying interpretations and analysis and rehashing everything that has been said. With over 35,000 American boys

having made the great sacrifice, there is just one answer. Peace with honor, and now.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, in his speech Wednesday night, President Nixon pronounced what his administration has implied since it came into office and what former President Johnson had implied in the closing months of his administration: that the United States is amenable to a mutual withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Vietnam. What was new in the President's proposal was a blueprint with a time schedule to that end.

His blueprint is comprehensive, his offer generous, stressing only what has been this country's objective all along: free choice for South Vietnam. He has provided a new initiative while promising flexibility in our position. The responsibility for making the next move now rests with Hanoi.

As one columnist noted:

If there is no light at the end of the tunnel yet, there is at least a tunnel.

I join the President in his fervent quest to reach the end of that tunnel.

The President laid his popularity on the line when he said that he expects to be held answerable to posterity if he fails in his search for peace. I believe the American people are convinced of his sincerity and determination to make good on his pledge. For myself, I believe he also has the skill to go down in history as a peacemaker.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was very much encouraged by President Nixon's willingness to be extremely flexible in this matter of peace negotiations and counter proposals. It was most significant that the President indicated a willingness of this government to accept among other solutions a neutralized and/or unified Vietnam with the single proviso that such a condition be established through self-determination of the South Vietnamese people. President Nixon's statement was unambiguous and reflected the desire of the United States and the South Vietnamese Government to separate political and military issues during the current negotiations so that a most speedy arrangement can be achieved for a cease-fire and a mutual reduction of combatants in the area.

With this peace plan, I strongly feel that Mr. Nixon has unequivocally responded to recent proposals by the other side and I am hopeful that his candor will facilitate more meaningful discussions which are required to end this conflict.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's May 14 message to the American people on the regrettable Vietnam conflict was indeed a forthright and statesmanlike appraisal of the situation. It not only provides new avenues of hope for peace in Southeast Asia, but it lays before world opinion our desire and willingness to put down our arms on a good-faith agreement which seeks only the same good faith on the part of our adversaries in return.

The terms for peace which President Nixon set forth can leave no doubt with regard to our singular purpose—that of

insuring the right of the people of South Vietnam to have the free choice of its political destiny. It seems to me that no man who believes in individual rights and human dignity can question this purpose.

Needless to say I endorse President Nixon's Vietnam position and his peace efforts. If the American people will unite behind his program, I believe we can achieve a meaningful peace in Southeast Asia. Surrender or total capitulation at this point appears to be the only alternative—and such a course would not only be a betrayal of our commitment but a shallow and temporary cessation of the conflict which could only invite reprisals, atrocities, and subsequently future war.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's talk to the Nation about Vietnam last night was a refreshing restatement of our goals and aims and those of our allies in that unhappy country—the same now as they have always been—that South Vietnam be allowed to choose its own destiny and that this choice be made by all segments of its population who are willing to forgo force and violence. The conditions for peace set forth by the President are moderate, sensible, and flexible, with plenty of room for face-saving by all parties.

The United States and its allies are meeting the responsibility of leadership in mankind's quest for peace. The tide toward peace is flowing. It is irresistible. A modicum of good will on the part of the hard-pressed North Vietnamese and Vietcong will let them swim with this tide instead of struggling against it.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, like the concerned citizens in my district and those across the Nation, I share the President's paramount concern toward ending the war in Vietnam and achieving a lasting peace.

It is in this light that I would like to comment on one particular portion of the President's remarks last night that I thought were most pertinent in our Nation's quest for peace.

President Nixon said we want to end this war permanently so that the younger brothers of our soldiers in Vietnam will not have to fight in the future in another Vietnam.

Personally, as a veteran of both World War II and the Korean war, I, like all veterans of war, fully appreciate what the President is telling us. In our efforts to effect a peace, we must remember that only a just and honorable settlement will guarantee peace for future generations.

Obviously, there is an easy way, but to simply abandon Vietnam would be to invite the wholesale slaughter of men, women, and children in a human tragedy mindful of other dark chapters of history in other wars. I do not think we want that on the American conscience.

The easy way would also invite, as the President so clearly pointed out, those who believe in aggression to try again—be it in Asia, the Middle East, Europe, or in our own hemisphere. Finally, to simply withdraw would be to repeat the mistakes many have made in the past—the mistakes of our fathers' generation

that led to our generation going to war and the mistakes of our generation that has led our sons and loved ones into this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, in closing his remarks last night, President Nixon said he asked not for patience, that he asked not for partisan unity, he simply asked for support of a program of peace. I intend to give him my strongest possible support in this regard and feel Americans genuinely concerned over a lasting peace will do the same.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, if the fighting in Vietnam is to be ended, and if that nation is to exist as a country free to determine its own destiny, the United States must have strong and wise leadership in pursuit of those goals. President Nixon last night displayed that type of leadership.

The President's proposals are reasonable; they are fair; and they do not break the faith of the 34,000 Americans who have died in Vietnam in their country's determination to throw back the tide of tyranny.

If the Government of North Vietnam is interested in ending the war, and if it truly believes that its agents in the south do in fact represent the majority of the people of South Vietnam, Hanoi can hardly do anything but agree with President Nixon's proposals. His plan offers assurances that, left in peace, the people of South Vietnam would be free to choose any government they wish.

The President has gone more than half way in the quest for peace. He has said we are not going to attempt to impose a military solution of Vietnam's problems. He has offered a plan whereby United States and North Vietnamese forces can mutually withdraw from the south. And he has pointed out that the growing strength of the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam will permit the withdrawal of some U.S. forces as the South Vietnamese gain the capability of defending themselves—regardless of what the Hanoi government may decide.

The Communists cannot reasonably ask for more; they certainly have nothing to gain by prolonging the struggle.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's speech should leave no doubt that he is earnestly seeking an early end to the Vietnam war. He said we are prepared to take risks for peace. I support that position. His emphasis of the need for political settlement and his statement that military victory is not a proper goal validates the position taken by a team of volunteers I led to Vietnam in 1967.

Phased mutual withdrawal and our willingness to accept the results of elections in which all political groups in South Vietnam could participate constitutes an acceptable basis for negotiation.

With Secretary of State Rogers in Saigon and Ambassador Lodge on his way back to Paris, the stage is set for serious and meaningful negotiation. The fact that President Nixon is willing to consider other proposals places us in a better position and holds out more hope for success.

By taking the position expressed by President Nixon, I believe we can get out of Vietnam on an honorable basis, regain our lost prestige, and establish a peace that will be real and genuine.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the returns of my recent congressional questionnaire showed the main concern of my constituents to be the conflict in Vietnam. I am sure this opinion would prevail throughout the rest of our Nation.

I was happy to hear our President speak out, frankly and forthrightly, on this subject last night in his address to the Nation.

President Nixon, in plain language, understandable to all, laid out his proposal for the withdrawal of all foreign troops in Vietnam and the eventual peace between the warring factions.

In language, just as understandable to all, he warned that while striving for peace, this should not be construed as weakness or an unwillingness on the part of America to honor the commitments previously made.

The President showed unusual candor and political courage when he said that if he failed in his quest for a true and lasting peace in Vietnam he expected the American people to hold him accountable for that failure.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud this first truly hopeful sign for peace in Vietnam.

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the President's message clearly outlined in a restrained and statesmanlike manner the objectives of the United States and her allies in Vietnam. It was also a clear offer to North Vietnam of a fair opportunity to end the fighting.

At the same time though, the President made clear that Hanoi will be the loser if it wishes to continue the war.

The proposal for a mutual withdrawal of troops by the North Vietnamese and Americans offers the possibility to save a great number of lives—both American and Vietnamese. It can also insure that the political decision as to what type of government South Vietnam will eventually have—will be left up to the people of South Vietnam.

President Nixon's speech leaves no doubt that the United States will settle for nothing less than a just and honorable peace.

I also think it was the initiative and fresh approaches of President Nixon that made the new approach possible.

Since the President's inauguration we have blunted the enemy's battlefield capability; we have restored our relations with Saigon, and we have taken new initiatives at the Paris peace talks. If these had not been skillfully coordinated there would have been no fresh initiative by the President.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, last night President Nixon issued a call for mutual withdrawal of North Vietnamese and American military forces from South Vietnam. The sincerity and freshness of his appeal should strike a chord of optimism in all of us. Surely the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris and their superiors in Hanoi must realize that all we seek is an honorable end to the fighting.

It will take time for the President's

words to be translated into tangible moves but I believe that the President's call represents the kind of step which serves to clear the air and can place negotiations on a frank and meaningful basis. As President Nixon stated, peace will not come tomorrow. Our patience will still be tried. It is up to Hanoi now to extend its hand. Peace will come just as rapidly as they shall truly want it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President has given the American people a comprehensive and clearcut statement of our Government's objectives in Vietnam, and our desire to bring the war to an early and honorable conclusion. In these efforts the President deserves the support of the American people.

The President's speech last night was both firm and flexible. He reaffirmed his deep desire to bring this war to an end soon—and in a way that will not sow the seeds for future Vietnams. Although counseling patience, Mr. Nixon has laid the basis for meaningful discussions. Let us hope it will serve to move the peace negotiations off dead center.

The President's speech should be recognized as a significant effort at peace-making. To turn this effort into solid accomplishment will require that his message be responded to in the spirit it was offered. Should this response be forthcoming, a giant stride toward peace in Vietnam will have been taken.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon in his address of last evening has again demonstrated to the American public the candor which they can expect from their new Chief Executive.

He has not attempted to fill the American public with false hopes.

Neither has he given our allies in the struggle in Southeast Asia cause for despair.

The President has reassured both the American public and our allies in South Vietnam that America will see the struggle through until the people of South Vietnam can make their own determination as to the type of government which they desire.

At the same time, through his firmness, he has publicly advised the leaders of North Vietnam that peace is available upon honorable terms, but that surrender by the United States does not lie in the future.

I urge my colleagues and the American public to stand beside their President in this difficult hour in American history.

The test now facing the American people is one of will and determination. The question to be settled in the coming months is that of whether or not the will of a democracy of great human and material resources can be broken by the will of a dictator of a small and poverty-ridden country.

I place my hand and heart beside our President and reaffirm that this Nation will not be deterred in its most worthy purposes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker—

I want to end this war. The American people want to end this war. The South Vietnam people want to end this war.

So began the President's statement as he spelled out the allied peace proposals

as the basis for bargaining with the 10-point plan for the NLF.

The President ruled out a purely military solution or a one-sided withdrawal. He said:

We seek no bases in Viet Nam. We insist on no military ties. We are willing to agree to neutrality if that is what the South Viet Nam people freely choose.

In this clear language President Nixon dispelled any thought of American imperialism.

The President opened the way to a new government for South Vietnam either through elections or negotiations. He stated the American position in favor of "full participation in the political life of South Vietnam by all political elements." He opened the door to negotiating the NLF demand for a coalition government by declaring that we had no intention of imposing any form of government on the people of South Vietnam. Implicit is the important assumption that the President's proposals have the agreement of the present South Vietnam Government. Rigidity was avoided in the President's acknowledgement that peace would not require a formal negotiated settlement but that peace could be achieved through informal understanding.

The President's proposal for mutual withdrawal of troops ends the previous U.S. reciprocal requirements made at Manila. It sensibly includes Laos and Cambodia and significantly narrows the area of disagreement.

The fundamental issues of North Vietnam considering the conflict a civil war, the disagreement as to the provincial government before elections or a coalition government following elections remain. However, if the NLF and North Vietnam wish to bargain in good faith, a far narrower stage is set. The President has made a significant contribution to peace.

Mr. Speaker, although each item here is important, the most important consideration is the general tone of President Nixon's speech. Candor and honesty are what the American people rightly demand of their leaders. Candor and honesty is what President Nixon delivered last night—honesty coupled with a realistic appraisal and a workable program to put an end to the bloody conflict that has killed our young men, drained our treasury, and sown the seeds of discord, distrust, and discontent in our great land.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased with the remarks of President Richard Nixon last night on the position of the United States in Vietnam. It should be apparent to all that Mr. Nixon is very serious about bringing the war to a negotiated conclusion as quickly and as fairly as possible.

Hopefully, the conciliatory tone of the speech will mark the new beginning of a general reduction in violence, reduced fighting, and an end to the killing. The recognition that the enemy simply does not respond to unlimited pressure and that all sides must give a little brought initiative to the U.S. position that we have seldom had before.

With the intent of the President clearly

stated that the South Vietnamese are going to take more of the burden on themselves, I look forward, as does President Nixon, to the exciting challenges of peace.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, in an honest, concerned, and thoughtful address to the Nation, has presented a plan for peace in Vietnam which is specific in outline yet flexible in detail, and which is not only reasonable but generous. It contains but two basic points: First, mutual withdrawal of American and of North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam and, in the case of the enemy, also from Laos and Cambodia; and, second, self-determination through a process of free choice by the South Vietnamese people. It is hard to see how anyone can honestly quarrel with propositions so clearly fair and right, and therefore the position thus so clearly set forth ought, in due time and course, to produce real progress toward a satisfactory peace.

It would be naive, however, to suppose that the road ahead will be short or easy. The existence and the extent of any real desire for peace on the part of Hanoi remains to be seen; and the critics at home grow daily more impatient—and this impatience, to some degree, is not entirely hard to understand.

It might be easy, in a way, as the President says, to simply cut and run—to withdraw unilaterally from Vietnam without delay. The prospect ahead, a prospect of protracted negotiation, with continuing casualties, is not a pleasant one. But I submit that the President is pursuing the only responsible course. With 35,000 American dead in Vietnam, with the South Vietnamese led by us to be dependent on us, with the whole picture of the Pacific area and future war or peace in that area at stake, we cannot easily or lightly shirk or shed our responsibilities and simply cut and run. The President has said that he does not ask for unlimited patience; but I think he is entitled at this point in history to have, as he has requested, a united American people behind a reasonable and generous offer for peace.

As one of those people, I, for my part, extend him that support.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it was impressive watching the President of the United States last evening recall the efforts of the past by the United States to achieve realistic world peace. The President strongly stated far reaching goals and realistic objectives for world peace, not merely for a ceasefire in Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese Communists have already been clearly and irrefutably proven the aggressors in this affair. Our involvement is a noble one as we are defending this small country from a brutal military act of aggression, and we are protecting that God given right of self-determination.

It is clear, or should be, to all Americans, that a unilateral withdrawal would result in wholesale slaughter by the Communists and torture of all South Vietnamese who had not been part of the Communist cause. We cannot betray these people, and this proposal by President Nixon hopefully will prove to be

the key to our political logjam on peace in Vietnam.

It was very clear the burden the President is carrying upon his shoulders. It was also clear that he is accepting full responsibility and "expects to be held accountable" for the results. Such earnest effort and dedication by this man deserves the country's total and unified support.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam conflict is basically a political problem and it took us several years to become enmeshed in it. It will take time, patience, self-restraint and a political solution to get out. President Nixon has recognized this most basic fact.

President Nixon, by his courageous and forthright statement last night, has revealed himself to be a creative man of peace. His offer of a mutual withdrawal of American and North Vietnamese forces presents, more clearly than ever before, the administration's efforts to lower the level of fighting and reduce the rate of casualties. This new formulation, and particularly his statements on political settlement between South and North Vietnam open the way to possible agreement and meaningful progress in Paris.

His proposals, generous yet realistic, constitute the most hopeful formula for peace in Vietnam that the world has yet heard. We have not been confronted, as has happened too often in past years, with inflated hopes and false expectations. The difficulties we are faced with in achieving our goals of "a true and lasting peace in Vietnam, in the Pacific, and in the world" have not been minimized. Mr. Nixon has laid it on the line, and pledged himself and his future to "a peace we can live with." We ourselves can do no less than to support him in this endeavor.

As syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft has commented:

The President seems to be moving in the right direction. If there is no light at the end of the tunnel yet, there is at least a tunnel.

I think we can look forward to the glimmer of light with more hope than we have had to date, and ask the consent of my colleagues to present here Mr. Kraft's thoughtful analysis of the potentialities, as well as the problems, that are before us:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 15, 1969]

GIMMICK SOLUTIONS CAST ASIDE AS NIXON RELIES ON NEGOTIATION  
(By Joseph Kraft)

The President is moving to get out of Vietnam via the negotiations route of the Paris peace talks. He is not going for gimmick solutions based on a unilateral American withdrawal that supposedly leaves the fight to a beefed-up South Vietnamese government and army.

That is the chief import of the Vietnam speech delivered by Mr. Nixon to the Nation last night. And that impression, implicit in the text of the speech, is confirmed by last-minute changes which preceded delivery of the speech.

Originally, Mr. Nixon had not planned to give a major speech on Vietnam at all. He has a horror of the long, full-dress television appearance. Up until last weekend, the idea was that he would have a press conference, opened by a short prepared statement on

Vietnam—the same formula he followed in announcing his decision on the ABM, or anti-ballistic missiles.

But over last weekend, the President decided he did not want any blurring of his message by a bunch of questions on troop withdrawal—not to mention such extraneous business as the draft, the Fortas affair or inflation. He wanted to address himself squarely to the negotiations in a way that would be unambiguously understood by the other side. So he chose to make the formal speech.

In the same vein there is the Washington visit of the chief American negotiator at the Paris talks, Henry Cabot Lodge. His visit was not something planned—like the current Saigon visit of Secretary of State William Rogers, or the recent trip to Washington of General Creighton Abrams, the American commander in Vietnam.

On the contrary, Ambassador Lodge was ordered home only after the President had decided on the full-length speech. The reason was to heighten the importance accorded to the Paris negotiations. And, as another little bit of theatrics to the same end, it was arranged for Ambassador Lodge to brief a joint session of the National Security Council and the Cabinet on the Paris negotiations.

Behind this emphasis on the Paris talks are a multitude of considerations, some recent and others of long standing. On the recent side, there was apparently a highly encouraging comment by Le Duc The—the North Vietnamese politburo member and leading Hanoi representative in Paris who returned to the talks early this month after a long period of consultations at home. This comment was not made on any specific point, and its substance is being kept secret. But it is considered by some American officials to be the most positive sign the other side has ever given of serious interest in the Paris negotiations.

Another recent, though less important event was the ten-point proposal put forward by the other side on May 8. The President probably would have made his statement on Vietnam even if there had been no ten-point program. And some aspects of the Communist program—particularly the insistence that it be taken as a package with each part necessary to all the other parts—were decidedly foreboding.

But there was enough favorable content in the program to require long and intensive analysis by the President's personal staff. The analysis turned up hints that the other side might be willing to accept international supervision of peace arrangements that would accord to the present leaders of Saigon some future role in some future South Vietnam. And thus the President's statement, as originally projected, was changed to include a reference to the latest proposals by the other side.

Probably far more significant than either of these recent developments in a view held at the White House since the beginning of the Administration. American civilian and military officials in Saigon and at the Pentagon may believe that there is a good possibility for major improvement in the performance of the South Vietnamese government and army. They may think it feasible to buy time with the American public through a series of unilateral withdrawals of U.S. troops until the day comes when the Saigon regime—stiffened, maybe, by modest American contingent—can stand off the other side.

But that is not the ruling conviction at the White House. The White House has little confidence the South Vietnamese regime can be built into a sturdy barrier against the other side. It is not interested in pulling out American troops merely to fool the American public into supporting a dubious South Vietnamese buildup.

It is interested in pulling out troops in order to lower the level of fighting, to cut down the casualties and as a sign to every-

body that the war is ending. But for a settlement, the Administration is pinning its chief hopes on the Paris talks.

Whether these hopes will be fulfilled is, of course, another matter. The use of a big public speech to advance proposals has about it a show biz element that is not reassuring. Neither is it clear that the Administration will have the cohesion and discipline to hold combat actions in Vietnam to levels consistent with its diplomatic objectives.

Still, the President seems to be moving in the right direction. If there is no light at the end of the tunnel yet, there is at least a tunnel.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has given the Nation an open and honest assessment of the situation in Vietnam and in Paris. He has brought all the problems, conflicts, and considerations out into the open.

As a result of the President's speech to the Nation last night, the United States is no longer bound to a rigid diplomatic formula in Paris. We will agree to neutrality if that is what is necessary. We will accept any form of government that the South Vietnamese people freely choose. We do not object to the principle of reunification of North and South Vietnam.

The President made it very clear that the United States has ruled out the further attempt to impose a military solution on the battlefield. We do not want any military bases in Vietnam. We are willing to withdraw our forces any time the Communists are ready to withdraw theirs. And we welcome the fact of a comprehensive proposal from the Vietcong.

The President, along with every American, wants to end the war in Vietnam. He has committed all the moral authority of the Presidency to that goal. He has spelled out the position of the United States. He has more fully opened the doors to peace.

The President's honest, clear, and candid statement is refreshing after the long line of self-serving propaganda statements that have clouded the atmosphere in Paris and in Vietnam. President Nixon has put all our cards on the table. I commend the President's taking this action and will support his efforts for peace. The next move is up to North Vietnam.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon proved by his remarks last night that he is, indeed, a man of peace. He also made it clear to the Nation that in seeking peace he wants a durable settlement. The President—and the American people—will not be satisfied unless our troops leave Vietnam under terms that will prevent future aggression in Southeast Asia.

I was particularly pleased that Mr. Nixon outlined his eight-point peace plan immediately after Hanoi's 10-point plan was made public. All the cards are now on the round table in Paris; another major step has been taken.

As the President noted last night, the hostilities in Vietnam have been going on for years; we cannot hope to end the fighting overnight. Peace negotiations after Korea proved this, and the Paris talks have so far held true to form. Communist propaganda statements follow Communist propaganda statements, and

it takes a practiced diplomatic ear and a lot of patience to separate what is meaningful from what is meaningless. Finally, I think, we are beginning to make progress.

I earnestly hope all Americans will stand behind the President in his effort to secure a lasting peace, so the horror of Vietnam will not be repeated.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, last night President Nixon outlined a direct and uncomplicated program to end the war. He spelled out our limited goal—self-determination for the people of South Vietnam.

I am hopeful that the North Vietnamese will accept the President's proposal so that we can disengage on an honorable basis and at the same time win for the South Vietnamese the right to determine their own form of government.

In addition to clarifying the framework for discussion in Paris, the President has been very frank with the American people. He has impressed us all with his earnest desire for peace, his intensive search for alternatives, and his desire to keep us informed about the status of the peace talks. This is what we have needed.

I think the President's speech clears the air and sets a good climate for real progress.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's statement to the people on Vietnam was a clearly outlined, specific statement of the American position, free from the morass of rhetoric that has confused and embittered large segments of the American population. Now, instead of qualified guesses as to the American position, the world knows exactly where we stand, and what our negotiating position is. It is far easier to negotiate point by point from a solid proposal, than to debate a hostile adversary from an ephemeral position.

The President has upheld the traditions of democracy by assuring the people of South Vietnam the final decision in the choice of governments for that nation is theirs and theirs alone. He has reaffirmed our position that the South Vietnamese must assume the greater share of the fighting in the war, and he has set a realistic timetable for mutual withdrawal supervised by a mutually acceptable international body. He has matched a definite peace program to the 10-point proposal offered by the other side, and said, in effect, "Let us concentrate on the points of difference."

Perhaps the strongest testament to the correctness of the President's position and the manner in which he spelled it out can be found in the accolades accorded to his speech by people of divergent viewpoints of the war. The so-called hawks and doves have hailed the President and his thoughtful proposal. This rare sign of unanimity will serve to show the Communist powers that we stand behind our President, and that we believe that his position is sound.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has offered, in my opinion, constructive initiatives to achieve peace in South Vietnam. Last night, the American people were told by their President—clearly and candidly—what our Government is doing to end the

war in Vietnam, what our objective is, and how it plans to handle the realities of negotiating an honorable agreement to bring peace to Southeast Asia.

Through the President's statement, the United States and Hanoi know the American goals and objectives. They know how the President hopes to move forward toward a solution of the Vietnam war that will mean not just peace tomorrow, but a peace settlement that will last. He has set forth the principles upon which a peace can be agreed.

The President said:

We seek the opportunity for the South Vietnamese people to determine their own political future without outside interference.

He declared our willingness to agree to neutrality if that is what the South Vietnamese people freely choose.

President Nixon has demonstrated his desire for peace. But, peace depends upon the other side as well. How the Communists respond will be influenced by how we respond to our President. If we support him, it could be a major factor in convincing the enemy that serious negotiations are the only solution.

If the President's proposals are to be effective, the American people must contribute patience and understanding.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the saying that in unity there is strength. Nowhere has this phrase been seen more to be true than in the President's address on peace in Vietnam.

It is the unity of the view expressed, the careful weaving of the old with the new, the dozens of different proposals now sorted and matched and combined into an admirably clear statement—it is all this that gives the President's statement great strength.

The address was precise; it was at once a new departure and a continuation of adherence to basic principles which has always—and will always—mark our Nation's effort for peace.

It centers on a key point: The essential issue is not what we want, or what North Vietnam wants, but what the people of South Vietnam want. This is one of those times when stating the obvious is an act close to genius. It serves to remind all concerned of the basic issue, the central concern, the heart of the matter.

Before now we have had words; but with these words we have an act, an act of political wisdom and humane judgment which will, I am sure, be seen by history as one of the great political acts of our day.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, we all listened with great interest to the President's address on Vietnam last night.

While declining to raise false hopes or appear overly optimistic, President Nixon has, nevertheless, given the most forthright and specific statement of the American bargaining position to date. Many of the administration's proposals—acceptance of a coalition government, withdrawal of foreign troops, and supervision of the post-cease-fire elections by an international body—are reasonably close to the announced peace proposals of the other side so as to provide a sound basis for substantive discussions.

We in Congress should congratulate the President for his reasonableness in staking out this bargaining position. We should further urge him to pursue the reconciliation of his peace plan with that of the NLF with the utmost imagination and sense of compassion for the continuing suffering of the Vietnamese people.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we should take note, in light of the snail's pace of the negotiations thus far, that a workable peace will probably be slow in coming.

The enemy in this conflict is well versed in patience—he has been engaged in the struggle for Southeast Asia since World War II. In addition, the Vietcong are not responsive to the pressures of an electorate. He is willing to bide his time and await favorable developments.

The problem is, to a large degree, complicated by the mind and logic of the enemy. Their leaders are dedicated Communists who are not concerned with the immediate future, and are willing to endure extraordinary hardship to accomplish their objective.

In response to this, the President has rightly made clear the American determination to avoid a hasty settlement. He has outlined a framework for a lasting peace—which, as he told the American public last night, is a slow and deliberate process. President Nixon deserves the support of all Americans in his efforts to bring a workable peace to Southeast Asia.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's Vietnam statement to the American people last evening further emphasized that his major concern is to end the war in Southeast Asia.

While reassuring the people of South Vietnam that the United States will not disgracefully pull out of Vietnam unilaterally, he did hold out promise that the time was approaching when South Vietnamese soldiers could replace American soldiers on the battlefield. The President's two-pronged plan for mutual withdrawal and free elections in Vietnam is justified and reasonable and I hope his proposal will be accepted by the North Vietnamese.

As mentioned in the President's statement, the American people are growing impatient with this war especially since American boys are losing their lives. The Paris peace talks began over a year ago and the number of American lives lost in Vietnam is now approaching 35,000.

I admire the strength and courage shown by President Nixon in exerting every effort to end this vicious drawn-out conflict. It is my sincere hope that the American people will unite behind the President and pledge their confidence and support in his attempt to find a reasonable settlement to this war.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, last night the President gave to the Nation and the world the most forthright statement on our Vietnam policy that has ever come from the White House. It was an excellent presentation, one that placed the cards on the table for all to see.

There were no promises, no optimistic predictions, just plain, simple talk that was easily understood. It was the personification of credibility.

The leader of this great Nation has stressed the determination of America to achieve a just and honorable peace in Vietnam at the earliest possible date. He has emphasized our will to gain this worthy goal. He has outlined a workable plan, deserving of immediate study and a favorable response from the negotiators in Paris. He has emphasized our willingness to cooperate. We will remain sufficiently flexible on procedures but firm on principles.

Last night our President was a symbol of leadership; forthright, sincere, flexible, determined, credible, and realistic. May the leaders of the Hanoi government and all governments around the world respond in kind.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has ever been involved in negotiations—in labor, in business, in international affairs—knows two principles must be followed if success is to be achieved.

First, you must narrow down the areas of disagreement. Then you must open up new approaches to solutions which permit both sides to move away from frozen positions.

The President has followed these procedures in developing his peace plan. The Nixon plan strips the issue down to its bare essential—the freedom of the South Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government. That is bedrock. Furthermore, it is a position both sides can adopt as their own.

Next, the Nixon plan opens the door to a room with a dozen other doors to peace. He insists on no particular approach, although he offers a sound one. He provides some "give" in the rigid formulas of negotiation—some facesavers, some ways out of a deadlock which do not require surrender by either side.

The President's proposals offer a sound basis for negotiation. His offer represents a practical approach to the solution of the greatest problem in the world today. Here is strong evidence of a President interested in getting results—no saber rattling, begging or sloganeering, but rather pragmatic reasoning.

In my view, this is the way out of the morass in Vietnam. The President holds firmly to his principles, and offers a variety of solutions to the other side. This is the way to bring about a peace we all can honor.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the American peoples—for whom peace in Vietnam must be the Nation's most immediate objective—have reason to be more hopeful about the prospects and more confident of American leadership as a result of President Nixon's address to the country last night.

While many of us had hoped for something more positive in terms of deescalating the fighting in Vietnam and providing for an initial withdrawal of some American forces, there was, nevertheless, much that was encouraging in the President's speech.

Conciliatory in tone, constructive in approach, flexible in its terms, the President's policy statement—his first comprehensive statement on Vietnam, it should be noted—will, at the very least, contribute to greater progress of the Paris negotiations. It was the kind of

speech designed to carry on the dialog and elicit further response from the other side.

What that response will be, we can only speculate. But the President has clearly moved the U.S. position forward. He has ruled out a purely military solution to the war in Vietnam. He has committed the United States to the acceptance of the results of elections in South Vietnam, so long as they are free and fair and represent the will of a majority of the South Vietnamese people. And he has agreed to consider alternative proposals from the North Vietnamese.

Of special significance to me, in view of my own often-stated position, was the President's openness to the possibility of a mutual cease-fire in Vietnam, his proposal for a mutually acceptable international team to supervise a cease-fire or the withdrawal of forces, and his specific proposal for the phased withdrawal of all outside forces within a given period of time.

The President's speech, Mr. Speaker, has brought us inevitably to what we all must earnestly hope will be the next step—an early next step—an end to, or a substantial reduction in the scale of the fighting in Vietnam. That beleaguered nation has suffered too much and we ourselves have spent too freely of our human and physical resources to permit the war to continue a single unnecessary day.

The fact that the President expressly recognized the vastness of the human suffering which this lamentable war has cost to all concerned gives me, personally, greater hope for the future than I have had in many, many months.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President for his forthright statement on the Vietnam conflict. It was a hopeful statement as well as a realistic statement. By putting the success of his administration on the line relative to peace, he has proved his sincerity.

Now, whether this peace formula, which is reasonable and logical to our Western mind, is acceptable to the North Vietnamese is another matter. Only time will tell.

However, to meet a possible rebuff from Hanoi, the President farsightedly has taken a flexible position in regard to diplomatic negotiations and he has stated his willingness to consider other approaches consistent with our principles.

Another feature of the President's speech that was pleasing to me was the inclusion of Laos and Cambodia in the area of settlement. He gives full recognition to the degree of Communist infiltration in those countries, and he acknowledges the fact that an agreement dealing solely with Vietnam would be only a piecemeal settlement in the troubled southeast peninsula of Asia.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I applaud President Richard M. Nixon on the forthright and earnest proposals he put forth to the American people, and to the world, last evening in his efforts to achieve a lasting peace in Vietnam. The sincerity of his efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement to end this "blood bath" is a great step toward reason.

The President's suggestion that the

South Vietnamese decide for themselves how and who should govern them without outside interference and agitation from Communist forces, or anyone else for that matter, is only fair and proper.

I agree with Mr. Nixon, that the time has long passed for any debate on the reasons why our country is involved in this war, or why the war has been fought and carried on as it has over the years. He proposes no further stalemate, but he proposes instead an orderly withdrawal of all outside military forces from Vietnam, including our own, with the understanding that the people of South Vietnam then vote on their own future.

The President's proposal therefore is a simple, honest approach toward ending the war as swiftly as possible. If the Vietcong or other outside Communist elements do not choose to honor or consider the President's offer as a solution, then the world will know once and for all that the Communists truly have as their ultimate goal the destruction of all those nations which prefer a free democratic government in the place of the heel of Communist dictatorship.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has placed before the world a reasonable and logical approach toward peace in Vietnam. President Nixon's proposal is based on the desire of Americans to bring the Vietnam war to an end, honorably and permanently.

It is also based on our Nation's traditional policy of fairness and generosity toward our foes.

Above all, it displays a refreshing candor, a welcome frankness and a painstaking honesty on the part of the President that is truly reflective of the basic character of our people. President Nixon's eight-point proposal is clear in its meaning, mechanically workable, honorable in its intent and straightforward in its goals.

Mr. Speaker, the President has set the face of America toward peace, but he has made it clear that our armed might will remain ready to crush any rashly conceived military adventures by the enemy during negotiations.

The President has asked for the support of all Americans as our Nation embarks on this newly charted course. It is imperative that we demonstrate our support so as to prevent the enemy from misreading this proposal as a sign of national weakness.

I urge all of my colleagues to set an example for the rest of our people by rallying behind our President today, to let the world know we are one in our resolve, and to exercise patience and restraint—coupled with firm resolve—while he negotiates this proposal with the enemy.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the President stated well the theme of his address to the Nation when he said, "I want to end this war."

An end to the war does not mean a postponement; an end to the war does not mean a simple withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam to leave the battlefield to other adversaries. An end to the war means that the fighting, and its reason for being, will cease to exist. When

that occurs we shall see peace in Vietnam.

The President wants to end this war and has pledged himself to do so. In so doing, he has removed every conceivable roadblock to the path of peace. In his words, we have no preconditions; we have no requirements. We have only one basic principle which we will not abandon: the final decision must reflect the free choice of the people concerned—the Vietnamese. That is a principle for which we continue to stand. But that is our only interest—we seek no bases or military ties, we insist on no particular form of government or upon any particular diplomatic formula.

The President has offered to withdraw our troops immediately, provided that we have some kind of assurance that North Vietnam will do the same, whether it chooses to acknowledge that it has troops in the South or not.

The President has made a pledge of peace and has done everything in his power to bring it about. But, Mr. Speaker, the hard fact remains that he cannot do it alone.

First, he cannot do it without the North Vietnamese and the NLF. Until the enemy desires to stop the fighting, then the fighting will continue regardless of any peace proposal we may put forward.

Second, he cannot do it without the support of the American people. The President stated that if he fails to achieve peace he expects the American people to hold him accountable for that failure. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this responsibility and the possibility of failure rests with every American. We must stand resolved that our quest for peace will be energetic and unceasing. But we must resolve also that the principle of free self-determination, for which 35,000 Americans have given their lives, is one that we will not abandon.

I stand by our President. With the understanding that "our fighting men are not going to be worn down, our negotiators are not going to be talked down," and "our allies are not going to be let down," we will have an enduring peace in Vietnam.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the President for his honest and forthright report to the Nation last evening concerning Vietnam.

Although, as he properly warned us, the road ahead in Vietnam—and at Paris—is still a hard and dangerous one, I believe there is substantial reason now to begin to believe that it is not as long as it was. It is important—and the President is obviously keenly aware of this—not to raise false hopes, but there is encouragement to be gained from the evident fact that both sides to this tragic conflict are now making and considering new initiatives leading to its conclusion.

When, and exactly how, that so-desired event will take place cannot yet be foretold. It was therefore necessary for the President to ask the American people to be patient yet awhile—as I believe they will be—and I would point out the importance of their also considering giving Mr. Nixon their full support in carrying out his program that, in

his words now, "can lead to a peace we can live with and a peace we can be proud of."

For it is precisely true—as the President said—that if that support is forthcoming "nothing could have a greater effect in convincing the enemy that he should negotiate in good faith."

Our Government has now made a realistic, generous, and yet still flexible offer for the appropriate settlement of this conflict. It was a clear signal—and one in which the American people can and should join. Having done that, we can then only hope that our signal is not missed or misread by the other side.

Negotiations of this sort can never be fully conducted in broad daylight. Put another way, in their sum total they are rather like an iceberg in that only a small portion of them are ever really visible. Take, for instance, this question of troop withdrawals—which Mr. Nixon now properly says should be "mutual." It is, I suspect, altogether likely that no such agreement can ever be publicly worked out so that—though it is surely desirable to attempt it—no timetable for mutual withdrawals may ever be formally announced. Still, as the President said, he is prepared—and we should support him in this—to "take some risks for peace."

It is no secret that the new administration is working as fast as it can to "de-Americanize" the war; that is, to shift back to the South Vietnamese the major responsibility for fighting what is still, essentially, their war—a responsibility I believe we should never have taken over.

By arrangement, then, with Saigon—and we are working toward this—American troops can be, and before year's end, I believe, will be withdrawn. This would have to be gradual in nature and carefully calculated, with probably supply forces being first withdrawn, and it might appear more in a decline in the rate of reinforcement than ever in the actual withdrawal of any single unit. But, however, it may be worked out, each such step down on the American side would be a further signal to the enemy to which one would hope he would respond. Again, that response might never be wholly visible for it, too, would be gradual in nature rather after the fashion by which, since the end of our bombing attacks, the actual level of violence in Vietnam has been steadily declining even though guerrilla activity has been sustained by the enemy at an unfortunately high level in order, probably, to gain such political advantage therefrom both in Saigon and here at home as was possible.

Speaking for myself, I would urge upon the administration that it expedite, as rapidly as reasonably possible, this form of deescalation of American effort, as one of those risks for peace. And this I believe should be attempted even though there are no immediate signs that progress is being made toward settlement of those difficult questions that will have to be answered before the arrangements for the actual political settlement of the war can be worked out. In this connection, inasmuch as one ob-

vious sticking point will be over whether or not there need be—to satisfy Hanoi—some form of coalition government set up in the south prior to the effort at new, internationally supervised elections, I would also urge the administration to give consideration to the recent suggestion not for a coalition government but a coalition electoral commission, in which representatives of all political groups in the south—the Saigon Government, the Buddhists, the neutralists, and the like—would participate. As this idea has been described, such a commission, in effect, would be the government for all matters concerning the anticipated elections, and such international agency as is eventually brought into the picture could either actively participate in the work of this commission or supervise it from the outside.

As the New York Times said, editorially, about this the other day:

Many months could be wasted in Paris wrangling about what sort of government will conduct the elections. But it is evident that neither side will accept government by the other or turn over full responsibility to Vietnamese or international neutrals. They will (therefore) have to join together in this task (and) an electoral commission offers the best way to bring about that coalition.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, this is no time for raising false hopes—we have had far too much of that. But, at the same time, I believe there is ample reason for optimism that a corner of sorts has been turned. I am convinced the President has been moving firmly in the right direction, and he has my full support.

As one columnist has just written:

If there is no light at the end of the tunnel yet, there is at least a tunnel.

And for that, I believe, we can be grateful to President Nixon.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has demonstrated in his first major address to the American people on the war in Vietnam that his administration has considered in detail all of the alternatives for the U.S. foreign policy with regard to the war. In my opinion the President has chosen the most appropriate approach and has clearly stated his policy objectives.

I fully support the President in the stand that he has taken and I urge that all Americans give thoughtful—and prayerful—consideration to his significant proposals. President Nixon spoke for all sane Americans when he earnestly expressed our desire for peace and in the proffering of the olive branch with eminently reasonable conditions he should receive the full support of his fellow countrymen. The time for dissent is past. As the President himself has said:

We can have honest debate about whether we should have entered the war in Viet Nam. We can have honest debate about how the war has been conducted. But the urgent question today is what to do now that we are there.

It is absolutely imperative that we not frustrate the continuing efforts of the Paris peace negotiations. While we are daily discouraged by the seemingly futility of those negotiations, the President

has made it clear that a purely military solution on the battlefield is now completely ruled out. As a result, negotiation must be continued in the hopes that it will promptly lead to a cessation of the useless killing. So long as such communication is continued, a military solution will not be a valid alternative.

Hopefully, the administration has achieved a new sense of harmony between Saigon and Washington which will ultimately lead to more fruitful sessions in Paris. Finally, it must be pointed out that there are now two open, authenticated, and public statements by two parties to the negotiations which should lead to a clearer basis for new initiatives. While there are still major points of dissension between the proposals set forth by President Nixon and those of the National Liberation Front, it is important to note that there is a wide margin of agreement as well.

President Nixon has clearly indicated our desire for peace. If this desire is shared sincerely by North Vietnam and the Vietcong, peace will at long last come to this troubled country.

I urge that all Americans take this opportunity to stand behind a positive approach and allow it a chance to succeed where the negativity of dissent has failed.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for millions of Americans and concerned people throughout the free world in applauding the initiative by President Nixon last evening to bring peace in Vietnam.

In so doing, the President has outlined a bold, positive, and specific approach on which the United States proposes the mutual withdrawal of all non-South Vietnamese forces, a supervised ceasefire, and self-determination for the people of Vietnam without outside intimidation, domination, or aggression.

One of the most significant aspects of the President's speech, in my judgment, was that, while we are willing to discuss a political settlement, our first thought and consideration must go toward stopping the killing on both sides. To this end, our President has said that this country will accept a settlement whether formally negotiated or merely mutually agreed to.

Now, just what is the significance of the President's proposal?

First, I think it presents a formidable challenge to the negotiators in Paris to get "off dead center" and deal with specifics—something that has been sadly lacking up to this point. Second, it constitutes a viable position on which to bargain from. And third, it represents a basis for determining the sincerity of North Vietnam and the National Liberation front as to their desire for peace and their willingness to accept at least some concrete proposals from our side regarding a settlement.

As one who, for several years, has advanced the "phase-in/phase-out concept" for resolving our country's overinvolvement in Vietnam, I have observed the remarkable progress made by this administration to encourage the Saigon government to assume a greater share of the overall security and combat re-

sponsibilities that, for too long, have been largely assumed by the United States.

I am extremely pleased at the forward progress which has been made to strengthen and update South Vietnam's military forces. Issuance of and training in the most modern weapons for their combat units is nearing completion, previously nonexistent artillery units are now an integral part of the South Vietnamese army, more and better naval vessels have been turned over to their navy, and their air force has been upgraded and enlarged. In addition, leadership, morale, and esprit de corps have been greatly enhanced in South Vietnam's overall security forces.

In his address to the Nation last night, President Nixon said that we were rapidly approaching the time when South Vietnam will be in a position to shoulder their fair share of the combat and security responsibilities. This, in my judgment, will provide additional alternatives for the President to consider in the near future.

In essence, then, I believe the President's proposal last night may well indicate where we go from here and whether or not the Communists are negotiating in good faith or merely stalling for time in order to gain a tactical advantage.

What is really important, in my judgment, is not how Hanoi responds to our President's proposal, but how the American people respond. Up to now, Hanoi's negotiators in Paris have had the unique advantage of believing and even negotiating on the basis that many Americans supported or at least sympathized with their position.

Hanoi can and undoubtedly will forthrightly reject President Nixon's positive and forward-looking proposal as part of their "wait and see attitude." They are waiting to see what the American reaction and world opinion will be to President Nixon's offer and, thus, we as a Nation, are about to be tested.

Our President has asked each of us to unite behind what I sincerely believe is a just and generous proposal to end the war in Vietnam. He has, in so doing, admitted that his own political future is "on the line." Therefore, at this critical juncture in our Nation's history, I submit that the time has come to lay aside the fixed, polarized positions of the past and to consider the President's proposal carefully.

If this President, or any President, is going to stop the fighting in Vietnam and restore peace in Southeast Asia, then we, as Americans, must get behind our President and let the entire world know in no uncertain terms that we share and support his desire to unite this country behind that common goal.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the President's speech, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

#### A RESOLUTION CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO CALL FOR AN IMMEDIATE CEASE-FIRE AND THE FORTHWITH WITHDRAWAL OF 100,000 U.S. TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include a resolution.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I must disagree with my colleagues who have risen to praise the President's statement on the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I listened very attentively last night to the President's proposals on Vietnam. In fairness, one must say that there was some slight difference between those made last year by President Johnson and those made last night by President Nixon. But the best that could be said in praise of the new proposals is that they are too little and too late. What we needed to hear from the President was not a call for a mutually staged withdrawal over the next 12 months which has been the subject of unsuccessful negotiations for the last 13 months at a cost in American lives since March 31, 1968, of 13,754 men. Rather we should have heard a clarion call from President Nixon for an immediate cease-fire to save the lives of the young men of this country who are dying daily on the battlefield, as well as the lives of those other young men, loved by their families on both sides of the war, the parents and wives of whom weep daily, especially those who receive the all too frequent notices of death.

Recognizing all that has gone on, surely at this point the President could and should direct the immediate unconditional withdrawal of at least 100,000 of the more than 500,000 of our American troops now in Vietnam. If the South Vietnamese are not willing to fill the gap with their own men then they are not worthy of our continuing support.

In the last political campaign to win the Presidency, Richard Nixon told us that he had a plan to end the war. If such a plan really existed, it is still the best kept secret of the century.

The killing in Vietnam must stop, and rhetoric alone will not bring the war to an end.

I am introducing today a resolution calling upon the President to forthwith propose an immediate ceasefire and to commence the withdrawal of 100,000 American troops without prior condition. I hope that my colleagues will join in this resolution with me. It follows:

H. CON. RES. 256

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the President should call for an immediate cease-fire and should direct an immediate unconditional withdrawal of one-hundred-thousand United States troops from Vietnam.*

#### RESOLUTION COMMENDING SECRETARY STANS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I am

introducing a House resolution commending Secretary Maurice Stans for his mission to Europe and now to Japan and the Far East.

Our distinguished and able Secretary of Commerce realizes the danger of our unfavorable trade balance with Japan and is taking positive action before it is too late. The Secretary is undergoing a gruelling schedule, long hours and painstaking efforts to promote fair and truly reciprocal trade with our friends in Europe and Asia. Mr. Stans' efforts are encouraging to our vital textile industry and its more than 2 million employees.

Mr. Stans is giving special attention to the deteriorating textile situation. The United States has not had a favorable textile trade balance since 1957—12 years ago. While textile exports since 1957 have increased by about \$170 million, from \$525 million to \$694 million, imports have soared from \$562 million to \$1.8 billion. This left us with a textile trade deficit in 1968 of \$1.1 billion and the gap grows wider every year. Textile imports reached a record monthly level of 362 million equivalent square yards in March. The March level was 45 percent higher than March 1968. A particularly large increase occurred in manmade fiber textile imports, which were 71 percent higher than in March of last year and the first quarter total was 24 percent higher than the 1968 first quarter total.

Mr. Stans' great efforts to promote orderly trade in textiles is the first major effort at the administration level to promote a fair solution to this problem since President John F. Kennedy's famous seven-point program. I wish Mr. Stans every success in promoting orderly fair trade, mutually advantageous to all concerned, and in that effort he will have the support of the Congress and the American people.

#### CREATION OF A FEDERAL HIGHER EDUCATION MEDIATION BOARD

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government cannot sit passively as our campuses continue to erupt in violent outbreaks of rebellion. We must act to control this damaging trend in which violence has taken the place of reasoned discussion.

To accomplish this end I have proposed to the President the creation of a Federal Higher Education Mediation Board. This Board would be composed of students, parents, educators, Government officials, and outstanding Americans from private life.

The Board could mediate disputes at institutions of higher learning when called into such disputes by either the students, administration, or faculty at any institution faced with possibility of violence.

I sincerely believe that such mediation efforts, that have proven their worth time and again in labor-management disputes, could resolve many disagreements with the potential for violence.

With the situation on the campuses having deteriorated so very much this

certainly seems like a minimum effort the Federal Government might make to improve the situation.

#### RIGHT OF 18-YEAR-OLDS TO VOTE IN NEW JERSEY—NOVEMBER REFERENDUM

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the New Jersey State Assembly, acting in Trenton, passed a concurrent resolution which will provide this November for a referendum by the voters of the State of New Jersey to provide 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds of the State of New Jersey the right to vote in future elections.

Mr. Speaker, it was our great Governor Richard J. Hughes who, in 1967, led the way to have this 18-year-old vote proposal included in the platform of the Democratic Party in the election of that year.

The State Senate of New Jersey, has already passed this resolution by a vote of 30 to 0. The State Assembly in New Jersey passed it today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say I am proud of our legislature in my State of New Jersey and I am very proud of our Democratic Governor.

I think this is a great step forward which will show that the people of New Jersey are progressive and are fair-minded people. I am sure that we will be able to be proud of the people of New Jersey for the action they will take in supporting this referendum next November.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### VIETNAM

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States spoke of a mutual withdrawal of troops from Vietnam staged over a 12-month period.

Mr. Speaker, if we are really serious about bringing this tragic war to an end, our action should not depend upon the action of North Vietnam. Rather we should immediately begin a withdrawal of at least 100,000 troops.

The longer this war continues, the more American and Vietnamese fighting men will lose their lives, and the greater the destruction and suffering of the civilian population in Vietnam will be.

While the Paris peace negotiations have dragged on over the course of the past year, over 10,000 American servicemen have been killed. The Vietnam war is the third costliest in our history, surpassed only by the two World Wars and the Civil War, in death and destruction. How many more American men will be killed during the 12 months the President believes will be required to achieve a mutual troop withdrawal? Whatever the number is, it will be far too many.

On March 26 on the floor of the House I outlined a three-point program for ending the war, which included the immediate withdrawal of 100,000 U.S. troops. This would persuade North Vietnam that the United States really intends to remove its troops from Vietnam and thereby provide a basis for a breakthrough at the Paris talks.

In his speech last night, President Nixon asked the Nation to support "a program which can lead to a peace we can live with and a peace we can be proud of." But this Nation should not be asked to support a program which contemplates the unnecessary continuation of the war for another 12 months and which, moreover, perpetuates the idea that our continued military presence in South Vietnam is either necessary or warranted. President Nixon spoke of the responsibility to see that our fighting men will not have died in vain. I think the first responsibility should be to see that no more die in vain.

The administration's request for supplemental appropriations in support of the war in Vietnam will be before the House next week. Congress should refuse to vote any additional funds for the prosecution of the war and make it clear to the President that the conflict in Vietnam must be ended now—not 12 months from now. For every day that the war is allowed to continue, more American and Vietnamese will be made to pay for a mistaken policy with their lives.

#### VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. WHALEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon addressed the Nation last night on the subject of the Vietnam war.

In his remarks, the President kept faith with the American people in demonstrating his profound commitment to achieve peace in Southeast Asia. The resolution of that conflict is the first order of business for the new administration. The war, as Mr. Nixon made quite clear, is the greatest problem facing this country today.

As the President suggested, we cannot expend our energies in fruitless discussion of why we are in Vietnam and what has happened in the past. The fact is that we are there, that 35,000 Americans already have lost their lives, and that a negotiated settlement is the only answer.

The President faces a most difficult task in bringing the hostilities to a close. His proposal for a mutual and simultaneous withdrawal of forces from South Vietnam is a means of achieving that goal.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of the House, regardless of party, hopes that this will be the initiative that will break the dike.

I would like to say also, Mr. Speaker, that the President is to be commended for his frankness in bringing this most serious issue directly before the public after less than 4 months in office. His action reflects an understanding of the

mandate of the people, as expressed in November, to terminate the war and to take the public into his confidence.

#### FOR A NEW MOMENTUM

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the President has cleared the air of the propaganda smog and self-serving statements that have bogged down the Paris peace talks.

Acting at the moment that only he could know was propitious, he has laid out clearly what the U.S. Government is doing to end the war; what our basic objective is; and a plan that comes to grips with the realities of the negotiation.

This was not a speech to stand on; it was a speech to move on.

It calls to mind Woodrow Wilson's great principle, "Open covenants, openly arrived at." Of course, there will be confidential discussions to make real progress on details—but the great principles are there in the open to be considered in the court of world opinion.

It was Wilson, too, who formulated the great principle of the self-determination of nations. That is what the negotiations in Paris are all about.

The President has added an element of urgency and frankness to the negotiations that could well be historic. He has made it clear that time is on nobody's side. He has opened up a wide variety of approaches that serious negotiators can find fruitful.

In my opinion, this will go down in history as one of the great efforts at peacemaking by a world leader. If it is met in the spirit in which it was offered, a new momentum will be on the side of peace in Vietnam.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON TO HO CHI MINH: "YOUR MOVE"

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's report to the Nation last night has left the next move up to Hanoi and to Ho Chi Minh. The President gave the American people no false hopes, no magic formulas, no over-optimistic predictions, like we have had in the past and seen dissolve before our eyes. He told it like it is.

Speaking as Chief Executive, he told the world the American position. Speaking like a man, he told his fellow citizens, the American people, that the responsibility and accountability was his.

The President will no doubt be attacked and criticized, both at home and abroad, for not yielding further to the Communists. Such a course would only mean in the end shame and surrender for the United States, and slavery and slaughter for South Vietnam.

Perhaps the "peace at any price" crowd prefers this, but I am sure the American people do not. And neither does their President.

### PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT ON HIS INITIATIVES FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's report on his initiatives for peace in Vietnam was heartening to the American people.

It was clear, candid, concise, and conciliatory; it was reasoned, reasonable, and realistic; it was intelligent and intelligible.

It emphasized his desire, his readiness, "to withdraw our forces" from South Vietnam, asking "only that North Vietnam withdraw its forces from South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, into North Vietnam."

It left no doubt that the only factor Mr. Nixon considered nonnegotiable was the right of self-determination of the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon spoke with no emotion but the emotion of sincerity; he spoke with no argument but the argument for "true and lasting peace."

It was a speech befitting a great President of a great Nation. Mr. Nixon's initiatives should indeed pave the way for a purposeful solution to Vietnam.

### PRESIDENT SETS FORTH BLUE-PRINT FOR PEACE

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the radio and television address of President Nixon last night was, in my judgment, one of the great speeches in American history. He made clear to the world his determination to end the war in Vietnam with honor, and he set forth a blueprint for peace.

Some of the quotes I am sure will live as threads woven into the Vietnam fabric, such as, "a great nation must be worthy of trust."

Again, referring to the sacrifices that have been made in Vietnam, he said:

It is our responsibility to see that they will not have fought in vain.

The President was precise in stating the principles and policies of this Nation. It would seem to me that his statement should put an end once and for all to the constant carping of a few people in high places who, by their utterances, are giving the enemy the impression of what the President referred to as a "collapse of American will."

We applaud the President for his continued forceful, compassionate, realistic, sound leadership, and join in supporting his pledge for peace.

### PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROPOSAL FOR PEACE IS COMPREHENSIVE, FLEXIBLE, AND HUMANITARIAN

(Mr. WYLIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, President

Nixon's proposal for peace in Vietnam was most reassuring. It was comprehensive, flexible, and humanitarian. It was a levelheaded statement calmly presented which has characterized every action of our President. This is not the time for precipitous, hip-shooting decisions.

There is no way the President's statement could be interpreted as a call for the escalation of the war. Rather, it displayed a conscientious desire to escalate the peace. Yet, the President's statement could in no way be construed as suggesting defeat. The essentiality of prearrangement or agreement before withdrawal was made clear.

President Nixon has taken a position which all Americans intent on an honorable end to the war in Vietnam can rally round.

### PRESIDENT COMMENDED FOR EFFORTS TO END TRAGIC CONFLICT IN VIETNAM

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first men to speak out on the floor of this House that the war in Vietnam was the most ghastly and costly military mistake in the history of the United States, I wish to commend the President of the United States on the efforts he is making to end this tragic conflict.

If one listened to the speech of the President and its tone, he must have been persuaded that the President is doing all in his power to bring the war to such a conclusion that the people of that area will be able to choose the type of government which they want, with no direction from the United States as to what type this may be.

It is my fervent hope that this country shall in the future adhere to the advice given by Lincoln when he said:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

Basing our actions on this premise, our country will be involved in no future wars in Southeast Asia, and our young men will be permitted to follow peaceful pursuits and their lives flow as peacefully as the streams by which, as youths, they once sported.

### THE PRESIDENT'S APPROACH TOWARD PEACE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. LUJAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has placed before the world a reasonable and logical approach toward peace in Vietnam. President Nixon's proposal is based on the desire of Americans to bring the Vietnam war to an end, honorably and permanently.

It is also based on our Nation's traditional policy of fairness and generosity toward our foes.

Above all, it displays a refreshing candor, a welcome frankness, and a

painstaking honesty on the part of the President that is truly reflective of the basic character of our people. President Nixon's eight-point proposal is clear in its meaning, mechanically workable, honorable in its intent, and straightforward in its goals.

Mr. Speaker, the President has set the face of America toward peace, but he has made it clear that our armed might will remain ready to crush any rashly conceived military adventures by the enemy during negotiations.

The President has asked for the support of all Americans as our Nation embarks on this newly charted course. It is imperative that we demonstrate our support so as to prevent the enemy from misreading this proposal as a sign of national weakness.

I urge all of my colleagues to set an example for the rest of our people by rallying behind our President today, to let the world know we are one in our resolve, and to exercise patience and restraint—coupled with firm resolve—while he negotiates this proposal with the enemy.

### PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

(Mr. RUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, last night our President came before the American people and the world to state the purposes of the United States in South Vietnam. After hearing his speech all Americans should have a better understanding of why we are there. He went beyond a presentation of a clear and informative picture of the Vietnam war. He made new, important, and substantive initiatives for ending the war. The steps are in the right direction and should have the effect of uniting our people to see us through more hard bargaining to an honorable settlement. Mr. Nixon's statement made clear the difficulties in solving this conflict. But his proposals were flexible enough to provide wide areas of compromise without surrender of basic principles. The speech offered a timetable for withdrawal of forces and means for establishing peace. But most of all it offered new hope that this administration is determined to end this war and turn America's energies to the problems of America and the challenges of peace.

### PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's forthright proposal of last night for mutual withdrawal of forces from South Vietnam will be welcomed by all who sincerely seek an end to the Vietnam war and a durable peace. The President has made it clear to the world that we are willing to meet the enemy more than halfway and have substantially changed

our position in a sincere effort to get the peace negotiations moving. For example, the President said we will no longer insist on the United States discussing only a military settlement, but are now willing to participate in the negotiation of a political settlement if this is the desire of both the South and North Vietnamese.

With these proposals our President has clearly seized the initiative for peace for our country. He is entitled to the continued support of all American citizens and of our allies in the free world as he continues to lead us toward peace with honor.

#### SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON THE VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon last night clearly indicated his willingness to walk the extra mile toward an honorable peace in Vietnam. If the Communists also want to bring this agonizing conflict to a conclusion, the President has pointed the way. He told it like it is. His assessment of the situation and his statement of the position of the United States put this struggle in perspective. The time for serious negotiation by North Vietnam has come. The time for further impossible demands, threats and recriminations by the Communists has passed. The President recalled his campaign pledge to end this war. He added:

The fact that there is no easy way to end the war does not mean that we have no choice but to let the war drag on with no end in sight.

I view this not as a threat but as a clear statement of fact. The leaders of North Vietnam and their allies would do well to ponder it.

#### BILL TO PROTECT ENDANGERED SPECIES

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague in the Maryland delegation, the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, has introduced an excellent bill, H.R. 8327, to preserve from extinction selected species of native fish and wild-life indigenous to our beautiful State of Maryland. To indicate my support for this effort, I am introducing today a bill identical to that of Mr. GARMATZ.

In these times of man's increasing encroachment upon nature, it is certainly right to set aside waters and lands in order to preserve them in their natural form for those who come after us and to save the creatures from wanton destruction and eventual extinction.

Not only because of the scientific and the naturalistic benefit, but because of our responsibility to the generations of Americans, of today and of tomorrow, who have every right to enjoy nature's endowments in their pristine form, it is our responsibility to see that these species are preserved.

The natural beauties of Maryland are well known and appreciated, not only by its residents, but by visitors as well, if such beauty is marred, or destroyed, the State will have lost one of its most important and irreplaceable assets.

Therefore, I hope my colleagues will recognize the merits in the endangered species preservation bill and support it.

#### AMERICAN UNITY TOWARD INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I join in urging the American people toward greater unity in our involvement in Vietnam. Last night we heard one of the most sincere, one of the most objective, a most truthful and realistic statement put to us by an American President.

President Nixon expressed hope for peace, but at no time did he indicate that the United States of America would weaken to the threats and harassments of communism. As he described it, his offer for settling the war is "generous," yet he had not only considered the present but the future of the people of South Vietnam.

The entire world wants peace, even the Communists. However, the kind of peace they seek is one in which they control the entire world. The United States seeks a peace that offers freedom and independence for each nation—freedom for the South Vietnamese to run their own country.

President Nixon delivered one of the best speeches I have heard. He was thoughtful, concerned, and sincere, and he was very specific in describing our commitment, in detailing our proposals for settlement, and in warning that additional casualties and suffering "will affect other decisions." In other words, his message to his country and to the world was that we are willing to end the war on reasonable terms, but we will not give in to a Communist takeover of South Vietnam to attain peace.

A country united behind our President is the contribution we Americans can make toward peace. I say let us pray for peace and let us back our Nation's effort in settling this terrible conflict.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS ON VIETNAM

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for his frank and candid message to the American people last evening on Vietnam. It has been a long time since a Chief Executive has been so forthright on this sensitive and controversial issue, perhaps made the more so because the American people in the past have had to piece together bits of information and were left to their own resources to come up with their own interpretation as to what the official position of the United States was with respect to our commitment in South Vietnam.

President Nixon last night clearly and unequivocally stated our essential objective:

We seek the opportunity for the South Vietnamese people to determine their own political future without outside interference.

A purely military solution has been ruled out, as has a unilateral withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces. The United States is willing, with the concurrence of the Government of South Vietnam, to accept virtually any settlement so long as the political future of South Vietnam is determined by the free choice of her own people. Significantly, a rigid diplomatic formula or treaty is not a precondition to a settlement nor an essential objective, providing that a clear understanding can be achieved with adequate assurances that any settlement will be observed.

For the first time, a definite timetable has been laid out for the withdrawal of a major portion of all non-South Vietnamese forces to be supervised by a mutually acceptable international supervisory body.

The position stated by the President and the explicit proposals set forth are realistic; I believe they are achievable, given a sincere desire on the part of all interested parties to seek a settlement in good faith based on the paramount recognition that "What is important is what the people of South Vietnam want for South Vietnam."

There should be no misunderstanding on the part of the adversaries as to the intent and resolve of the United States in her commitment to the people and Government of South Vietnam. There is an implicit warning in the President's message, although not emphasized in a manner that would deter from its spirit:

I must also make clear, in all candor, that if the needless suffering continues, this will affect other decisions.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there was an appeal, an appeal which should be of the utmost concern to all of us here and to the people of this great Nation, whatever one's convictions. These words should be repeated at every opportunity and remembered:

Nothing could have a greater effect in convincing the enemy that he should negotiate in good faith than to see the American people united behind a generous and reasonable peace offer.

#### SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON THE VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that so many Members in a very spontaneous fashion are addressing the House commenting on the President's address of last night.

However, I would like to point out, since this is a practical world, there is one item which I believe the President underplayed yesterday. This is the fact that we are not going to have permanent peace and freedom in the world until the Communists stop their aggression. We ought to keep in mind that the people of South Vietnam are the victims of delib-

erate Communist aggression against their country. We are not the aggressors there, regardless of the Communist propaganda that may be directed at world opinion. We are not going to have peace in southeast Asia, in Africa, the Middle East, or Latin America until the Communists renounce their drive for world conquest. It is wishful thinking to believe that one noble statement by the President of the United States is going to change the evil intentions of the world's Communist leaders. I certainly hope that we will not be lulled into a false sense of security or hope by the President's great address. As practical and as sound as it was, the real menace to world peace remains the diabolical plans of the tyrants in the Kremlin and Peking. Until they understand that aggression does not pay, the freedom of the world remains in jeopardy.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the important thing concerning President Nixon's report on Vietnam is not just what he said but how his words are understood and interpreted at home and abroad.

President Nixon's speech was thoughtful and sober and it revealed necessary flexibility of attitude by the proper reaffirmation of American policy points.

By emphasizing that the North Vietnamese aggressors are asked to withdraw their forces from Cambodia and Laos as well as South Vietnam the President underscores the fact that a solution must be permanent and produce true peace.

He clearly emphasized that the great sacrifices made by American fighting men must be productive of an honest agreement that will have protected the sovereignty of South Vietnam in conformance with our pursuit of international peace and freedom for all people.

#### SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I returned from a tour of Vietnam. Many of my colleagues have seen military service and know all too well the harsh outlines of the battlefield. But, this was my first confrontation with the grim reality of a world in war. In that week in Vietnam, I saw the war through the eyes of our military leaders. I saw it through the eyes of the people of South Vietnam. I saw it through the eyes of our boys in uniform fighting in farflung outposts in the jungle. More poignantly, I saw it through the eyes of my own son—a son who has been in Vietnam for the longest and most agonizing 9 months of my life. And, I assume, the longest and most agonizing 9 months of his young life.

In the 3 weeks since my return, I have been desperately searching for the words to create for my fellow Americans the real and graphic picture of what I saw and learned. Last night, President Nixon said those words for me. He told it how it is. With stark candor he told us where we had been, where we were and where we might be able to go.

Mr. Speaker, I can certainly fully understand and respect the motives of those who, in tragic heartbreak over the horrors of war, point in desperation to frantic alternatives. But, I cannot understand those who recommend these alternatives when they have full knowledge that to take these courses would be at the unthinkable cost of the lives of millions of young men yet uninvolved in war as well as those yet unborn.

To the people of America I would say this—your President gave you clear and inescapable truth last night. When you accept that, you must accept that he also presented to the world what the realities of Vietnam dictate can be the only realistic, viable and humane plan to bring about a settlement of this terrible conflict.

The President also said very candidly that we in this Nation could argue the issues of how we got in Vietnam and how we have conducted ourselves since becoming involved. And, of course, we can agree with this. But, to what purpose at this time in our history? To my son, and hundreds and thousands of our young men serving with him, Vietnam is not debatable. They are there because their Nation is pledged and committed. They are there showing some of the most incredible heroism and bravery of any young generation of any war in our Nation's history. And there they must stay until our Nation's leadership, which bears the awesome responsibility of ultimate decision, determines, with all the facts at their command that they can come home.

It is desperately important that we in America fully accept our committal to giving this world leadership toward peace. It is desperately important that we in America recognize our responsibility of protection to generations of people yet unborn. But, above all, the immediate urgency is that every one of our 500,000 men fighting in Vietnam know that we in America are giving them complete and unquestioning support. In his message last night President Nixon spelled out clearly what that support and loyalty required of us—fortitude, patience, understanding and citizenship dedication. It is my hope, my prayer and my belief that our country will give the President and the men in Vietnam all of that.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT OF LAST EVENING

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, including those like myself who consider our involvement in Vietnam a colossal mistake, should be heartened by the President's statement last evening. The circumstances of his speech, as well as its substance, give new hope to an early termination of our combat operations in Southeast Asia. The formula for withdrawal of our forces was expressed in conciliatory terms. To quote the President, it is not "offered on a take-it-or-leave-it basis." The door plainly was left open for further modifications.

Perhaps what is most important is the

fact that the White House gave so much advance billing to the President's remarks. This may indicate that the President has received some advance indication from the North Vietnamese that meaningful steps can now be taken to deescalate the war. With the hope that this is the case, I commend the President for his honest and forthright statement.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO KNOW ALL OF THE RELEVANT FACTS LEADING TO JUSTICE FORTAS' RESIGNATION

(Mr. MACGREGOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extemporaneous material.)

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding Mr. Justice Fortas' resignation, the American people are entitled to know all of the relevant facts leading to his decision to resign. These facts should be set forth in a proper forum. That forum now need not necessarily be the House Committee on the Judiciary. It could be the American Bar Association or the Judicial Conference of the United States. I would hope that Chief Justice Warren—if he has not already done so—would see fit to release the pertinent portions of Justice Fortas' latest letter of explanation about the Wolfson Family Foundation fee matter. The larger problem of existing ethical standards and morality in high positions in Government has not been solved by the Fortas resignation.

More important than the Fortas case is popular confidence in the quality of governmental service, and in the integrity of high officials. Washington cannot function in the future under the standards of the past.

I have today introduced these two bills:

First. Making it a Federal criminal offense for anyone to pay or to offer, and for any Federal judge, Member of Congress, or policymaking official in the executive branch to receive any sum greater than \$500 for a speech, published work, professional service, personal appearance, or otherwise by way of honorarium.

Second. Requiring the quarterly disclosure to the Comptroller General for printing by the U.S. Government of the source and amount of all income received by Federal judges, Members of Congress, or policymaking officials in the executive branch.

#### WHY THESE TWO BILLS?

First. The bills are designed to solve the ethical problem arising from questionably large fees or honorariums for actual or implied services paid or offered to officials serving the people from high posts in the U.S. Government.

Second. It is also my intent to eliminate secrecy in conflict-of-interest matters by insuring a prompt and full public disclosure of any and all outside income received by any top governmental official.

Third. With the new salary schedule for Members of Congress, Federal judges,

and top level executive branch officials, the necessity for outside income no longer exists.

Fourth. The American public rightfully expects that the obligations of Government service will occupy the entire working time of key officials.

Fifth. These bills are designed to remove the suspicion that anyone is receiving a monetary consideration for extending preferred or favored treatment—either through means of a vote in Congress, a judicial decision or an executive action.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. MARTIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's report to the Nation last evening on prospects for peace in Vietnam was one of the most logical, straightforward, and realistic approaches to the problem which the American people have heard.

The President set forth our Government's position in clear, concise terms, which could be easily understood by all Americans, as well as the North Vietnamese. He presented our Government's position in a forthright manner which would provide for a fair and equitable settlement of the conflict. He was neither conciliatory nor arbitrary. He was firm in his position in regard to the recent increased attacks by the Vietcong.

Many American people are heartsick over this war, but they also want a fair and just settlement of this conflict, and are not quitters. President Nixon's speech, I am sure, hit the right chord with our 200 million people. He is to be commended for his explicit and fair proposals which he so ably enunciated last night.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Nixon on his address to the Nation outlining his new initiatives to bring honorable and lasting peace to Vietnam. It was a forceful and well-reasoned expression of this Nation's resolve to end the war while guaranteeing true self-determination for the South Vietnamese people.

During the campaign Mr. Nixon promised a plan to end the Vietnam conflict, and many Americans supported him because of that promise. Last night he stated clearly that ending the war is the paramount goal of his administration. However, he cautioned against a quick or expedient settlement that some people have been advocating. We cannot tolerate a truce that would endanger the free world security posture in the Pacific region.

The President deserves the encouragement of this body and the support of every American citizen in his quest for lasting world peace.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Nixon for his most complete and accurate appraisal of the war in Vietnam during his report to the people last night.

Just as the President stated, we are all concerned about this war, and we must terminate this war in a manner that will assure peace in Southeast Asia, and in the world, for years to come.

Of course, we could just pull our troops out of South Vietnam, as some people have suggested, and leave the people of South Vietnam to the mercy of the North Vietnamese and their Communist allies. This would give us a temporary peace. However, this action would only encourage the Communists to start another Vietnam elsewhere in a short time.

Such a unilateral troop withdrawal would encourage Communist countries in further expansion and in their stated aim of world domination.

The President made it clear that we are ready to negotiate, and anyone familiar with our history knows that we are always ready to negotiate and negotiate in good faith. The proposal made by the President that a mutual troop withdrawal from South Vietnam be accomplished is an excellent proposal and should be accepted by North Vietnam and their Communist allies at once.

The President also made it clear that any maneuver on the part of North Vietnam, such as escalating the war in South Vietnam while talking peace, will not be successful. I join with my colleagues in hoping that the North Vietnamese will realize this and will start to negotiate for peace in good faith.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON: SPEECH ON VIETNAM

(Mr. STAFFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has, in my estimation, made a concise, relatively straightforward proposal for a political rather than military settlement of the Vietnam war, and I join in lauding his efforts to this end.

This political settlement must, of necessity, be accompanied by mutual military withdrawal, but it is clearly evident at this stage of the prolonged conflict in Vietnam that a political settlement is the only way to gain a meaningful and lasting end to this unfortunate war.

I am still personally hopeful that conditions will permit at least a partial withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam while negotiations for this political settlement are being pursued. I have confidence that President Nixon, as he stated, will continue to take every step possible to end the war.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

(Mr. RIEGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's thoughtful Vietnam statement came at an important time for the Nation. It is essential that our people have a precise understanding of American Vietnam policy and peace plans, particularly given the long and dismal history of the war. His candor was refreshing.

While I support the President in his determined quest for a negotiated settlement, I believe we must be fully prepared to implement new policies should the enemy continue intransigent at the negotiating table. I am convinced that such contingency plans are being developed and set in motion. This is sound and proper.

Let us be absolutely clear on one key point, however. Despite familiar phrases about "meeting commitments," "allies not being let down," and the concern about American withdrawal by the leaders of non-Communist Asia—all of whom are substantially undercommitted in Vietnam in my view—the blunt truth is that the United States is today strategically overcommitted in South Vietnam. We are spending too much American blood and money in Vietnam—and this excessive Americanization is counterproductive both in Vietnam and here at home. This fact burns through all other considerations concerning this problem. Deamericanization must get underway very soon.

As I interpret his remarks, by no means should the President's speech be construed to mean that we are reducing the pressure on the South Vietnamese to reassume full combat responsibility and press forward with long overdue economic and social reforms. Ultimately, the South Vietnamese must fend for themselves and the Government of South Vietnam must move with new urgency now to earn a much broader measure of political support from the Vietnamese people. I urge the South Vietnamese to redouble their efforts at this crucial hour.

While I deeply hold the above beliefs, I recognize that our Chief Executive must try to move this program to solution according to his perceptions and information. As I have personal faith in the President, I join with him in seeking a negotiated agreement for scaling down this U.S. overcommitment. Two weeks ago, I asked in a floor speech that he be given another 40 to 60 days to fully reveal his Vietnam plans and show substantive specific progress toward scaling down the U.S. commitment. I reiterate that call today.

But let us make no mistake about it—time has run out in Vietnam and our people will not, and should not, be asked to wait indefinitely for a desperately needed breakthrough. It must come, and come quickly, in one form or another.

I believe the President and most of his

advisers understand this. Based on this belief I stand with the President in his search for a settlement.

#### PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON VIETNAM

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the President's address to the American people last evening outlined a forthright positive course of action for bringing the Vietnam conflict to an honorable conclusion. He stated again our objective in that embattled land, to assure to the people of South Vietnam the right of self-determination. If the South Vietnamese agree to neutrality, we will respect their decision. Whatever Government results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese we will recognize. We insist on no rigid diplomatic formula. We make no proposals on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. We will consider other approaches consistent with our principles. But let no one confuse our willingness to be flexible in negotiation with weakness or with lack of resolution.

This is a program behind which the American people can unite. The conflict will be shorter if we do. Once Hanoi understands that the American will in the United States is resolute, and that the enemy cannot win through a division of American public opinion what he cannot win militarily, peace negotiations in Paris will move rapidly forward.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S TELEVISION ADDRESS

(Mr. McCLURE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's televised speech to the Nation last night should meet with the approval of all thoughtful persons. It was a call for national unity over an issue that has divided our people for far too long. The President has gone about as far as a reasonable man dares in dealing with the Communist world, and the enemy should realize the consequences that will befall them should they fail to heed Mr. Nixon's temperate proposals.

Beyond what the President himself has said, I hope that all Americans will unite in firm resolve to back the President's quest for peace. Those who fail to do so can only reduce the possibility of successful negotiations.

Hopefully, Mr. Nixon has returned the spirit of nonpartisanship to the foreign policy arena where it belongs without bombastic rhetoric, without rash promises, without overoptimistic assessments, but with quiet purpose and firm resolve our President spoke from the heart of America. Let us not destroy the possibility of success in these efforts by seeking personal gain in irresponsible dissent.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

(Mr. LLOYD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, last night President Nixon charted a course in the Vietnam war between outright withdrawal from South Vietnam, on the one hand, and increased aggression to achieve a military victory in North Vietnam on the other. His speech comes at a crucial point in this war and in American history. Principal criticism of the speech this morning is from those who seem to favor withdrawal. As to this, the President reemphasized two points, the first being that our withdrawal would risk a massacre of the South Vietnamese, and the second, that to renege on our pledge would threaten our longer term hopes for peace in the world, although it does appear to me that this country has made overwhelming demonstration in Vietnam that we honor our commitments. "A great nation must be worthy of trust," said the President.

The President gave us very little to cheer about in the way of announcing miracles, or even of news of encouraging progress. The fact is that the attitude of the hostile, totalitarian countries of this world today gives us little to cheer about. It is Communist aggression, not American aggression which caused this war in the first place and is continuing it today.

The President set forth specific proposals for negotiation. They reemphasized our commitment to a free choice for the South Vietnamese. If the North Vietnamese are sincere, they will respond now. To Americans he said our objective is to secure a peace we can live with. A peace we can be proud of. The history of this Nation is that under God, we do have the courage, the will, and the ability to achieve this honorable goal. The President fulfilled his obligation to the people in making disclosure of efforts to achieve peace. He deserves the Nation's thanks, both for the quality of those efforts, and for the disclosure.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT ON VIETNAM

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States, in an extremely important report to the people, made a significant commitment of the American Government and the American people to peace. I strongly support the President's commitment and know that the people of the Nation will unite behind his efforts.

In his inaugural address 4 months ago the President said:

The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker. This honor beckons America—the chance to help lead the world

at last out of the valley of turmoil and onto that high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of time.

In his address last night the President committed this Nation to a course which will win that honor.

The President's proposal is both honorable and achievable. He set peace as our primary objective. We ask for no bases; we ask for no Americanization of South Vietnam; we ask for no permanent stationing of troops. Our only goal is the assurance that the South Vietnamese people are able to choose their own government in free elections. We agree to abide by that decision no matter what it may be. This in the best traditions of our national commitment to freedom.

Perhaps even more important than the words themselves was the President's clear commitment to procedural flexibility—his statement gave real evidence of interest in meaningful negotiations and provided the flexibility to make the Paris talks productive. We are sincere about negotiations. We are sincere about peace.

I know that the people of America will unite behind the President's efforts to find peace. I am today embarking on a program of encouraging the people of Michigan's Second Congressional District to write the President to symbolize their support for peace and for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I stood in the well of the House with seven Republican colleagues to emphasize the need for mutual deescalation and flexibility in American policy on Vietnam. The President's message, I believe, embodied those principles. Although the situation has changed since this proposal was first issued, the basic tenets continue to hold true; and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

#### GRADUAL, RECIPROCAL, IDENTIFIABLE DEESCALATION

(Statement of Republican Congressmen MARVIN L. ESCH of Michigan; JOHN R. DELLENBACK, of Oregon; CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., of Maryland; F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts; CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont; and FRANK J. HORTON, of New York, July 10, 1967)

It is disturbing to us that the recent public discussion of the war in Vietnam has polarized into rigidly opposing sides, the one urging military escalation in the hope of a quick settlement of the war, the other urging total withdrawal as the only key to peace. Both of these points of view, in our judgment, reflect their advocates' lack of understanding of the nature of limited war. In addition, they are essentially negative and do not offer any positive approach to the tragic problems of Southeast Asia.

What both sets of critics have forgotten is that the conflict in Vietnam is a limited war. This fact imposes special requirements not only on our military planning but on our diplomatic efforts as well.

We do not for a moment believe that the proposal we will make later in these remarks is the only hope for settlement, but we do think that discussion of the kind of diplomatic initiative we will suggest would contribute to a more balanced appraisal of our problems and perils in Vietnam.

## THE NATURE OF LIMITED WAR

The war in Vietnam is a limited war. It is limited in the combatants involved. It is limited in the objectives of the combatants. It is limited in the weapons they use. It is limited in the targets against which those weapons are employed.

Without a clear perspective of the nature of limited war, it may not be possible to devise practical diplomatic and military steps to bring the war to an end.

Many of the comments of the Administration and of both groups of its political critics on the Vietnamese war—both those who would bomb more and those who would bomb less—reflect a failure to comprehend the differences between limited and total war. Those differences are essential to an understanding of which steps may maximize the opportunities for peace.

What are the essential truths about limited war?

*First, a limited war with limited objectives cannot be ended and cannot remain limited if one side insists on the unconditional surrender of the other.* In one sense this is obvious; the weapons and level of force necessary to obtain an unconditional surrender would turn the war from limited to total. In another sense this fact is not so obvious; when objectives and weapons are limited both sides must be willing to compromise if the war is to be ended.

*Second, the end of a limited war requires that the combatants that meet at the peace table appear to be equals.* If one side were to appear to "lose face" by negotiating, negotiations in a limited war context would not occur. A peace conference between victor and vanquished is possible only when one side wins and the other loses—loses not just face but the war, too. But that means surrender, which in turn means that at least one side has removed most of the limits of its use of military force. In other words, negotiations to end a limited war must appear to be at the initiative of both sides, must appear to some degree to be the result of a military stalemate in which both sides can claim success, and must result in an agreement which each side can convincingly claim as a major achievement in pursuit of its objectives. It is not necessary for the two sides to be actual equals; nor is it necessary for the agreement to be equally valuable to each side; but it is of paramount importance that both governments can make a believable case to their people that will justify both the negotiations and their results.

*Third, negotiations to end a limited war are unlikely without an advanced degree of mutual confidence in the word of the combatants.* Unlike total war, limited war requires communications between the opposing sides—effective communications of both a tacit and direct form. It is through these communications that each side can understand the objectives of the other side and understand that both these objectives and the weapons used in support of them are genuinely limited. The purpose of the communications is not merely to avoid catastrophe from misunderstanding but also to build the kind of confidence in the sincerity of the other side that will allow negotiations to take place. It is thus in the interest of each side to define its limited objectives precisely, to avoid extravagant public diplomacy which might easily be misinterpreted as mere posturing for public relations purposes, and to be credible by keeping its promises and being willing to listen to the thoughts of others. It would be unwise for anyone to expect that a limited war will end suddenly—by one dramatic gesture which will lead to an immediate peace conference. On the contrary, if such a conference is to happen, it must be preceded by a series of

small steps by which each side can test the other's genuine desires and by which each side can clearly demonstrate its own. Without that atmosphere of mutual confidence, negotiations for the end of a limited war are not likely to happen and are even less likely to be successful.

*Fourth, it is not possible for one side to fight a limited war and the other a total war.* The escalation of one side will inevitably be matched by the other. It is unreasonable to think that if one side has an advantage in available air power and the other in available number of land forces, that either would allow the other to use its advantage without employing its own. It is equally unwise to become preoccupied with the limits you have imposed on your own military forces and neglect the obvious but unused power available to the other side. A decision by either side to remove the limits to the power it employs is a decision to risk the likelihood of total war.

From the perspective of these truths of limited war, the Vietnam positions of the Administration and both sets of its critics are found wanting.

Those who advocate a rapid or steady escalation in the power applied against North Vietnam are convinced that such a course would force North Vietnam to the negotiating table on its knees. Far more likely would be the rapid escalation of the conflict from a limited to a total war.

Among the options still available for Communist escalation in the Vietnamese conflict are: the use of terrorist bombings against Saigon and the civilian populations of other South Vietnamese cities; the infiltration in massive numbers of the very large North Vietnamese standing Army; the use of Communist volunteers in massive numbers from other Communist countries; the opening of a second diversionary military action in Korea to sap Western strength; etc.

Despite its increasing qualifications as a truism, it is nonetheless vital to appreciate that it is not in the United States' interest to become engaged in an unlimited land war on the Asian continent. Escalation which would change the psychological atmosphere of the Vietnam war from emphasis on restraint to emphasis on power would be likely to result in such an unlimited land war. Therefore, it would be wrong.

Those who advocate a sudden and complete halt to the bombing are similarly convinced that this step would have the best chance of bringing North Vietnam to the negotiating table. Unfortunately, this step would also be unlikely to achieve the desired results. Given the history of U.S. policy and the nature of U.S. domestic politics the government in Hanoi is likely to think that the sudden and complete cessation of or even pause in the bombing is either a ruse or a sign of desperation—and in either case the cause of negotiations would not be meaningfully advanced. Making the cessation a pause minimizes its risk and its effectiveness, too. The only positive value a sudden and complete cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam would have would come if the bombing were stopped for such a long time that North Vietnam became convinced of the genuine nature of U.S. motives and had the opportunity to make a diplomatic initiative of its own which would appear to be unrelated to the bombing cessation and would thereby not cause any loss of face to the Hanoi government. But in all likelihood the period of time required would be so long as to involve serious military risks in allowing the re-establishment of free-flowing supply and support channels to the South.

In other words, a complete bombing pause would not prove the genuine sincerity of the United States while a complete bombing ces-

sation long enough to prove the genuine sincerity of the United States would involve a great military risk to the United States.

In still other words, a complete bombing pause would not prove the genuine sincerity of the United States but a complete bombing cessation long enough to prove the genuine sincerity of the United States would not in any way assure the genuine sincerity of North Vietnam. It might, therefore, prove to be a greater impetus to instability than to stability.

While the Administration rejects both of these suggestions from its two sets of critics, its position is also a dubious one. It appears to be unyielding and inflexible—rigidly insisting that the first concrete step toward de-escalation be taken by North Vietnam—dogmatically demanding that North Vietnam demonstrate its genuine sincerity for negotiations before the United States does. It is an attitude which may reflect a misunderstanding of the nature of limited war, for it asks the enemy to risk losing face. The Administration insists on publicly putting the government of North Vietnam on the spot by insisting that she back down first. It is a position which comes dangerously close to changing the atmosphere of restraint to an atmosphere of power—and a limited war cannot stay limited or be ended in an atmosphere of power.

Significant military escalation, sudden and complete cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, and a rigid devotion to the status quo all fail to meet the limited war criteria of a promising policy to bring about honorable negotiations to end the war in Vietnam.

But does a viable policy option exist? To qualify such a policy must meet the following criteria:

It must not risk expansion of the limited war to total war.

It must not risk significant erosion of the current military advantage of the United States in Vietnam.

It must induce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence.

It must permit each side the opportunity to claim initiative.

It must not require either side to "lose face."

It must be susceptible to presentation, verification, and implementation through the private channels of diplomacy.

## STAGED DEESCALATION

Such a potential policy does exist. The experts would probably call it "staged de-escalation." One variation of it would be as follows:

The United States would agree to halt all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for 60 days.

If during that time the North Vietnamese Government undertook a similarly limited, similarly visible and similarly measurable step toward de-escalation, the United States would immediately halt all bombing in North Vietnam north of the 20th parallel for 60 days.

If within the first 60-day period the North Vietnamese had taken no such step, the bombing would be resumed.

In five such successive steps the United States would gradually cease all bombing of North Vietnam. Each step after the first would be dependent upon a similar de-escalation by Hanoi. If no such step were taken in the first 60 days, the plan would end.

If either side violated its word at any time, the plan would end. (The system should have the flexibility, however, to cause a minor violation merely to set back the timetable rather than necessarily ending the entire experiment.)

The United States should propose the plan to the Hanoi government through private diplomatic channels only. Any public notice

or acknowledgment of its acceptance or implementation should be made only by mutual agreement.

Those equivalent de-escalatory steps to be taken by the North Vietnamese government could be proposed in the plan by the United States, or could be defined in advance by the North Vietnamese government, or could be accepted one by one as they are implemented. It is vital, however, that clear and precise information about them be communicated so that they can be verified. Obviously, agreement in advance would be preferable in order to assure that what Hanoi thinks is equivalent Washington does also.

Examples of measurable and equivalent de-escalatory steps by the North Vietnamese government might include: the cessation of shipments to and from specific military supply depots in the southern portion of North Vietnam; the erection of barriers on and the non-use of specific supply routes in North Vietnam and Laos along the Ho Chi Minh trail; the withdrawal of all MIG fighters to distant bases in Northern North Vietnam; the cessation of all terrorist bombings in specific areas of South Vietnam; the release of U.S. prisoners of war; etc.

It would be vital not to expect the North Vietnamese to undertake steps which might put themselves at a distinct military disadvantage.

The staged cessation of U.S. bombing, if the plan does not work, can be reversed on a few hours notice. The steps to be taken by North Vietnam should be expected to be of the same nature. It would be unwise, for example, at an early stage in the de-escalatory process to demand or expect, from the North Vietnamese, steps such as the dismantling of their SAM sites, total evacuation of supply depots, or withdrawal of Army units from the South.

This policy of staged de-escalation meets each of the criteria cited previously to maximize the chances for negotiations in a limited war and minimize the military risks involved.

It obviously does not risk expansion of the limited war to total war.

It does not risk significant erosion of the current military advantage of the United States in Vietnam. The greatest military advantage which results from the bombing of North Vietnam comes from destroying targets in southern North Vietnam—supply depots and routes along the Ho Chi Minh and other trails into South Vietnam. By halting the bombing stages, by starting the cessation in Northern North Vietnam and gradually working southward, then by trying each successive stage to equivalent North Vietnamese reductions in support operations to the South, the plan minimizes the military risks to the United States. If a cessation of U.S. bombing north of the 21st parallel were matched by a dismantling of and evacuation from major North Vietnamese supply depots along the Ho Chi Minh trail, and if successive U.S. steps were matched by similar North Vietnamese steps, by the time U.S. bombings were halted in all of North Vietnam, most significant North Vietnamese infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam would also be halted. The first U.S. step envisaged in the plan may not be matched by the North Vietnamese—in which case after 60 days all the bombing the United States is now doing could be resumed. Furthermore, the sixty day cessation of bombing above the 21st parallel would effect raids over Hanoi, but would not effect raids over Haiphong or Nam Dinh areas, each of which would be immune from bombing only after the second U.S. step which must be preceded by some significant North Vietnamese de-escalatory step.

The staged de-escalation plan would induce a growing atmosphere of mutual confidence. In fact, the most important attribute

of the plan is that each step by each side involves little military risk in itself, is clearly visible to and measurable by the other side, and is dependent upon a previous step by the other side. It is a series of small steps, each of which builds confidence in the genuine sincerity of each of the combatants. If it is successful, at the end of the process not only will U.S. bombing in the North and North Vietnamese infiltration into the South be ended, but a spirit of confidence might have emerged. That spirit of confidence could provide a real opportunity for fruitful and honorable negotiations or for a similar staged de-escalation in South Vietnam itself—or both.

The plan would permit each side the opportunity to claim initiative. The plan calls for nine or ten separate steps, taken alternately by the United States and North Vietnam. Patriots, political scientists, and propagandists in each country will be able to claim that it was the steps taken by their government which led to the other side taking similar steps. Each side can claim—and do so justifiably—that its initiatives paved the way toward peace. It is a flexible system through which both sides can equally contribute toward peace and through which both can appear to pursue their national objectives.

The plan would not require either side to "lose face." It would not require that one side yield either to the force or the threat of force of the other. It would be a mutual de-escalation from which both sides could benefit. This would be especially true if the plan were initiated through private diplomacy—and implemented and announced through mutual diplomacy, which leads to the final criterion—

The plan obviously can be susceptible to presentation, verification, and implementation through the private channels of diplomacy. It can be, and if it is to succeed, it should be.

Even if the plan meets all the criteria of limited diplomacy, will it work? No one can answer that. All that can be said for it is that it seems to offer more promise than the stand-pat policy of the Administration or the alternatives suggested by either set of its major critics. For too long the Administration implicitly, and its Vietnam critics explicitly, have held out the hope to the American people that there is some simple formula, some magic key which, if found, could end the Vietnamese war suddenly and dramatically. This is extremely unlikely. It is not in the nature of limited war for peace to come overnight—for surrender is improbable and a cease-fire comes only after arduous diplomacy.

There is no panacea for Vietnam. The proposal offered here is not put forth as one. Without doubt it can be improved upon. But the best chance for peace lies not in giant power or in giant concessions. It lies in small steps, taken quietly—steps that make the position of each side credible to the other. This is now the task of responsible diplomacy in Vietnam.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS ON VIETNAM

(Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last night as I watched the President of the United States on television pride filled my body because we have a President who can so forcefully articulate the American position in Vietnam.

Pride also filled my body because we

have a President who is so earnest in his desire for peace.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than honest if I were not to state that President Johnson had just as sincere and honest and forceful a desire for peace as does President Nixon.

The proposals that President Nixon set forth last night, in many parts had been proposed by President Johnson.

There were some new and meaningful innovations and some new means for compromise and some new means for negotiation. However, Mr. Speaker, just as we saw President Johnson practically destroyed by public opinion in this country because of his forceful insistence on protecting the free choice of the people of South Vietnam, so could we see the same havoc wrought on President Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, I view the President's speech last night as having tossed the ball into the court of American public opinion, for had the American public supported President Johnson in his aims, this war would have already been over.

The Vietcong and the North Vietnamese feel that the American public will not back our President and we will eventually capitulate. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the American public will make clear to the North Vietnamese that we intend to back our President and we will stand forthright in insisting on a free choice for the people in South Vietnam for the type of government they would like to have.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### JUSTICE ABE FORTAS

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, to my mind one of the most tragic aspects of Mr. Fortas' presence on the Supreme Court is the effect it surely must have had on the young people of this country, the overwhelming majority of whom love and respect this land as much as have their forefathers.

Mr. Speaker, greed and public service are incompatible and the Fortas affair is a classic example of this incompatibility.

Beyond this, however, is the fact that the criminal laws of the United States apply to private citizens as well as to Federal officials. What we have not seen of the extracurricular activities of Mr. Fortas is most important.

Mr. Speaker, a Federal grand jury should be impaneled immediately to conduct a sweeping investigation into the activities of this man, and of his former law firm and their relationships and their dealings with the past administration.

I would hope that the House Committee on the Judiciary would turn its attention to Associate Justice Douglas and his acceptance over the last several years of a \$12,000 fee from the Parvin Foundation.

The circumstances of the Fortas and Douglas "fees" are strikingly similar except that in the case of the latter the

money comes in part from the gambling tables of Las Vegas.

I can see no reason whatsoever why Mr. Douglas' dealings with this tax exempt foundation or other organizations, if there be other organizations, should be exempt from the same scrutiny that the committee was prepared to give to the affairs of Mr. Fortas.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues do well to praise the President of the United States for the restraint, the reasonableness, and the statesmanship of his proposals for a solution of the Vietnam conflict, and I would join in their praise.

I would also like to underline, however, the fact that he felt free to make these proposals, clearly implying a courage, a restraint, and a confidence on the part of the present Government in Vietnam, which is likewise commendable. That Government is an expression of the self-determination of the people of South Vietnam. It was born in the midst of a vicious and protracted war by the vote of the people. It is based upon a constitution created by them and approved in a referendum of the people. It is composed of men elected by the people in a larger voter turnout than is the case in U.S. elections. It therefore has nothing to fear from honest withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces and an honest and free election, in which I am confident the people of South Vietnam will continue to give their endorsement to a free and republican form of government.

Its counterpart in South Vietnam, on the other hand, the National Liberation Front, so-called, is the creature of the North Vietnamese Government, created, led, and supported by that Government, and could not survive if there were honest and total withdrawal of North Vietnam from South Vietnam. There is no Communist government in the world today that was created as a matter of self-determination of a people. There is no Communist government in the world today that believes, apparently, it can survive an honest election, because none are held in Communist countries.

I am confident that if there is an honest withdrawal and an honest election, it will result in an overwhelming endorsement of the present government in Saigon by the people of Vietnam.

#### LET US RALLY TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. BROCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, what a refreshing thing it was to watch a great American acting as President of all

these United States address these people with candor and completeness on a highly emotional and very difficult issue last night. Showing his faith in this country's basic sense of responsibility, which always accompanies full knowledge of the issues, President Nixon frankly offered the world an example of America's dedication to the cause of lasting peace. Without rhetoric or fanfare he stated our objectives and the steps we will take to achieve them.

Just as our President has chosen to deal honestly with this Nation, so must we rally to his leadership in the pursuit of freedom, peace, and security for the world.

#### NIXON'S VIETNAM PROPOSAL

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, last night President Nixon revealed his long-awaited peace proposal for Vietnam. He urged mutual withdrawal of American and North Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam within a year's time and reported that some unilateral U.S. withdrawals are likely soon, regardless of the results of the Paris negotiations.

It was encouraging to hear him declare, in no uncertain terms, "I want to end the war." But he also cautioned that there is no easy way to end the war, if we are to end it permanently. He presented to the Nation conditions vital to achieving peace and various possible courses of action. He deserves our careful consideration and support as he seeks to end this tragic conflict.

President Nixon's address was conciliatory in tone, but he made clear that he would not sacrifice the goals for which so many of our young men have given their lives.

The Vietnam situation has been the most serious international problem facing the new President. He is to be commended for examining the record and weighing further action with great care, instead of rushing to take ill-considered action when he took office, as some wished him to do. Throughout the Nation people will be observing new developments at the Paris peace talks and even more, the reactions to Mr. Nixon's proposals on the battlefields of Vietnam. We wish him success in his efforts. We are with him in the hope that this is the critical turning point which will lead to peace.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON WILL FIND BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR PEACE EFFORTS

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, all Americans last night were impressed with the sincere and forthright statement of our President as he proposed his recommendations for a solution of the Vietnam problem.

This is a peace-loving nation and we want peace. The President will find that Members in a bipartisan manner on both sides of the aisle will support his proposals to find peace.

I was particularly impressed with the emphasis the President placed on the fact that whatever kind of solution or treaty is obtained, it will be a meaningful one and that our direction for the past 4 years will not have gone for naught. But I think it is well to point out that what the President said last night basically was not anything new. These are proposals that in essence President Johnson has been making for the past 3 years.

We are trying to find a solution. The President's statement last night was just a restatement of the basic problem, and on basic proposals.

Let it be remembered that President Johnson had offered not to run again just in order that these peace talks could be started, and President Johnson was carrying on the direction of the two Presidents before him in an effort to find peace for the world.

We will join in an effort to find a solution, but we should not be overexcited that this is something bold and new. It is a good strong statement and it will find support in the Halls of Congress.

I think we should also remember this is the same policy President Johnson and those who preceded him had been advocating in this troublesome field.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1969

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives legislation sponsored by myself and 52 other Members of the House providing for a 15-percent increase in social security benefits.

This legislation must be acted upon this year. Inflation has had its most cruel impact on the millions of our senior citizens who live on social security and fixed retirement income. Action cannot be delayed on this urgent matter.

Following are the names of the Members who cosponsored this vital legislation: the Social Security Act of 1969. In the course of the next week, I expect to list additional cosponsors.

MESSRS. VANIK, BOLAND, BRASCO, BROWN of California, BURTON of California, BUTTON, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHISHOLM, MESSRS. CONYERS, CORDOVA, DAWSON, DONOHUE, EDWARDS of California, FARBERSTEIN, FOLEY, WILLIAM D. FORD, FRIEDEL, FULTON of Pennsylvania, GALLAGHER, GONZALEZ, HAWKINS, HELSTOSKI, HICKS, HOLIFIELD, HOWARD, KOCH, Mollenstein, MIKVA, MRS. MINK, MESSRS. MOLLAHAN, MOORHEAD, MORGAN, MURPHY of Illinois, NEDZI, NIX, OBEY, O'NEILL, PODELL, POWELL, PRICE of Illinois, RANDALL, REES, RODGERS of Colorado, ROYBAL, RYAN, ST. ONGE, SANDMAN, STOKES, THOMPSON of New Jersey, TIERNAN, VIGORITO, WALDIE, and WRIGHT.

**PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM AND PROPOSALS FOR THE CARE OF VETERANS**

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, along with most Members of this body and many Americans I listened also last night to the speech of President Nixon. I found much to appreciate in it, and much to admire in it.

I certainly join the many speakers here today in the hope that it will lead soon to fruitful negotiations and a just and enduring peace.

I particularly appreciated the President's recognition of the valor and the patriotism and the great contribution of the men who are serving in uniform in Vietnam. I thought it was well said, and certainly timely that he said it.

I found it a little difficult, though, to reconcile that Presidential recognition of our fighting men in Vietnam with the recently submitted administration budget for the Veterans' Administration, with a \$40 million cut in the Johnson budget for essential items to modernize and repair our hospitals. I am deeply disappointed by administration cuts which are compelling layoffs in the Veterans' Administration, and which have led to the shutdown of a ward that serves 30 veterans in the veterans' hospital in my own hometown, Muskogee, Okla., effective tomorrow.

I hope that we can have from the President and his administration new recommendations in the field of Veterans' Administration funding that will recognize with appropriate action the service being performed by our fighting men in Vietnam, and see to it that when they return to this country they find adequate facilities for them and personnel to take care of them, as have the veterans who have returned from other wars in this century.

In many cases, these people pay for their dedication to their country with the loss or impairment of their own personal health. One of our finest veterans programs has been our guarantee of first-rate medical care for those who need it. This is a service a grateful Nation has freely offered and willingly maintained.

Frankly, I was amazed when I learned that the revised budget eliminated a number of projects to remodel and modernize Veterans' Administration hospitals—including the one in Muskogee, Okla.—making it necessary to use facilities which are clearly inadequate and outdated.

I wrote the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration for confirmation of this information, and he replied, in part:

We are continuing with the development of our plans for this project, but actual construction will be delayed. In compliance with the current policy of restricting new construction contracts to lessen inflationary pressure, this is one of our projects for which the construction contract award has been deferred until a subsequent fiscal year.

I believe the veterans of Oklahoma and the other States where projects are being deferred have waited long enough. I believe our fighting men in Vietnam, where we have committed billions to the war they are fighting, will find it difficult to understand that their future welfare is being traded off for a savings of \$40 million. I believe this particular budget cut is unwise and untimely, and I sincerely hope that Congress reverses the administration on this item. Our Oklahoma veterans have struggled persistently and patiently for years to have this hospital at Muskogee air conditioned and modernized. I want Congress to assure them that this is the last hot Oklahoma summer that hospitalized veterans will have to endure without air conditioning. I hope we assure them that their hospital will be modern and adequately staffed.

**THE LATE HONORABLE FRED HARTLEY**

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1969 a former Member of this House, the Honorable Fred Hartley, passed away at the age of 67 in Red Bank, N.J. I rise today to express my sympathy and that of my family and constituents to his widow, Mrs. Hazel Roemer Hartley and to his family.

Mr. Hartley was born in the town of Harrison which is now a part of the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey, and was elected to this House in 1928 from the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey and served for 20 years before his retirement in 1948.

Although most of his district was in Essex County, Mr. Hartley resided in Hudson County in the town of Kearny and all during his service in the Congress represented three communities, Harrison, East Newark, and Kearny which in 1966 were made part of the 14th District. Thus, I speak of Mr. Hartley as a constituent for although he moved out of Hudson County in his later years, his heart was always in West Hudson where his great successes were enjoyed. And he was a man who knew great success at a very young age. Elected to the Kearny Town Council at the age of 22, he was the youngest man ever elected to the Congress when he was chosen by the people of the old 10th District in 1928.

Fred Hartley and I represented different political parties and had different political philosophies. Yet, I always respected him as a man of great courage and great dedication to this Nation and its principles.

Mr. Speaker, Hudson County has lost a very distinguished man, a man who brought honor and distinction to the office he held.

**PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON VIETNAM**

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the many speeches made here today praising President Nixon and his proposal yesterday for bringing the war in Vietnam to an end.

I am sure that Mr. Nixon today must gain great strength and comfort from the fact that those of us in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle have overwhelmingly joined in our support of his courageous program presented last night.

While this bipartisan support is a comfort to the President, it should be of grave concern to Hanoi and to the negotiators in Paris.

Mr. Nixon yesterday did not sound any reveille for retreat. He offered a compassionate and fair program for bringing this war to an end. But I hope that his last words do not escape the attention of the negotiators in Paris or Hanoi. The President made it very clear that American patience is not inexhaustible when he said that if this needless suffering continues we will have to take another look at our alternatives.

If Hanoi does not accept Mr. Nixon's offer, it is entirely possible that we will have to resume bombing of the North and take whatever other steps are necessary to end this conflict. It is entirely possible we will have to take stronger military action if the very generous offer made by President Nixon yesterday to bring this war to an end through negotiations fails.

President Nixon yesterday outlined a broad program, a fair program. It was an honest speech, a speech that needed to be made. There were no gimmicks; no trick mirrors. It outlined our objectives and our goals. It outlined what we are willing to do, the concessions we are willing to make to bring this war to an end. Mr. Nixon was eloquent in his sincerity and dauntless in his integrity to bring about peace with justice.

I think the American people will be united in demanding that if Hanoi refuses this very generous offer, the United States must take whatever other military steps are necessary to bring this war to an end.

I congratulate the President for rejecting the imposition of a coalition government on South Vietnam. We know the tragic history of coalition governments.

I also congratulate the President for insisting that there must be a mutual withdrawal of troops not only from South Vietnam but also from Cambodia and Laos. There again the President shows great wisdom in not permitting those two enclaves to become sanctuaries from which North Vietnamese troops could carry on their subversion and aggression in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in praising President Nixon and I offer a fervent prayer that the enemy will accept this generous offer for peace. Their refusal will leave the President no alternative but to escalate our military activity until the enemy is defeated. Mr. Nixon has offered them a 14-karat olive branch of peace. I hope they have the wisdom to accept.

## JUSTICE FORTAS

(Mr. MIZELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fortas took the only course open to him in resigning from the Supreme Court. Had he remained on the bench, the American people could not have retained their confidence in the highest court in the land. With one of its members engaged in questionable activities and receiving money from questionable associates, their faith would have been severely shaken. I am certain that the Congress would have demanded Mr. Fortas' resignation, or it would have begun impeachment proceedings. Either course by the Congress would have been a further blow to the confidence of the American people in the Court.

Members of the Supreme Court should be men of character with high principles and integrity beyond reproach. Had it not been for the wisdom of the Republican leadership in the form of men like Senators BOB GRIFFIN and STROM THURMOND, Mr. Fortas would now be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. If he had been appointed last year as the previous administration desired, chances are that none of these charges would have been made and the facts brought to light.

We now call upon President Nixon to screen very carefully the men he would name to fill this position. He will have the privilege upon the resignation of Chief Justice Warren to name two men to the Supreme Court, and thereby have the opportunity to make great headway in restoring the confidence of the American people in the high court.

## SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, frankly and forthrightly, has taken a constructive step forward to bring the tragic war in Vietnam to an end. I commend him today for his action of last night, and I pray for a similar response from the other side.

Rejecting the extremes of total capitulation on the one hand and an all-out military onslaught on the other, the President, nonetheless, has placed himself and his administration on the public record as favoring settlement of this conflict in a manner as generous as seems possible at this time.

I say "generous" because Mr. Nixon chose not to get bogged down in debating points, such as North Vietnam's reluctance to admit they have troops in South Vietnam, and also the President's refusal to insist on a particular form of agreement. He asked only that whatever understanding can be reached be clear to both sides.

Mr. Nixon stressed the positive by pro-

posing a phased withdrawal of all non-South Vietnamese troops over a 12-month period. Realizing a negotiated end to the war cannot be achieved immediately, the President's withdrawal plan is designed to bring about the next best thing—a slowdown in hostilities and a reduction in the killing.

I was also heartened by the straightforward manner in which our President stated that we seek neither military bases nor other ties to South Vietnam. We seek only self-determination for the people of that embattled country.

This must be our public position as well as our private commitment. We surely have learned we must not impose our will on others, and we must not waver in this belief.

The President's proposals, added to his implicit promise to begin unilateral withdrawal of some American troops soon, may prove to be the beginning of the end to the slaughter in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I pray this will be the result of the President's address to the Nation and the world last night.

## SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was refreshing to hear the President make his statement on Vietnam last evening. His forthrightness in squaring with the American people is certainly in the best interest of all of us, and is quite welcome.

I spent a good portion of the rest of the night musing over our posture in Vietnam, knowing that some 47 percent of the residents of my district expressed themselves in favor of increased military action to achieve victory, using every weapon in our arsenal short of nuclear. Some 38 percent had expressed themselves in favor of the replacement of our troops by the South Vietnamese as rapidly and practicably as possible.

In weighing the matter carefully, I have decided that the President's course is the best avenue for the United States. I believe that if we turn over the control of the fighting to our allies in South Vietnam, the tide of battle may well turn in favor of victory for freedom.

We will all be watching and praying for peace with security for the principles of freedom. Life is too precious to pour it out endlessly with hope for the freedom that is the innate possession of every human being. We cannot continue to wait until by default and/or exhaustion, tyranny has its way.

It is well that our men be released from Vietnam at the earliest time consistent with the goals of freedom and self-determination. The President has rightly called for removal of all non-South Vietnamese forces and permit the Vietnamese people to settle their differences within the framework of their own traditions.

## SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon last night performed a valuable service to America, and indeed to the world. He spoke on a problem of deep complexity; a problem the early and sound solution to which is of concern and importance to everyone in the world; a problem for which there is quite obviously no single panacea.

He spoke soundly; he spoke forcibly; he spoke clearly. He faced the facts as they exist, made no empty or easy promise. He avoided demagoguery.

His speech demonstrated his own deep concern and his commitment to a solution of the problem on a fair basis that called for an adherence to the basic principles involved while avoiding any tie to superficialities.

At a time when it is critical to the world whose hand and mind and heart are at the head of this Nation, it was comforting and confidence-inspiring to see this latest demonstration of President Nixon's capacities and commitment.

I commend the President for a task well handled. May our joint hopes and prayers for an early and sound and fair resolution of this worldwide problem be answered.

## SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has forthrightly set out for our adversaries, the American people, and the world our Nation's position regarding peace in Vietnam. His statement establishes a solid platform for peace negotiations. It is now up to the Communists to respond.

If the North Vietnamese respond as they usually do, the first reaction to President Nixon's peace offer will be negative—probably insultingly so. Not until they have had a chance to study the proposal will we get an accurate reading on their response and know whether there is any sincere willingness on their part to find the road to peace.

Mutual withdrawal and free elections under neutral international supervision, total amnesty and full political participation by all factions in South Vietnam should be agreeable to both sides.

A lasting peace can only be secured through true negotiations which require concessions by both sides. The President made it clear that we seek such a peace, that we are willing to make some concessions to achieve it and that we are willing to negotiate sincerely in the interest of finding that peace.

The President's speech should be hailed by peace-loving peoples everywhere as a wholehearted effort to find the peace that

has eluded the world in Southeast Asia for the past generation.

Let us pray that the North Vietnamese will be wise enough to respond—and soon—in a way to maintain the momentum toward peace. To fail to do so, or to respond in a belligerent manner, God forbid, would represent a complete disregard for worldwide sentiment and be the greatest of international follies.

#### SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in supporting President Nixon in his quest for a permanent and honorable peace on our planet.

The terms of his proposal have been clearly set forth.

Now, much of the success of the quest for peace is up to us—the American citizen.

Like a successful football team, much planning and preparation has gone into this proposal. The quarterback, our only quarterback, has called a good play. Success is possible.

All of us must cooperate.

All members of the team, the bench, the cheerleaders, the spectators, the auditors—all must add their wholehearted support.

The men in uniform on the frontlines, the prisoners of war, the families of servicemen have more than done their share.

We at home, in all capacities, can help to speed the way to peace by cooperating with our President in his quest for peace. Unity at home is as important as valor on the battlefield.

Our weaknesses are not in the front lines, or at the negotiating tables. Any weaknesses on our side can be easily and quickly alleviated by full and complete support of the President so long as this proposal is being considered.

President Nixon needs the undivided support of all those who sincerely desire peace—whether we be hawk or dove, or something else, the best and quickest way to a lasting and honorable peace is the support of the President.

#### SPEECH OF PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM WAR

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues today in commending the President for his wise course of action in working toward a peaceful settlement in South Vietnam.

Aside from the mutual troop withdrawal, the most important part of Mr. Nixon's solution is his proposal for a political settlement with either a new government created by elections or by negotiations. Even more important, however, is the fact that the President has spoken with the complete agreement of President Thieu.

The North Vietnamese have been depending upon the unpopularity of the war and the steadily increasing lack of support among Americans.

What America needs now, Mr. Speaker, is the full support of the American people for the President's proposals. We need to stand fully behind our President as he works for peace in Southeast Asia. He has asked that we consider the facts, and whatever our differences, that we "support a program which can lead to a peace we can live with and a peace we can be proud of."

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the time has come when we can show a little restraint—when the American people can withhold criticism—and not interfere with negotiations in Paris that can and will bring about the end of this war. The President has provided our negotiators with the tools they need to face Hanoi at the bargaining table. We must provide them with the silence so essential to an honorable peaceful conclusion of this war.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S LUCID, COMPREHENSIVE, AND HOPEFUL DISSERTATION ON THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon last night delivered a lucid, comprehensive, and hopeful dissertation on the situation in Vietnam.

If Hanoi and Moscow have been waiting for a definitive print-out of America's views on the war, they have it now.

The President, Mr. Speaker, was stern, solemn, and encouraging, as I had hoped he would be. I applaud him for his performance. Much of what he had to say was said for the ears of Hanoi and Moscow. The American people have a vastly better understanding of what the War in Vietnam is all about as a result of President Nixon's speech. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the whirling dervish critics who have advocated a sell-out to the Communists will find the American people backing the President more strongly than ever as a result of his explanation of our efforts in Vietnam. It was a first-class performance by a first-class American President.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAM MESSAGE

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in supporting the position taken by President Nixon in his Vietnam message. All Americans, regardless of political philosophy, seek an early and honorable conclusion to the war in Vietnam. The President addressed himself to this most difficult problem in an honest and forthright manner. He offered a plan that can be

put into effect immediately. At the same time he made it clear that our patience is not unlimited.

It is most important that Hanoi note the wide bipartisan support of the President in this matter. I join all my fellow Americans in the hope that the end of this conflict is near.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

#### MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), I call up House Resolution 407, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 407

*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. 4152) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce. 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 Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 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 any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill. 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. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 407 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4152, to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The purpose of H.R. 4152 is to authorize certain appropriations for the Maritime Administration programs within the

Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1970.

The bill, as amended, would authorize a total of \$387,378,000 for the following categories of activity:

First, acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, \$145 million: Funds authorized under this heading would provide for the payment of construction-differential subsidy and national defense allowances on vessels constructed for service on essential foreign trade routes. In addition, these funds will provide for the acquisition of ships replaced by and traded in on newly constructed vessels and for the expenses associated with placing these replaced vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

Second, payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy, \$212 million: The authorization under this heading will provide for payments of operating subsidy to ship operators in order to maintain a U.S. merchant fleet in support of U.S. foreign commerce and capable of serving as a naval auxiliary in event of national emergency. Based on studies of foreign costs, present subsidy board regulations provide for payment of operating subsidies to equate the difference between the fair and reasonable U.S. cost of insurance, maintenance, repairs, wages, and subsistence of officers and crew, and the estimated foreign cost of the same items if the vessels were operated under foreign registry. The 1970 estimate of subsidy payments will provide financial support for the 14 operators who presently have operating contracts with the Maritime Administration. This level of funding will provide for the continuation of berth services of our foreign commerce.

Third, expenses necessary for research and development activities, \$15 million: The research and development projects of the Maritime Administration are designed to improve the competitive position of the American merchant marine while reducing the Government's share of the costs of its construction, operation, and maintenance. The 1970 program calls for an expansion of Government-industry cooperative program efforts and will concentrate on advanced shipping systems, development of intermodal transportation, modernization of cargo handling methods, and similar technological advancements.

Fourth, reserve fleet expenses, \$5,174,000: Included funding provides for the preservation and security of ships held for national defense purposes, distributed among six active fleet sites. Periodic representation of hulls, machinery, and electrical components, combined with continuous application of cathodic protection to the bottoms, are methods employed in maintaining the ships for further service. In fiscal year 1970 preservation work will be performed on approximately 626 ships retained for national defense purposes. Custody is also provided for several hundred ships awaiting disposal.

Fifth, maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., \$6,164,000: A 4-year course is provided to train cadets for service as officers in the U.S. merchant marine, including 1 year of sea duty designed to qualify graduates for licenses as merchant marine deck or engineering officers. About 200 cadets are graduated annually.

Sixth, financial assistance to State marine schools, \$2,040,000: This program provides for training of cadets at State marine schools for service as officers in the U.S. merchant marine. The program is aimed at a level of graduating approximately 400 deck and engineering officers each year. The five participating State schools, Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Texas, and California, prepare officers for our merchant marine requirements. Additionally, a nucleus of highly trained officers is provided to man our merchant ships in times of national emergency.

Seventh, reimbursement of the vessel operations revolving funds for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations, \$2 million: This will provide obligational authority to reimburse experimental operation of the *NS Savannah*. In previous years this authority was a specific provision within the appropriation for research and development.

It is imperative that we commence rebuilding our merchant marine fleet and, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 407 in order that this important legislation may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) House Resolution 407 does provide an open rule for 2 hours of debate for the consideration of H.R. 4152, the Maritime Authorization Act of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize for fiscal 1970 the Maritime Administration's appropriations.

As introduced, the bill authorized expenditures of \$262,966,000. The committee has increased this figure to \$387,378,000. Almost all of this increase is for use in ship construction.

The committee bill increases the authorization for construction or reconstruction of vessels from \$15,918,000 to \$145,000,000. It also increases the research and development authorization from \$7,700,000 to \$15,000,000. One category authorization is reduced from \$224,000,000 to \$212,000,000 as the committee believes the original amount would not be used in fiscal 1970. This is the cost differential subsidy program for American shipowners.

All other authorizations in the reported bill are identical with the bill as introduced. These include:

Reserve fleet expenses.....	\$5,174,000
Merchant Marine Academy.....	6,164,000
Assistance to State maritime schools .....	2,040,000
Revolving fund operations.....	2,000,000

The committee supports its large increase in the construction authorization

with the clear evidence of the evergrowing obsolescence of our merchant fleet. The committee also recommends the use of the funds frozen over the last 3 years which have been appropriated for ship construction but unused. There is currently about \$101,600,000 so frozen, making a grand total recommended by the committee of \$246,600,000 for ship construction and modernization in fiscal 1970.

The committee report points out that at present levels of replacement, within 5 years the number of American ships which are less than 25 years old will fall from 663 to only 244.

The administration supported the bill as introduced with one amendment which reduced the differential subsidy. This was partially accepted by the committee.

The bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4152 and urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. SISK, Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARMATZ, 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. 4152) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILBERT), and the Chair requests that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL), temporarily assume the chair.

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. 4152, with the Chairman pro tempore (Mr. RANDALL) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 4152, to "authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce," is generally referred to as the "maritime authorization bill."

The bill was reported by our committee on May 9, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute text.

Under existing law, only such sums as the Congress might specifically authorize may be appropriated for several spe-

cific programs administered by the Maritime Administration. They include such matters as vessel construction, vessel operations, reserve fleet expenses, research and development, maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy and the State marine schools, and the vessel operations revolving fund.

This bill—reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute text—is identical to the bill as recommended by executive communication No. 269, dated January 15, 1969, and as introduced on January 23, 1969—except for changes in the authorization amounts for—item No. 1, ship construction aids; item No. 2, payment of obligations for operating subsidy; and item No. 3, expenses necessary for research and development.

The items dealing with reserve fleet expenses, maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point and the five State marine academies in New York, Massachusetts, Maine, Texas, and California—and the vessel operations revolving fund—remain unchanged.

The bill as introduced would have authorized a total of \$262,996,000 for the previously indicated activities of the Department of Commerce administered by the Maritime Administration.

The bill as reported increases the total amount by \$124,382,000—to a total sum of \$387,378,000.

Four days of public hearings were held by the committee on April 15, 16, 17, and 18, during which time testimony was heard from representatives of the Secretary of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and all major segments of the maritime industry.

Specifically, the reported bill amends the budget request of the bill as introduced as follows:

Item No. 1. The bill as introduced would have authorized only \$15,918,000 for acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels, construction-differential subsidy, and cost of national defense features thereto.

This amount, together with \$101,600,000 of unobligated funds which had been carried over for several years, is estimated to be sufficient to provide construction subsidy to build from eight to 10 ships.

The amount of money and the number of ships to which it would contribute, is totally inadequate in the light of the continuing drastic decline of the American-flag merchant marine. The table on page 8 of the report graphically illustrates this decline.

Industry sources provided evidence that if funds were available, at least 82 large, modern ships of various types could be contracted for during fiscal year 1970, for some 19 private owners. See table on page 4 of the report.

While recognizing the great needs for new vessels—both to replace and augment our aging fleet—the committee also gave careful consideration to the present period of extreme competition for appropriated funds.

Accordingly, this item was increased from \$15,918,000 to \$145,000,000 which—depending upon the exercise of administrative discretion in approving pending

applications—would be sufficient to assist in the construction of 18 to 22 new and modern vessels—which should include some very much needed new bulk carrier construction—as well as the new liner types such as LASH, sea barge, and container ships.

There are indications that the administration is currently reviewing maritime program needs—and that in the reasonably near future—recommendations may be made for a program which will reverse the present perilous decline. The American-flag merchant marine is currently carrying less than 6 percent of our waterborne foreign commerce.

Item No. 2. Payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy.

The Maritime Administrator stated that as a result of a recent budget review by the new administration—\$29,000,000 should be pared from the original bill—due to lack of subsidy accruals during the 2-month-long longshoremen's strike—and the increased productivity and efficiency of the newer vessels which are coming out.

With this, the committee agreed.

However, there are subsidized—and presently unsubsidized—operators with fully processed pending applications—whose needs should be considered in the national interest as steps to contribute to stemming the obsolescence of our American-flag fleet.

In order to provide the availability of operating subsidy funds to operators whose applications might be approved and become effective during fiscal year 1970—the committee recommends in the reported bill that the operating subsidy authorization should be in the amount of \$212,000,000.

As noted, this is a decrease of \$12,000,000 from the original proposed authorization—but an increase of approximately \$17,000,000 over the reduced amount recommended by the Maritime Administrator.

Item No. 3. Expenses necessary for research and development activities.

The committee increased this item from \$7,700,000 to \$15,000,000.

Considering the inadequacy of research and development programs in the recent past, the recommended increase is extremely modest.

On the other hand, it was felt that a higher figure probably could not be effectively used during fiscal year 1970—in view of the time it takes to plan, initiate, and carry forward with new research and development projects.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report sets forth in greater detail the matters involved in this legislation.

The bill, as amended, was approved unanimously by our committee, in the light of the needs which have been known for a number of years. We feel it is extremely modest.

I urge its enactment.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join our distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee (Mr. GARMATZ) in

support of H.R. 4152, the authorization measure for certain programs of the Maritime Administration. This bill, as introduced, of course represented the viewpoint of the past administration and was consistent with the low priority which it gave to our merchant marine. As our distinguished chairman has stated, the Committee on Merchant Marine has unanimously reported this bill, amended to reflect the high priority which that committee and the Congress have consistently attached to the critical need for a modern merchant marine.

I think it is appropriate at this time, at the beginning of a new administration, to reflect upon the condition of our merchant marine. About 12 years ago, we had just embarked upon an ambitious ship replacement program which would have by now replaced our entire subsidized liner fleet of some 300-odd ships. Had this program been carried out, at least this one vital segment of our merchant marine would consist entirely of modern, efficient ships, all less than 10 years of age. To its credit, Congress has never wavered in its support of this program. What were considered to be overriding budgetary considerations at the Executive level, however, have resulted in minimal requests for funds in hearings before the Appropriations Committee. Let me state at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I am in no way criticizing our distinguished colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. Indeed, they have been of great assistance in seeing that this program was not completely scuttled. We have also witnessed occasions when budgetary restrictions have been imposed which prevented the Maritime Administration from utilizing funds actually appropriated by Congress. Under such circumstances, it would appear to be an exercise in futility for the Appropriations Committee to fund this program at the level authorized.

As a result of the failure of the White House and Cabinet-level officials to recognize the significance of a strong merchant marine, both for defense and for the well-being of our economy, we have now reached the point where American ships are transporting only slightly more than 20 percent of our liner cargo and only about 5.6 percent of our overall total foreign trade. We are thus dependent on foreign-flag ships to transport almost 95 percent of our imports and exports.

May 22 again has been proclaimed National Maritime Day. The theme this year is "American Ships—Freedom's Lifeline." The concept of a lifeline is particularly appropriate when considering America's vital interest in developing a strong merchant marine. Whether we like it or not, the United States has been cast in the role of thwarting worldwide Communist aggression. At the same time, the growth of our own economy has significantly increased our dependence on ocean shipping.

Vietnam, of course, clearly illustrates the importance of our merchant marine as the key to freedom's lifeline. Over 98 percent of all supplies for the maintenance of our Armed Forces in

Vietnam have moved by ship, as well as large numbers of our troops. This effort involves our privately owned merchant marine, Government ships broken out of the reserve fleets, and the MSTTS nucleus fleet. The Vietnam sealift has succeeded, however, at the expense of other areas of legitimate U.S. national concern.

In order to sustain this lifeline, we have been compelled to divert ships from their normal trade routes, further reducing what were already inadequate sailing schedules. This, in turn, has made it increasingly difficult for American-flag liner companies to remain competitive with foreign-flag carriers.

The hearings conducted by our committee clearly illustrated the woeful inadequacy of the request for construction-differential subsidy. As you know, the \$15 million request contained in the bill as introduced took into consideration a carryover of \$101.6 million appropriated for fiscal year 1968. That money was intended to build ships which we should be launching today. Therefore, in reality, the amount requested in this bill would only cover one to two new ships over the number which we anticipated would be built when that \$101 million was appropriated. If we are to have any hope of seeing the ship replacement program come anywhere near its intended goal, we must discount that \$101 million from our consideration of what should be authorized and appropriated this year. The figure our committee arrived at of \$145 million is really a bare minimum to reinstitute a realistic replacement program.

The amount requested by the Maritime Administration for operating-differential subsidy throws a highly significant light on the benefits which can be expected to flow from a revitalized ship replacement program. H.R. 4152, as introduced, would have provided \$224 million for operating-differential subsidy for the 14 currently subsidized liner companies. The Maritime Administrator, Mr. Gibson, testified before our committee that this sum could be reduced by \$17 million without reducing the number of voyages to be performed by the subsidized operators. The reason for this reduction in subsidy is simply the fact that the ships built under the vessel replacement program are more productive, more efficient, and therefore are more economically competitive with foreign-flag carriers. The amount of subsidy required to offset foreign-flag operators' lower costs is therefore less.

There have been significant developments in the concept of transporting general cargo. These include container-ships, seaborne ships, and LASH or lighter-aboard-ship vessels. Examples of this type of vessel are the container-ships to be constructed for American Export Isbrandtsen Lines. These ships will have a service speed of 25.5 knots and will be capable of carrying 1,600 20-foot containers. Six of these ships will have the equivalent productivity of 15 traditional break-bulk vessels. The increased productivity of these ships, together with the high degree of automation, will mean that the operating-differential subsidy cost to the Government will be substantially reduced. The 15 break-bulk vessels which these six container-ships will re-

place now receive an annual operating-differential subsidy payment of approximately \$10 million, whereas the six container-ships will receive an annual payment of approximately \$3.2 million. At the same time, these new ships will carry approximately 60 percent more cargo. This is just one example of the progress that is being made as a result of our vessel replacement program. The United States has been a leader in the development of these new designs, but our foreign competitors have been quick to follow our lead.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated in the report accompanying H.R. 4152, the funds recommended for construction-differential subsidy should enable the Maritime Administration to contract for the building of 18 to 22 new ships. The exact number will depend upon the needs of the carriers and the designs agreed upon. Assuming this program will be fully funded, a fleet of 18 to 22 ships of the type I have just described will be able to replace between 50 and 60 of our 25-year-old Victories, C-1's and C-2's. It must be recalled, however, that these ships, if we decide to build them, will not be laid down until 1970 and will not begin to enter service until 1973. By then, our active liner fleet under 25 years of age will have declined to less than 250 ships from its present level of approximately 600. Clearly this is a bare minimum program which your Committee on Merchant Marine is recommending.

Our liner fleet of subsidized ships is only one segment of our merchant marine. The balance of our fleet has been completely ignored. This includes the ships needed to transport the 350,000,000 tons of bulk commodities which are imported and exported by the United States annually. In this area, we have placed some reliance on American-owned ships that are operated under foreign flags. These, of course, include principally oil tankers registered under the flags of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. These ships and many more under other flags maintain the vital flow of oil, bauxite, iron ore, and innumerable other commodities which the United States requires in ever-increasing quantities to satisfy the needs of our economy.

During a period of international crisis, history has shown that a heavy price is paid by any country which must rely on foreign tonnage to transport its essential commodities. Not only may the tonnage not be available, but freight and charter rates have been shown to escalate an average of 400 percent. This reliance on foreign-flag carriers has been allowed to exist for too many years, and we will not be able to remedy it overnight. President Nixon has expressed his concern and our committee has been informed that a complete review of our maritime requirements and a program to fulfill those requirements is now underway. Hopefully, we have reached a turning point, and we will now witness an accelerating effort to revive all segments of our merchant marine.

Should the President, after completing his review of our maritime posture, decide to implement any new program immediately, the authorization level recom-

mended by your Committee on Merchant Marine will enable the President to seek funds to supplement the present budget request without the necessity of going through the authorization process again during this session of Congress. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4152 as reported by your Committee on Merchant Marine.

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I compliment the committee and the gentleman from California and his colleagues for their leadership in bringing this to the floor of the House. I think it recognizes the need for some new additional means to protect the U.S. merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question or two in regard to the cargo preference provision which became effective as a result of an Executive order by President Kennedy shortly before his death. This was made effective to facilitate the Russian wheat sale of that period. It applied not only to the grain sales to the Soviet Union, but also to the grain trade with certain other countries.

It did provide that in such transactions, one-half of the shipping would be in U.S. vessels, if U.S. vessels were available. I am sure the motivation was very commendable. It was to protect the U.S. merchant marine, but it has had quite a different effect. It has effectively shut off this grain trade entirely. It has not helped the U.S. merchant marine at all, because it has effectively shut out U.S. merchants from this trade. I just wondered if the committee in its deliberations considered this and if the committee has any thoughts as to whether the Executive order should stand or not.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, we have not considered it, but this committee produced many years ago the basic so-called preference law which applies to AID cargoes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes.

Mr. MAILLIARD. But it is not very effectively applied to commercial sales.

No. I think our committee is always very pleased—but I can remember when President Kennedy made that announcement, that I was slightly amused, because it was perfectly obvious to me that there were not sufficient ships available, and there could not be, to carry the kinds of quantities we were talking about in that particular sales program.

So with that escape clause, that if the U.S. flagships were not available, that foreign ships could be used, I can see no particular hindrance in that to the trade.

Mr. FINDLEY. This increases the cost very substantially to any merchant who is trying to compete in that business. It adds about 25 percent to the shipping costs, which are a major part of the money involved in the transaction. It has had the effect of simply denying access to this business to the U.S. farmer.

I had hoped some thought could be given to going into this.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I am not quite clear how the President of the United States

can by Executive order tell a commercial trader how he is going to ship commercial cargoes. I do not believe he can do that. I think it had to apply only where there was a government-to-government transaction.

Mr. FINDLEY. It was an exception, but it applied to commercial transactions, and it still stands, and it has had the effect of cutting us out, I might say, from competing for 1 billion bushels of wheat business in the last calendar year alone. So this is an item of great importance to the American farmer.

I think the way the President was able to effect this was the requirement that sufficient licenses be issued to any of the countries involved.

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

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Chairman, I was not here to hear the remarks of our distinguished chairman, who has worked so hard for the merchant marine. I know there is no great controversy about this legislation. Since I did not hear the preliminary remarks, I will say I know my colleague, the gentleman from California, and/or my colleagues on the committee, as well as many in the House, are well aware of the crisis which affects the merchant marine industry.

In fact, I believe we now carry 6.5 or 7 percent of our shipping in American-flag ships. That is a cause for concern, but of much greater concern to me is that we are going headlong into obsolescence in our strategic reserve fleet with no plan right now to put new ships into that reserve. Of course, the impact on our balance of payments we all know about, but I think the fact that we are having a relatively quiet day today gives us an opportunity to underscore the fact that we face a severe crisis in our maritime industry, and it is an industry in which many countries not friendly to us are going full speed ahead in strengthening their shipping on the high seas.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I might comment, to strengthen what he has said, if my understanding is correct and if our information is correct, about now, or if not now, within the next few months, the Soviet Union will pass the United States of America in tonnage of its world shipping fleet. And their fleet is brand new, or almost 90 percent brand new, whereas ours is still very largely made up of World War II vessels. I find the prospect as to the potential for some pretty devastating economic warfare quite frightening.

Mr. GROVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING), a member of the committee.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of this legislation, and I want to compliment the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member for the work which they and the other members have put into it.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that each year for the last 6 or 7 years some

of us in this body have risen on similar occasions, spoken our piece and resumed our seat much in the style of the old-time radio announcer who always reminded his audience to "tune in tomorrow, same time, same station." The chief difference is that we would come back not the next day but the next year. That time has now arrived, and here we are once again.

Congress has always reacted—the fault lies elsewhere. We are not, however, singing the same old refrain. The tune is quite similar, but it is pitched in a higher key and the tempo has been increased. This is not the same old merchant marine song. We are trying to sing an upbeat tune, in keeping with the ever-increasing tempo of this modern world, a tempo which year after year has left the United States literally waltzing on the high seas while our competitors have all danced away from us.

At one time we were the leader. We set the tempo and called the tune, and the rest of the world tried to keep up. This is certainly not the case today. Our generation has become the "lost generation" as far as a national maritime is concerned.

I am neither hawk nor dove, but my blood boiled just as much as any American's when the North Koreans took the *Pueblo*. Like so many of you, I became almost apoplectic over the shooting down of our Navy reconnaissance plane a few weeks ago. I would have liked to have been able to retaliate. I do not mean that I would have called for it, but I would have preferred to know that we had the capability if retaliation had been called for. Militarily we do, but logistically we do not.

The military tells us that we could muster the necessary commercial vessels to sustain a supply line to Korea in addition to the present line which stretches to Vietnam. However, in order to do this, it would mean pulling every commercial vessel away from our already thin international trade routes. We would lose the small benefit that these vessels bring to our balance of payments. Worse than that, we would retire completely from world commerce. Our imports and exports would be at the mercy of foreign flags. No nation in such a position could survive very long.

We are fortunate in so many respects that we have not had to undertake another war. We will be more fortunate when there is no longer a need for the bridge of ships to Vietnam, but our only hope for a promising future on the high seas is to build ships at a pace which will surpass the retirement rate of our present fleet. That is why I voted in committee to increase the authorization to the figure that is before us today. That is why I ask most earnestly for the support—not of a majority, but in unanimity—for this authorization bill.

Preparedness has always been the watchword of the strong. My cry is for preparedness on the high seas. Construction of 25 to 30 new ships must be started during the next fiscal year if we are to prepare for the future.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, with regard to H.R. 4152 which was reported favorably by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I want to make it clear my support for the committee amendment raising the authorization for construction differential subsidy, and so forth, is based on the Maritime Administrator's statement that he expects the President to recommend a new maritime program sometime this summer.

In other words, recalling President Nixon's campaign statement that his policy would be one to enable American-flag ships to carry much more American trade at competitive world prices, I think the increases over the original Nixon budget are justified so that later, if and when the President sends over a supplemental budget request to provide for construction of more ships, there would be sufficient authorization so the Appropriations Committee, if it desired to do so, could add funds in a supplemental bill later on. And, incidentally, the amount of \$145,000,000 in lieu of \$15,918,000, is based somewhat on what our committee felt was feasible in fiscal 1970. We had in mind, too, that, due to the previous administration dragging its feet, there is \$101,600,000 left over from fiscal year 1968 which is available for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, our committee realizes that two-thirds of our merchant fleet is beyond a useful life. A new, modern merchant ship today, in many cases, will do the work of three obsolete vessels because of faster turn-around time and other features.

The United States cannot count on foreign-flag ships for several reasons, including national defense and the drain otherwise on our international balance of payments. At present, American-flag ships carry only 5.6 percent of U.S. cargoes. This should be at least 30 percent.

The Congress has every reason to believe that President Nixon will offer a program to provide, to quote his own pre-election words, "new departures, new solutions, and new vitality for American ships and American crews on the high seas of the world."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and thereby afford him the opportunity to fulfill those words.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK), a member of the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the remarks made by our distinguished chairman, concerning H.R. 4152.

We members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have been acutely aware of the totally inadequate level of funding that this and prior administrations have allocated in the recent past for merchant ship construction. I do not feel this vital area can be overemphasized, because new ship construction is the core of the whole maritime structure of this country. Recent figures compiled indicate that today the total of U.S. merchant fleet is less than 900 vessels over 1,000 gross tons.

In less than 3 years, some 600 ships

or two-thirds of the American merchant marine will be more than 25 years old, obsolete and uneconomical. This block obsolescence coupled with the lack of any positive new ship construction in quantity, creates a substantial threat to our Nation's economy and security. In fact, at present, our replacement program is behind by at least 100 new vessels.

During our hearings on this bill, the Maritime Administrator, Mr. Andrew Gibson, stated:

Very very few of the ships in the reserve fleet are worth saving and reconditioning. The AP-5's Victory troop ships could be made available but at an exorbitant cost.

Thus the so-called reserve fleet, about which I am sure you all have heard in recent years, has been reduced to practically an "imaginary" auxiliary to the merchant fleet. One more reason for this Nation to embark upon a sensible ship construction program immediately.

It is for these reasons, and many more equally as important, but, too numerous to mention in detail here, that we on the Merchant Marine Committee have increased the authorization for ship construction from \$15,918,000 to a figure of \$145 million for fiscal year 1970.

To quote relative statistics, the administration's figure of \$15,918,000, plus a carryover of some \$101 million from previous years for construction-differential subsidy would be enough to build merely eight or nine vessels in fiscal year 1970. However, we feel that by increasing this figure to \$145 million, plus the carryover, we can embark on a shipbuilding program that is realistic, and in tune with any real program that may emerge in the near future. It would reflect the contract for the construction of from 18 to 22 new, modern vessels depending upon the type and mix during fiscal year 1970.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. ST. ONGE), a member of the committee.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, the House will note that this bill has been substantially increased by the committee as a result of hearing witnesses from all areas of government, labor, and industry. The major increase is from approximately \$16 to \$145 million for ship construction. The original item would provide for the construction of eight to 10 replacement vessels as compared with 11 last year, whereas the amended proposal would find 31 new ships and 17 major conversions.

We, who have been following the affairs of our merchant marine over the years, are becoming more and more concerned over its deterioration. True, our best ships are the best in the world, but our average ships rate toward the bottom of the scale. A considerable portion of our fleet dates back to World War II, and whatever the shortcomings of other types of emergency construction may have been, our ship construction was wonderful since these ships not only performed through that emergency but have been utilized ever since in the Korean and Vietnam emergency and throughout the intervening periods of

relative peace. But, it must be recognized that even the products of American shipbuilders cannot last forever, and the time is past when we should have embarked on their replacement. Ships were used in the Vietnam lift that were overdue for the scrap heap and it is certain that they will be unable to perform should another emergency arise.

It is essential that we provide a bear minimum of sea lift for the future and this cannot be done under the bill as submitted to the committee providing for the replacement of only eight to 10 ships. It is essential for our well-being, both from the point of view of our commerce and our defense, to start on a program to provide an adequate number of vessels. The bill as amended by the committee provides for such a start. Admittedly, it is insufficient to meet our minimum needs, but if we provide this amount for the current year, it can be increased in the future as needed.

I strongly urge the House to consider this bill favorably, since I am firmly convinced that the choice before us is a start to an adequate merchant marine or almost total elimination from the seas.

For my part, there is no choice. I foresee nothing but harm from the current practice of cutting down each year the number of ships being built. I strongly urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration to this legislation.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before us today—H.R. 4152—authorizing appropriations for our maritime program.

Every Member of this body is aware of the crisis facing our maritime industry today. Since the end of World War II, when the merchant fleet was no longer needed in the war effort, it has received the minimal attention of this Congress. Eighty percent of today's American merchant ships were built more than 20 years ago. Our merchant marine is obsolete, inefficient, and inadequate. Among the world's merchant fleets, the American fleet has dropped to fifth place; in shipbuilding, this country now ranks an inglorious 14th. The Soviet Union, by contrast, has a merchant fleet of approximately the same size as ours but 50 percent of its ships are less than 5 years old. It has expanded its shipbuilding program and its marine education program; it has constructed the largest shipbuilding yard in the world; it is building faster and more versatile ships than the United States. Seven thousand students are enrolled in schools for marine engineers and naval architects in the Soviet Union—23 times as many as in this country. It is making an all-out effort to establish its supremacy on the high seas.

In view of this crisis in the maritime industry, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member, increased the budget request for the shipbuilding program from \$16 to \$145 million for the purpose of revitalizing our merchant marine. It is contemplated that this authorization will make possible the construction of between 18 and 22 new ships. The committee has also recommended an au-

thorization of \$212 million for the operating-differential subsidy and \$15 million for research and development.

Let me clarify that, while I am deeply aware of the critical need for a viable maritime program, from both a strategic and an economic view, I am not happy about the large subsidies which the Federal Government is forced to offer shipbuilding companies in order to achieve our goals. Blame for this policy has been placed traditionally at the door of the unions. Part of the high labor costs, however, must be attributed to the fact that American shipyards are operating on an inefficient level of production. They are using outmoded equipment and archaic methods of operation. We could take some valuable lessons from the forward-looking maritime nations of the world which are building more ships and larger ships at a proportionally lower cost than we are. It appears that our shipbuilding companies do not have the necessary incentive to modernize their yards and to gear up for volume production. Perhaps one solution would be to award contracts for 10 ships each to two yards each year, thus offering these yards an economic impetus to overhaul their antiquated equipment and methods.

I will support the program at this time, but I believe that the maritime industry should be on notice that, if excessively liberal subsidies continue to be necessary to provide this country with an adequate merchant fleet, it will be necessary to look elsewhere for answers to this problem.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, with some exceptions such as in the field of containerization, and container ships, our merchant marine is woefully deficient and weak.

Other nations are building fast ships—they are building container ships—and very shortly our lead in both of these fields will disappear.

With respect to the balance of our fleet, it consists of vessels dating back to World War II. They performed yeoman service during that conflict and have been serving ever since. Progress has long since overtaken them and they are showing the effects of age.

The bill here as submitted by the administration called for \$15,918,000 for construction-differential subsidy for the coming year. There is a balance of \$101 million that has been arbitrarily withheld by previous administrations in this category, but even this total of some \$117 million is insufficient. It will provide for construction of but eight to 10 replacement vessels—down one from last year. It is clear that this small number will only serve to slow the decline in our fleet. What we need, on the contrary, is an increase so that at some period in the future we may be in a position to look forward to an adequate fleet—adequate not only for our commercial needs, but also defense.

We have been told in the past that the advent of newer, larger, faster planes would eliminate the need for merchant ships in emergencies. While this may be true at some indefinite time in the future, the cold fact remains that 98 percent of the materiel and a very sub-

stantial portion of the troops serving in Vietnam have been conveyed there by ship. Unhappily, another Vietnam in the future will find us without the means of supply. Many of the ships used in the Vietnam lift are in such shape that future use is unthinkable, both from an expense and safety standpoint. We must be in a position to provide newer and faster ships for such service.

The condition of our commerce is too well known to require comment. We require many more ships to maintain even the pitifully small percentage of our cargoes carried under the American flag.

The committee, to start to meet this problem, increased the ship construction item from \$15,918,000 to \$145 million. I am all too aware of the conflicting needs of various agencies of our Government, but this is one that we can ill afford to stint. Ships cannot be built overnight, and unless we make a start toward a reasonable program, we are going to wake up some morning with a very substantial requirement and no ships to meet it.

We of the committee had had the opportunity to hear the varying viewpoints with respect to expenditures, and we are all firmly convinced that the bill, as amended, represents the utter minimum that will provide some degree of safety to us.

The authorization of \$145,000,000 for ship construction will not only help the local steel industry of Cleveland but will help reverse the trend which now places the United States as 16th in the world's shipbuilding statistics. Our Merchant Marine is presently carrying less than 8 percent of our foreign waterborne trade.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4152, the maritime authorization bill. I join my chairman and the other members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee over their concern because of the declining posture of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet.

After World War II, this country enjoyed the largest and most productive merchant fleet in the history of the world. But today, this situation has come "full circle"—we no longer can enjoy that luxury of 25 years ago. Ironically, two-thirds of our present fleet is made up of these same vessels that were part of that postwar fleet. Needless to say, these vessels are overaged, uneconomical and just a hair away from the scrap heap.

There is no question in my mind that a critical need for new vessels is necessary and desirable to inject resilience and life into our aging U.S. merchant fleet. The time for action is now.

H.R. 4152 will provide for the construction of at least 18 to 22 new, modern vessels. Of course, this is not the complete answer to this Nation's critical need for new merchant tonnage, but it is a very good start.

I strongly urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration to this legislation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman and his committee for bringing this

maritime authorization bill to the floor for action.

There are few things more disturbing at this time than the steady decline over a period of years of the maritime strength of this Nation, which is an important, integral part of the national defense.

The sad fact is that our overall maritime power is receding while that of the Soviet Union is rapidly advancing.

Moreover, it should be noted that the very large Soviet fleet is young and modern, whereas most of our American fleet is old and, in many respects, outmoded.

While this bill will be very helpful, I think we must give considerably more attention to the problem of building up our American merchant marine, and I urge the committee to continue its efforts to develop a program that will enable us to build our merchant marine at a faster rate so that we can stay on a parity with other shipping in the world and be in a position, when it is required, to carry American goods in American bottoms and have afloat an adequate, modern merchant marine.

I am pleased to support this bill and am sure that the House will overwhelmingly adopt it. It is a forward step and one that should be followed up by additional action to upgrade, modernize, and build to satisfactory levels our American merchant marine.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4152

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation as the appropriation Act may provide for the use of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1970, as follows:

(a) acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, \$15,918,000;

(b) payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy, \$224,000,000;

(c) expenses necessary for research and development activities, \$7,700,000;

(d) reserve fleet expenses, \$5,174,000;

(e) Maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, \$6,164,000;

(f) financial assistance to State marine schools, \$2,040,000; and

(g) reimbursement of the vessel operations revolving fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations, \$2,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation as the appropriation Act may provide for the

use of the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year 1970, as follows:

"(a) acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels and construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships, \$145,000,000;

"(b) payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy, \$212,000,000;

"(c) expenses necessary for research and development activities, \$15,000,000;

"(d) reserve fleet expenses, \$5,174,000;

"(e) Maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York, \$6,164,000;

"(f) financial assistance to State marine schools, \$2,040,000; and

"(g) reimbursement of the vessel operations revolving fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations, \$2,000,000."

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address a question or two to the chairman of the committee.

It is my understanding that this bill is somewhat above the budget and that the purpose of this additional funding or authorization for funding is in anticipation of a program to come later this year; is that correct?

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

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

Mr. GARMATZ. I would hope so. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And, if the program does not make its appearance later in the year, will the additional funding be requested and the money spent for some other purpose? If the gentleman will explain briefly what would take place in that event I would appreciate it.

Mr. GARMATZ. I would hope that the administration would be more maritime minded than the past administration. I am optimistic they will come up with a program. The money that we now have will effectively carry us over, but we have in mind the subsidies with this large increase. What we are really doing in adding, roughly, from 8 to 10 percent to 18 to 20 percent of ship construction. That is where the majority of the money is. There are quite a few companies who will request subsidies for shipbuilding and I am sure some of those will be given consideration. If that is done, that will be used up probably even before the program comes forth that we are expecting from the new administration.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MAILLIARD. Obviously, I think that the basic question which the gentleman from Iowa has asked would have to be presented to the Committee on Appropriations, primarily, as to whether they want to take the situation as it now stands and then wait and see if there is a request for a supplemental appropriation, or whether they want to appropriate more money now than what might come later. It would be in their hands and they have the authority to do it.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand the proposal, the timing of it might not coincide with the actions of the Appropriations Committee.

I am merely trying to clarify what may be the situation with reference to matters that we cannot foresee here today with respect to the operations of the Committee on Appropriations.

I would like to get some feel of what will happen in the event the program does not come up at all or in the event that the Committee on Appropriations presents a bill to the House prior to the submission of the new program.

Mr. MAILLIARD. We do not know, of course, as I stated. We leave them flexibility here to prepare for a program, if we get one.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate that information and thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question which has been presented to me.

As I understand the authorization, it is for the acquisition, construction, and reconstruction of vessels, or payment of obligations incurred for operating differential subsidies and for certain expenses necessary for research and development activity.

My concern is that in the construction of these vessels that we are not here at this point granting any kind of a shipping subsidy insofar as commodities are concerned that might be in competition with merchants here in our own country.

By way of an example, it is rumored in my State that these new vessels might bring in to this country large deposits of calcium and that they might be subsidized in competition with our own merchants.

I assume, however, that this bill is primarily for construction and the purposes which I have previously mentioned and in no way involves subsidies for a particular commodity?

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

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

Mr. GARMATZ. In answer to the question which has been posed by the gentleman from Texas, the answer is "No." Second, we have no authority in the field where subsidies are concerned.

Mr. PICKLE. This would be a matter, then, for the Maritime Commission?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman. I will be in correspondence with the gentleman and his committee on further details about this. However, I wanted to have that assurance. Again I want to thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONER) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILBERT, 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. 4152) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 407, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the maritime authorization bill just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 19

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of the week and the schedule for next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we do not have any further legislative program for this week and I will ask that the House adjourn over.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There are four suspensions as follows:

H.R. 10595, extension of Great Plains conservation program;

H.R. 6808, relating to education benefits provided veterans and certain dependents;

S. 408, relating to various veterans' housing programs; and

H.R. 2667, to revise the pay structure of the police force of the National Zoological Park.

Tuesday and the balance of the week: On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called.

Then on Tuesday and Wednesday we expect to have up, subject to a rule, the

second supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1969.

The annual New York event for Members takes place on Thursday and we do not propose to program any legislation for that day.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished majority leader give me information on this point. I have heard that we will have just general debate on the supplemental appropriation bill on Tuesday and that the bill will be read for amendment on Wednesday.

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding. I have discussed that with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not see the gentleman on the floor now, but that is my understanding, that the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

Of course, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, do I understand that there will be a session of the House on next Thursday?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. But there will be no business?

Mr. ALBERT. We do not intend to program any business in view of the annual New York event.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### TWENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in our society the age of 21 marks the threshold of maturity. Today we are celebrating the 21st birthday of a mature and well-established nation—the State of Israel.

Since its birth in 1948, Israel has grown and prospered in a most unprecedented manner. The economy has been launched, the immigrants absorbed, the desert watered, and a true democracy assured. The countless accomplishments of Israel in achieving a viable and thriving economy and a true democracy deserve both praise and awe.

Israel's gross national product has multiplied untold times from its initial tiny base, U.S. technical assistance has long since been withdrawn as being unnecessary, and her population has more than tripled. Agricultural production is expected to expand at a rate of 10 percent per year, an increase that will hopefully eliminate the need for food imports.

Much of this agricultural increase is coming from lands considered barren prior to the advent of Israel. Today, swamps, deserts, marshes, and eroded hills have been turned literally into lush gardens with tremendous productive capacity.

As former legislative and educational director in Chicago for the Steelworkers of America, and one who has always been keenly interested in the labor movement, I am pleased to note the Histadrut is the largest labor union in Israel with a membership of 1 million, over 275,000 of whom are agricultural workers and 270,000 of whom are wives with membership status. Health, welfare, education, athletics, insurance, and other programs make the Histadrut a vital segment of Israeli life.

The Hevrat Ovidum, which is affiliated with the Histadrut, operates a variety of industries and services which also make Histadrut the nation's largest business firm. Most of the cooperative farms are run by Histadrut. The elected officials of Histadrut represent all the political parties and all segments of Israeli life.

The arts, higher education, and athletics have received equal concentration. Israel boasts of a fine symphony orchestra, internationally recognized artists and sculptors, and Nobel Prize-winning authors. There are more than 1,000 libraries and 5,000 schools in Israel today, and there are seven major universities and 52 colleges, and many museums and institutes which specialize in studies ranging from archeology to atomic energy. An annual international Bible contest, and the Maccabiah games provide areas of competition.

Israeli technical and manpower assistance have been extended to many of the emerging nations in Africa, and to countries in Asia and Latin America. Hundreds of instructors, advisers, and survey missions, as well as builders, have been sent to these nations as part of a program of assistance to other developing countries.

Israel stands today as a tribute to courage, strength, ingenuity, and perseverance. On this independence day, I

congratulate Israel and wish for her people peace, prosperity, and happiness in their homeland. I salute our friends in Israel, as well as Americans of Jewish descent throughout our Nation who are joining in this celebration, and extend to them my profound respect and warmest personal regards.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON SAYS YES TO \$10,000 MILLION ABM, BUT NO TO \$100 MILLION JOB CORPS

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled at the decision of Secretary of Labor George E. Shultz to close 50 Job Corps conservation centers. The failure of the Senate to muster a majority to abate this desecration is lamentable.

Alder Springs Job Corps Center in the Mendocino National Forest is located in my congressional district. I am familiar with the success of Alder Springs in terms of its rescuing of human potential.

Alder Springs is 40 miles west of Willows, a small pastoral community in Glenn County in northern California. The center was dedicated on July 31, 1965. The setting of the camp is breathtakingly beautiful and for many of the corpsmen residence at Alder Springs has been their first exposure to an environment which is conducive to learning and developing positive values in a natural setting.

Secretary Shultz has stated that the isolation of some of the rural centers has been a detriment to the corpsmen. That is the opinion of the Secretary. However, the majority of the corpsmen to whom I have spoken personally have stated that Alder Springs has given them their first chance to succeed in life. I believe that the wholesome outdoor environment coupled with educational and work experience has provided many of these youngsters with positive values which will remain with them the rest of their lives. Rather than taking the self-destructing, society-destroying routes of drugs and desolation, thousands of youngsters have at least glimpsed life's broader horizons at the Job Corps conservation centers in this country.

I assisted in the dedication of Alder Springs back in 1965. I pointed out to the new young men assembled that they were part of a national experiment. We wanted to see if large numbers of young men, formerly the dropouts of society, could be "cost effectively rehabilitated."

We started off with a plant at Alder Springs of nearly \$1 million value, that since has been improved an additional 50 percent. Corpsmen originally did very poorly due to the fact that so little time was available to train supervisory personnel. There was a problem in management of the program and this was subsequently solved by vesting full local responsibility in the Forest Service.

And the boys have been doing a job. While the costs of the camp have run about \$1 million per year, the annual

benefits, constructing furniture, improving the forest, have run nearly half that amount. The boys have built trails, water conservation works, planted cover and trees, have volunteered during floods and forest fire disasters. Corpsmen have built checkdams to stem erosion and last year they converted 200 acres of brushland into pasture for livestock and deer. We are experiencing a conservation crisis in this country, and we should be aware of the constructive work these young men are doing as they improve their academic skills.

The cost to the taxpayer, true, has been running several thousand dollars per year per boy, but I firmly believe that if it is worthwhile for the United States to spend \$40 billion per year to save the United States from godless communism from without in Vietnam, our local investment in human being redevelopment is quite cheap.

The staff at Alder Springs has made an effort to coordinate academic and job training with the work which the corpsmen do. For example, the welding class learns its skill as it builds fire grates for the camp. The carpentry class has built picnic tables, poured cement sidewalks, and built outbuildings. In this way, the corpsmen are able to see for themselves that cooperative activity brings personal rewards. They are also learning skills which are transferable to the urban job market.

We must remember that the Job Corps was initiated to deal with youths who, through no fault of their own, have come from extremely deprived backgrounds. I do not think that the decision of the administration to concentrate on urban centers is necessarily a wise one from a psychological point of view. The removal of these young people from a hectic urban environment to one such as Alder Springs provides can create much more calm and controlled conditions for learning both skills and the value of community cooperation.

Mr. Ed Davis, the editor and publisher of the Willows Daily Journal, stated in a recent editorial that 1,200 young men from poor families have completed training at Alder Springs. This figure comprises 70 percent of the trainees who have arrived at the center since it opened 4 years ago. I think that is a good showing, indeed, when you consider that the group is 100 percent society dropout.

Of this group, 10 percent have returned to school, 13 percent have joined the Armed Forces, although they were previously unqualified, and 77 percent have been placed in jobs. These jobs range from operating bulldozers to carpentry work.

It should be clear to the Establishment by this time that the most destructive element in society surfaces when promises are made, accepted in good faith, and not kept.

It is clear to me that the administration is attempting to operate on the Job Corps not with a scalpel but with a meat ax. I intend to appeal to my colleagues in the House to join me in preventing this operation before it is too late.

The farmers of my district do not

quite understand national economics. They heard the Government say just a few years ago that the local water project—the Tehama-Colusa Canal—Will S. Green Canal—would have to be substantially held back because the Government did not have the money to lend. This did not make too much sense to the folks at home because they knew that whatever funds that were lent on the canal would be paid back in a few years and likewise they knew that the canal would bring better irrigated production that would nearly double income tax returns to the Government right away.

Now the Government says that not only do we not have the money for the canal but the Job Corps has got to close.

This Job Corps decision has made less sense than the canal decision to the local folks because everybody knows the great work the Forest Service has done with those city kids at the nearby Job Corps camp. They know the problems that the Government has had in getting the Job Corps camp operating right. Now that the problems of administration are coming under control, it does not seem right to summarily close up the camp without the Republicans even making a halfhearted attempt to right what they feel is wrong with the effort.

I wish to present for the edification of my colleagues a series of articles and editorials by the distinguished editor of the Willow Daily Journal, Mr. Edwin Davis.

Mr. Davis, who has followed the progress of the Alder Springs camp since its inception, tells it like it is. He knows the facts and he presents them in a straightforward manner. He has seen the difference in the lives of the many boys who have passed through Alder Springs. The Alder Springs experience has clearly been a constructive one both for the boys and for the surrounding community. Mr. Davis feels that Alder Springs provides the last chance for many young men to lead constructive lives. I concur. The articles follow:

[From the Willows (Calif.) Daily Journal]

#### JOB CORPS OFFERS CHALLENGE TO CITY

Mixed reactions have greeted the news that a Job Corps Conservation Camp is likely to be located in the wildlife refuge south of Willows if, as seems almost assured, Congress passes President Johnson's anti-poverty bill. And it is understandable that some residents look with a certain amount of disfavor on this development which will represent a departure from the established pattern of community life.

Some of the 100 carefully screened youths to be housed, educated and trained for useful occupations at the refuge will be members of minority races and of "underprivileged" groups.

To those of us who live in a wholesome rural community like Willows, "underprivileged" is a word which perhaps lacks complete meaning, because we have not experienced it. For full comprehension of what it implies we would have to live awhile in a teeming tenement district where a population the size of Willows is jammed into a single city block.

We would have to face the futility of a lifetime on pavement and creaking boards, the desperation of nighttimes fending off slimy cockroaches and voracious rats, the frustration of an environment dominated by

ricketty tenement houses rather than fields of grain.

We would have to share the hopelessness of wanting an education where none can be adequately provided, of seeking a job where none exists.

To residents of such a slum district, a city like Willows, with its friendliness, tolerance and pleasant living conditions, must be like a mirage which is tremendously desirable but hopelessly unattainable. Perhaps this is the reason that the Willows area has been tentatively selected for one of only four pilot camps in six Western states. The environment here is conducive to healthy thoughts as well as healthy endeavor.

Whether the camps will be successful, as the depression-years Civilian Conservation Corps was eminently successful, or whether they will fail to achieve their goal of educating, training and finding jobs for these youths is still, of course, to be determined.

But, in any event, the program represents a worthy objective of giving potentially productive youths the prospect of bettering themselves in the American tradition of equal opportunity for those with the brains and character to grasp it.

Whatever the merits of the program itself, surely the reaction of Willows residents will determine, to some extent, whether it succeeds or fails here in Northern California.

If the youths are treated as unwanted interlopers, then isn't that precisely what they are apt to be? If, however, they are made to feel they are worthwhile as individuals and that Willows will do whatever it can to help the program and help the youths succeed in their endeavors, then isn't their reaction apt to reflect this warm, helpful attitude of the community?

Probably the youths will engage in organized sports. Will they do so as segmented stepchildren of the community, or will they be invited to compete with Willows teams?

Probably many of them will be churchgoers, either existing or potential. Will they be made to feel welcome or unwanted in Willows churches?

Will the community, working perhaps through a group of civic leaders, meet and plan with the Fish and Wildlife Service for a cooperative effort aimed at serving the best interests of both the Job Corps camp and the community itself; or will Willows dismiss the opportunities and the problems presented by the camp as being of no concern to itself?

Doesn't the program offer not a cross to bear, but rather a tremendous challenge and opportunity for the people of Willows to take a vital part in enlarging the horizons and job prospects of a group of youths who have lacked them in the past through no fault of their own?

#### STEP IS PRAISED: HIGH SCHOOL TRAINS JOB CORPS YOUTHS

A new link was added to a growing chain of cooperation between the Willows High School and Alder Springs Job Corps camp as 21 corpsmen began an 18-week night course in fundamental auto maintenance this week.

Nick Neuberger is teaching the course, and plunged the youths directly into basic use of a basic tool—the micrometer for making precise measurements. Their concentration and comments indicated they were intensely interested.

Arrangements for the course, held each Tuesday from 8 to 10 p.m., were made by Erwin A. Decker, high school superintendent, with Job Corps Camp Director, A. R. Groncki, Educational Director Stanley Lynch and Counsellor Clyde Wilson.

Tonight six corpsmen will attend adult typing class at the high school, and next Tuesday three to four will attend art class.

Lynch was high in his praise of the community in general and Decker in particular.

"This is a wonderful thing," he said. "It certainly indicates tremendous cooperation from the community, and a marvelous attitude.

"So far as I know the cooperation between Jobs Corps and community is unmatched anywhere else in the country.

"And Mr. Decker is really to be commended for his leadership in helping the corpsmen get education and training in skills."

Tom Rogers, resident counselor at the camp, is in direct charge of the 21 corpsmen attending auto maintenance classes.

The youths include Robert Gomez, Donald Mason, Jerry Borders, Richard App, Jim McClurg, Joe Piko, Ken Belsar, Ed Gilbert, Dave Weatherly, Jim Gibson, Ernest Oliver, Allen Rickert, David Renschert, Ernie Stoess, Daniel Merchant, Red Ellis, Gaston Amaro, Guillermo Ortega, Harold Nuhning, Tom McCoy and Clarence Soloman.

#### JOB CORPS AIM IS USEFULNESS

Like most significant steps forward in the history of mankind and of the United States, the Job Corps has its detractors.

They are just as convinced that the concept is all wrong as perhaps their forebears were convinced that the women's vote, regulation of monopolies, and income taxes were all wrong.

The Job Corps, they contend, is too expensive; indeed, it's a waste of money because a person determines his own fate.

They are inclined to forget that environment does, indeed, influence a youth and often makes the difference between useless and useful adulthood.

They are inclined to ignore the alternatives to programs such as the Job Corps—idle, unproductive adults on relief, or in jail, at an expense to taxpayers, when they could be paying their own way.

They are inclined to overlook the basic tenet of Christianity: that man be his brother's keeper.

Perhaps if many of them could spend a day at the Alder Springs Job Corps camp observing the overwhelming majority of the youths, they would change their views—if they could see the intense concentration on books and classwork, the eagerness to learn, the desire to be applauded for a job well done.

A Purdue University student, in an interview published on page 1 today, gives a discerning and inspiring account of his experience as a summer supervisor and counselor at Alder Springs. He speaks of the corpsmen's driving thirst for education, and of their rapid learning in spite of their lack of opportunity for education.

He estimates that about 90 percent of them can be helped by the Job Corps program.

The firsthand, objective account by 22-year-old Charles P. Poore should go a long way toward putting the Job Corps in its proper perspective—as by no means a waste of money but, on the contrary, as an inspiring and very hopeful attempt to replace lack of opportunity with opportunity, irresponsibility with responsibility, lack of self-respect with human dignity.

#### PURDUE MAN CITES JOB CORPS BENEFITS

LAFAYETTE, IND.—A Purdue University student is telling his classmates here how he really had his eyes opened about education during the summer 40 miles west of Willows.

Charles P. Poore, a 22-year-old senior in forestry from Indianapolis, says the 6 weeks he spent at the Federal Job Corps camp at Alder Springs taught him that there is just "no substitute for a good education."

Poore, Fred Hansford, University of Mississippi student, and Dick Bertoncini, Chico State College student, were working for the U.S. Forest Service when the Alder Springs camp put out a call for emergency help for supervisors.

Hal Ward, head ranger of the Willows district, loaned them to Job Corps Center Director Al Groncki, and they found in 6 weeks that:

Even the most wayward youths at the camp want an education;

Most of them will be in jail in 10 years if they don't get it;

The Job Corps is a good effort to rehabilitate these young men;

The city of Willows is a good host to the boys and helps their desire to excel.

"I've never before met a person who couldn't read a newspaper or write a letter," Poore says. "I just didn't realize how important an education was or how adversely it can affect those who don't have it."

For 6 weeks the three students lived with the 150 Job Corps youths, supervised sports and helped encourage them.

"The camp was set up to bring their education to the eighth grade level so they could be sent to another center to learn a skill. The boys worked one day at forest service duties and spent the next day at study and classwork," he says.

Two events especially pleased Poore and convinced him that although all the boys in the camp were dropouts from school, all is not lost for them.

A driving thirst for education became apparent among about 25 percent of the boys who voluntarily spent evenings with Poore trying to learn math. His classes, held informally, were conducted after the boys had completed their work or their regular study days.

Poore also drew on his Purdue Air Force ROTC training and organized a group of about 16 into a drill team.

"At first, the other boys hooted and poked fun as the boys drilled, but soon at least 15 others joined the drill team," he relates.

The math class took up rather advanced forms for boys with their backgrounds, Poore says, "but they learned fast in spite of their lack of opportunity for educations."

"They wondered why they had to learn such basic things as multiplication tables, and reading and writing. One boy couldn't understand why he just couldn't go to the electronics school, as he had volunteered for rather than to this camp to get a basic education.

"The drill team provided a discipline these boys wanted and needed. They crave someone telling them what to do; they don't like to make decisions themselves and they respect a man who can lead them.

"The drill team drilled about 1 hour daily and soon was formed into a color guard and took the flag down at night."

It is apparent Poore has a soft spot in his heart for the Job Corps boys. On one hand he has to admit their morale and outlook on life are low, but on the other hand he is quick to praise their desire to excel.

"These guys came here with no place to go; many would have been in jail in 10 years. They have to settle every problem with physical means. But about 90 percent of them can be helped by the Job Corps program. They want to be treated as human beings; they are very happy with a little recognition, some attention, a little money and freedom to make their own choices.

"They don't need a lot of these things, but just a little. It's surprising what a little medal means to them, or a person who takes an interest in them personally," Poore observes.

But they don't know right from wrong, he believes. They think "if it's right for me, it's right, and what do I care about tomorrow, I might be dead."

He said he especially noted that only about 10 percent of the boys had any religious conviction and these were always the boys with higher values. They were patriotic to the United States, though Poore doesn't feel

it is a deep-seated patriotism. Just because everyone else seems to be patriotic, they are also, he believes.

The boys were mostly from urban areas and didn't like to be in the forest. If they wandered away from camp or were among the 25 percent quitters they probably would become lost, he says.

One boy couldn't understand that the directions remained constant no matter where a person stood.

But they want to learn if it is patiently explained that education can be used and will help them. Most have the capability to learn fast, Poore says.

"There are some who came to the Job Corps for a free ride," he admits. One lad came to get about \$400 free dental work, another came as an agitator. But most were at the end of their roads, and it seemed like a good thing to make something of themselves.

The experiences have helped Poore change some of his own thinking. He plans to get an extension from the Air Force to delay the 5-year service he is committed to when he graduates in January. He will get another degree from Purdue—probably in a biological area. Then after his 5 years Air Force service, he says he'll decide whether the Air Force will be a career, or whether he'll be a teacher. His fiance, Sue Rider, a teacher in Marion, will help him decide.

At some time in his life, Poore thinks teaching will be his occupation. "I can't explain the feeling I got when I could see how much good education can do, how even in 1 hour a boy could be so happy when he understood what a fraction was."

#### WILLOWS IS ALREADY "ALL-AMERICAN" CITY

Whether or not Willows wins an "All-American City" award for painting downtown buildings, constructing a civic center or expanding its sewer system, only the future can say.

One conclusion, however, seems self-evident: So far as its help to underprivileged youths is concerned—its relationship with the Alder Springs Job Corps camp—Willows is an All-American city.

Before the first youths arrived last March, a Willows civic advisory committee had been established. Its sole aim was to try and cement relationships between the camp and the community for the benefit of both.

From that beginning, here have been some of the activities in the intervening 6 months—many of them inspired by individual citizens.

#### Willows has:

Welcomed the first group of corpsmen to arrive with the high school band, son leaders, and other residents;

Attended the camp's dedication in droves; Taken youths from the camp into their homes;

Invited the camp's softball team to play city league teams;

Stocked the camp library with appropriate magazines and books;

Taken corpsmen on privately piloted flights to inspect their environment from the air;

Arranged for the youths to see Giants' games in Candlestick Park;

Established a special auto maintenance course at the high school for 21 corpsmen and welcomed additional corpsmen into adult art and typing classes;

Been friendly and courteous.

Is it any wonder that Western Regional Job Corps Director Mike O'Callaghan, in a letter to Congressman ROBERT L. LEGGETT, praised the community for its "positive, progressive attitude," which, he said, "not only has assisted the success of the program in Willows but has served as a pattern for the West."

Is it any wonder that the camp's educa-

tional director, Stanley Lynch, commented on High School Superintendent Erwin A. Decker's arrangement for providing classroom instruction for exceptional corpsmen:

"This is a wonderful thing. It certainly indicates tremendous cooperation from the community and a marvelous attitude.

"So far as I know the cooperation between Job Corps and community is unmatched anywhere else in the country."

Every resident of the community and of the area can be justifiably proud.

#### THE JOB CORPS WORTH KEEPING

If President Richard M. Nixon carries out his plan to abolish the Job Corps, he will kill one of President Kennedy's and Johnson's most valuable programs for giving the poor and uneducated a chance to become productive citizens; he will, furthermore, effect a cost cut which will not be a savings but an expense to taxpayers.

Henry J. Taylor, in a column published on this page last week, sought to justify Mr. Nixon's design by reviewing the cost of the Job Corps.

Each underprivileged youngster guided through it in its first fiscal year "cost the taxpayers \$270,000," he stated.

This is an irresponsible statement, since Mr. Taylor neglected to explain that the cost of Job Corps facilities was included in that cost. This is a huge investment, incidentally, which will be washed down the drain if the Job Corps program is ended. What other possible use could be found for camps such as those at Alder Springs west of Willows and near Weaverville, Shasta County?

Mr. Taylor went on to bemoan the current Job Corps budget, which he said "is \$280,000,000 for only 33,000 enrollees." Naturally, in a biased article, Mr. Taylor failed to note that this represents \$8,484 per corpsman, as against \$270,000 per corpsman during the initial year, when necessarily heavy outlays were made for installing and equipping camps.

Furthermore, Mr. Taylor failed to report what alternative might replace the Job Corps.

Many Alder Springs corpsmen, quoted in Daily Journal articles, realize that the Job Corps represents their "last hope."

Without such an opportunity for self-advancement the vast majority of them would have been doomed to lives of sterile unproductiveness, and in many cases to years on relief or in prison.

Edith Louderback, Glenn County welfare director, points out that the average monthly welfare payment to a family of five in Glenn County totals some \$312 per month, plus medical expenses. This means that the cost of educating a job corpsman is returned to the taxpayers in savings within approximately two years.

Perhaps unwittingly, Mr. Taylor himself quoted figures attesting to the success of the Job Corps toward producing productive citizens.

Of some 1,000 graduates during the first year, he said, about 5 of 10 found jobs, 4 of 10 entered the armed forces (most of them, if not all, would have lacked the reading and writing ability to enter the armed services if they had not joined the Job Corps), and the remaining graduates "went back to school."

Is this not an impressive record? Is it not well worth the cost to taxpayers? Doesn't it perhaps indicate that the program should not be killed but expanded?

As Mrs. Louderback pointed out in discussing Mr. Nixon's proposal to terminate the Job Corps, the success of the program cannot be measured in money.

"It's what we can do for these people that counts," she said.

"They need education. Any child with the capacity to learn should be given the opportunity—not just those whose parents can

afford it. Every child deserves an opportunity.

"After all, we spend a great deal more for people in foreign nations and expect nothing in return.

"Of these youths we expect them to become productive, to take their place in society and contribute to it."

Mrs. Louderback is justifiably known as a welfare director who is careful with the taxpayers' money. She not only keeps a sharp watch against welfare fraud but she acts, on her own initiative, to secure jobs for employable welfare recipients.

Yet the very nature of her job proves to her the immeasurable depression and deterioration which set in when a person is long without work. She recognizes that educating and training underprivileged youths not only saves taxpayers' money but creates self-respect through self-support.

Does Mr. Nixon's philosophy contain no recognition of this?

#### THE JOB CORPS MUST NOT END

In a speech to the 15 foreign ministers of NATO last Thursday, President Nixon proposed formation of a committee to improve "the quality of life of our peoples."

The next day his administration announced plans to close more than half the nation's 106 Job Corps centers, including the Alder Springs center some 40 miles west of Willows.

No committee has been needed to improve "the quality of life" of 1,200 young men from poor families who have successfully completed the Alder Springs training program—a phenomenal 70 per cent of the 1,700 young men who have arrived at the center since it was formed four years ago.

They themselves, mostly Negroes, have improved their own quality of life, assisted by sympathetic, skilled staff members and a program of learning by doing.

Ten per cent of the graduates returned to school, 13 percent joined the armed services (they had been unqualified previously due to educational, health or other deficiencies), and 77 percent were placed in jobs—a wide variety of skilled jobs ranging from operating bulldozers to carpentering.

Operating under a million-dollar annual budget, the cost averaged about \$5,000 for each youth successfully completing the program.

Is that cost too high? Apparently to President Nixon, who proposes appointing an international committee to improve "the quality of life of our peoples," it is.

Yet consider the far greater cost of maintaining each of these young men for the remainder of their lives on welfare. Or in prison. As many of them have freely admitted, the Job Corps was their "last chance" to lead dignified, constructive lives. It was their last chance to improve the quality of their lives. Now this last chance will be closed to countless other young men from poverty-stricken homes.

Consider, too, the work programs accomplished by the corpsmen as they have learned by doing. Located in the Mendocino National Forest they have built fire trails and lookout stations; last year alone spent 3,233 man-hours fighting fire. At the current rate of \$2.10 per hour for inexperienced firefighters this alone represents \$6,789 which the taxpayers otherwise would have had to pay.

The corpsmen have built complete campgrounds, including, last year alone, more than 75 camping tables and more than 30 stoves.

They have built checkdams to stem erosion, and last year converted 200 acres of brushland into pasture for livestock and deer.

These and other programs to conserve and enhance the publicly owned national forest have greatly offset the reasonable \$5,000 cost of training a youth for a useful instead of a

useless life—of making him self-supporting rather than tax supported; of preserving his dignity as a man. No better program has been proposed for improving "the quality of life" of deprived American youths. How can President Nixon possibly be justified in reducing and eventually eliminating the Job Corps?

#### LET'S FIGHT FOR JOB CORPS UNIT

During and after his campaign, President Nixon spoke of the attention he would pay to rural communities in order to strengthen their economies and preserve their valuable contributions to the nation. His proposal to close the bulk of California's Job Corps camps, including Alder Springs, represents a repudiation of that promise.

As Lloyd Britton, Mendocino National Forest supervisor, has pointed out, the Alder Springs camp has accounted for more than a half-million dollars of spending in each of the four years since it was established. The money has been spent not only in Glenn County communities but in others extending from Redding south to Williams and east to Chico. Hence, the entire region has an important stake in keeping Alder Springs in operation.

A good chunk of the annual \$525,600 in staff salaries is spent in the area. Then the camp itself has spent some \$189,000 in Glenn County and \$106,000 in nearby counties each year for groceries and other supplies. Corpsmen themselves have spent an estimated \$12,400 per year in the area, much of it in Chico as well as in Willows.

The most important reason to keep Alder Springs and the other camps operating is, of course, to continue their tremendous human contributions by converting futile, destructive lives into constructive lives.

Yet the figures cited by Mr. Britton demonstrate that not only Willows but every other major community in the region will lose economically if the Alder Springs camp is closed.

Should not all civic and other organizations, as well as individuals interested in their communities' welfare, bombard Congress with letters and telegrams urging that the Alder Springs camp be retained?

Your elected representatives in Washington are Congressman Robert L. Leggett, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, and Senators George Murphy and Alan Cranston, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

It wouldn't hurt to urge Assemblyman Ray E. Johnson and State Senator Fred W. Marler Jr., State Capitol, Sacramento, to introduce resolutions in the Legislature opposing the proposed Job Corps closings.

#### CORPSMEN WRITE: LIVES SAVED BY JOB CORPS

Cold figures say that the Job Corps, which President Nixon plans to emasculate and eventually eliminate, has done an excellent job; that the Alder Springs Center, as an example, has placed 70 per cent of its enrollees in gainful occupations.

What about the youths themselves? What has been their reaction to the basic education and the training they have received at Alder Springs—the vast majority of them unable to read or write when they entered the center? The following excerpts are from a few of many letters received by John McLaughlin, former welding instructor at the center. They are unedited for spelling and grammar.

The letter below was written by the mother of Eddie Griggs, one of 13 children in a Negro family who now contributes to his family's support, having been employed as a welder in Philadelphia, Pa., for the past 22 months. He had arrived at Alder Springs with a third-grade educational level. Mrs. Griggs wrote to Mrs. McLaughlin as follows:

"... Eddie is doing fine since he has come back home. He has a job as a 'welder' at the P.&W. Industries. He has been employed

there for over two months now. He works the 2nd shift from 3 p.m. to 12:00 p.m. This is Eddie's first job. He is putting some of his money in the bank, because he said that one day, he would like to make a trip back to California. I have heard him talk so much about his life in the Job Corps, especially the people that he has met, that I feel as if I know all of you personally.

"Every one here comments Eddie on how well he looks and carries himself, since coming back.

"Eddie would get angry at me if he knew I were going to write this, but I use to have a problem with him as far as personal hygiene was concerned (smile) but now, no more.

"I would like to thank each and every one of the instructors who taught Eddie, and all persons, who in some way or other inspired, encouraged or taught Eddie to be a MAN."

"Big Jimmy" Brown wrote last Dec. 4 from Herlong, Calif. that "I told you I were coming back to California—and I did and how is the families fine I hope... I am going to get a job here make \$3.75 an hour as a welder and I am glad I have taken up welding—and I am sorry that I did not have more to say. I am close for now."

A week later he wrote, in part: "I am work as a welder on a Sierra Army Depot and I get this job for I would go into the Army. And I have get married and one kid."

Jimmy White wrote from the Gary Training Center in San Marcos, Tex., in part as follows:

"Mr. McLaughlin, today is Sunday, and I'm setting down here in the Dormitory, thinking about the wonderful time and the wonderful people that were so kind, and so helpful to me at Alder Springs, until I just had to write these few lines.

"Mr. McLaughlin, I'm doing good in my vocation and education. I have increase my reading level to 8.5 and have finished basic math..."

"Well I guess its time for me to come to a close. I just had to write these few lines to let you know that I haven't forgot about you all, and always will remember the tremendous job of training that you all gave me at Alder Springs."

From a former corpsman now employed by the city of Honolulu came this message, in part:

"I didn't pass the writing test for the army, and I'm working as a janitor and I'm wait for call for a welders helper..."

"As for the job that I'm working now pays \$1.55 an hour and as when I get this job as a welder helper it pay \$2.45 an hour, when the welding job calls me I quite the job I got now."

Almost none of the youths could write an understandable sentence when they arrived at Alder Springs. As illiterates they were ineligible for training in skilled occupations, such as welding, from the customary institutions, and ineligible for the armed services—not only for lack of education but in many instances because of poor teeth or other physical ailments. As many of them have frankly said, the Job Corps was their "last chance" to lead constructive, self-supporting lives.

#### JOB CORPS CLOSURE BRINGS RESENTMENT

ALDER SPRINGS.—To youths at the Job Corps center here it's as if Uncle Sam had thrown them a life preserver and then, as they struggled toward it, pulled it back.

They learned with shocked disbelief that the Administration planned to close the center along with more than half the Job Corps installations in the nation. Shock has turned to resentment; it is shared by staff members.

After four years of experimenting and of some setbacks staff members feel that their program is at least reaching a peak of effectiveness in giving basic education to "last

chance" illiterates, and in training them for skilled jobs.

Lawrence Caplinger, for eight years a forestry technician in Lassen National Forest and now supervisor of corpsmen at Alder Springs, was raised in Oklahoma, Alabama and Arkansas. He is sympathetic with the plight of low-income black youths from the Deep South, who make up nearly 70 per cent of Alder Springs' enrollees, and feels gratified that "I've been here able to help a lot of them."

Speaking in the absence of Dean Lloyd, the center's supervisor, Caplinger told *The Daily Journal* in an interview Saturday that although many of the youths have been shunted through elementary school and at least part of high school, they arrive at the center "unable to read at all and barely able to write their names."

"They go to school, leave to harvest crops, and get promoted when actually they don't 'have it'—simply to provide school room for others."

The job center's task is to teach them basic education and then train them for skilled jobs, and the record indicates that the Alder Springs center is being phenomenally successful. Last year some 70 per cent of enrollees were placed in useful occupations; the figure is now running at about 77 per cent.

"We're making constant progress," Caplinger said. "We're now on the verge of raising the percentage of placements into the 90s."

Pointing out that "the government is going to have to pay so much for poverty regardless," Caplinger reflected resentment expressed by corpsmen, he said. "It will cost money—lots more money than it costs to give them basic education and train them for jobs." The figure is somewhat over \$5,000 per enrollee.

If the centers are closed, as is now planned for July, Caplinger said, the corpsmen "will feel that President Nixon has taken away their last chance, and you can't blame them."

"This is the first time anyone has paid any attention to them. They aren't going to let loose of it easily."

"If Nixon closes half the centers it will have an impact on the country that he doesn't now realize."

A sampling of corpsmen's opinion indicated that Caplinger was not exaggerating about their resentment.

Walter James White of Mobile, Ala., who had completed the 11th grade yet could barely print his name when he arrived at the center, didn't feel resentment on his own behalf since he has almost completed his training as a heavy equipment operator.

"I'm speaking of my brothers," he explained after saying that the closing would be "real bad—a promise to train men and then fail on the promise."

When asked how many brothers he had at job centers, he gestured toward Blacks and Whites alike in the mess hall and said: "They're all my brothers. They're all my friends."

"I'm talking about my fellow brothers who won't progress because they've been here a brief time. That hurts me as bad as it hurts my brothers. These days if you don't have a skill you're messed up."

One of the youths he was referring to is Richard Clark, talented 18-year-old Black from Alabama, who has been at Alder Springs less than three months.

"Not good in math" at high school, where he completed 10 grades, he has raced through basic math, fractions and decimals and is now taking algebra, aspiring for his General Education (high school) diploma and then advanced training to be a draftsman. He is taking a correspondence course in art, and his drawings indicate talent.

"I would go anywhere they send me for

training," he said, but now his future is clouded.

One of the center's most effective math teachers is a young man who has sped Clark and many other corpsmen along the educational trail and is himself a corpsman. Paul Blacketer, 21-year-old White, came to Alder Springs two months ago from a Texas Job Corps center, and showed such great math ability that he is now an assistant teacher.

He pointed out that 75 to 80 new corpsmen arrived at the center last month.

"What are you going to do with all these corpsmen—put them back on the street?" he asked.

As for himself, he aims to be a teacher. If the Job Corps program is ended, this path will be blocked and he will probably return to Georgia for "welding with my stepfather."

#### THEY DESERVE A FAIR SHAKE

One of California's best-known industrial leaders commented the other day on the plight of ghetto families. B. F. Blaggini, president of Southern Pacific Co., said:

"Amid unprecedented wealth, California must remember sadly, the unemployment rate in the black ghetto poverty areas of many large cities is said to hover around 32 per cent, as compared with the new national low of 3.5 per cent.

"Only by creating economic opportunity and individual responsibility for the minority people, through jobs and training, can we help them solve their problems."

Surely no governmental program has been more successful in "creating economic opportunity and individual responsibility for the minority people, through jobs and training," than the Job Corps.

The Alder Springs Center, for example, has increased its "success ratio" so much over the past four years of its existence that it is now placing 77 per cent of its enrollees in useful occupations. And Lawrence Caplinger, former forestry technician with the U.S. Forest Service and now dedicated supervisor of Alder Springs corpsmen, told *The Daily Journal* the center is on the verge of raising this already high percentage "into the 90s."

As Mr. Caplinger said: "The country is going to have to pay so much for poverty regardless. And if Job Centers are closed, it will be back on the streets for the corpsmen. It will cost money—lots more money than it costs to give them basic education and train them for jobs."

The Nixon administration has apparently latched onto the less costly Head Start program as the answer. The program is, indeed, promising. Many Alder Springs corpsmen arrive at the center unable to write an understandable sentence even though they have been shunted through nine or more grades of school. An educational "head start" when they were children could well have changed that.

But Head Start is no answer for the present generation of youths in their late teens and early 20s. Are they to be kicked back onto the street merely to make financial room for educating the following generation?

Mr. Caplinger warned of the violence to come:

"They will feel that President Nixon has taken away their last chance, and you can't blame them."

"This is the first time anyone has paid any attention to them. They aren't going to let loose of it easily."

There is logic in Mr. Caplinger's warning. Closure of Job Corps Centers would be to the detriment of the nation as well as of the corpsmen concerned.

#### JOB CENTER HOPE DIMS

Scant hope was held yesterday that the Alder Springs Job Corps Center will be kept alive, although members of a Willows advisory committee expressed the strong opin-

ion it should remain in operation at least another year.

James Coakley of Vallejo, Congressman Robert L. Leggett's field representative, told the group at a Willows meeting that Leggett, Senator Alan Cranston and other legislators had received no reply from President Nixon to a letter strongly opposing the Job Corps cut-back.

More than half the nation's centers are scheduled to be closed June 30—59, including 27 in California.

The Willows meeting was held in the supervisors chambers at the county court house.

Coakley, after pointing to Leggett's strong opposition to the center's closure, said: "We have to face the fact that the Administration has made the decision to close it."

He pointed out that it is strictly an Administration decision; that Congress cannot override it.

Spokesmen for the Willows Unified and Elk Creek School Districts bid for buildings and some of the equipment if the center is closed.

Willows district superintendent Erwin A. Decker emphasized his own opinion that the center should be kept open; that it has been successful in giving youths from poor families a basic education and job training and that friction between corpsmen and local residents had been minimal.

However, he added, if the center is closed he wanted to put the district on record as seeking some of the equipment and supplies at the center, as well as three relocatable buildings. The latter, he said, could be used for libraries in district schools.

County Supervisor Ralph Colbert, speaking in behalf of the Elk Creek School District, said, "They're stuck for space, in Stonyford, for instance, there are 35 kids in one room. We would like to get some of the school buildings down there if the Job Corps center does close."

Opinion in support of keeping the center open was not unanimous.

Colbert said he felt he was expressing the "general opinion" of the County Board of Supervisors, which declined to pass a resolution opposing the center's closure, as follows:

"The general feeling of the Board is that we elected this Administration to run things as reasonably and with as small a crack on taxpayers as possible.

"The thought is: Let's see how Nixon will replace this. If he comes along with something else for less cost, let's go along with it."

He said he himself felt the center was "well administered," adding: "I think it has been good for the county."

Supervisor Pete Holvik verified that Colbert's statement reflected the supervisors' general opinion. He said some of his constituents had objected that more emphasis should be placed on "getting the job done rather than making a palace; on cutting the overhead and trying to maintain what they're now doing."

He said he himself believed that with the large investment in the Alder Springs center—over a million dollars—"to tear this camp down is not good economics."

The Rev. Raymond P. Squire, pastor of the United First Methodist Church and a member of the advisory committee, said that in closing the center "we're doing away with whatever we have done. Somewhere, somehow, we're going to pay. Unless we have something better, we're just foolish."

Coakley speculated on what would happen when corpsmen who had been recruited for the centers were suddenly told: "We're pulling the rug from under you."

"Where will they go?" he asked. "It's false economy. Most of them will probably go back on welfare. If just a few get into trouble, the costs will be much higher (than the Job Corps costs)."

Robert E. Boyd, attending the meeting,

said that "while a lot of things can be said about taxes and whether the money is well spent, as I view it I don't believe in chopping things off so fast. You often create a situation more expensive."

He said he felt the center should be kept open "at least another year so they (the present corpsmen) can complete the program—until trade schools or other facilities can be established to absorb these youths."

Decker pointed out that "a big factor" concerning the Alder Springs corpsmen was "in getting them out of their environments into a wholesome environment." He said he seriously doubted that urban centers could absorb them.

Lloyd Britton, Mendocino National Forest Supervisor, also expressed disappointment at plans to close the center.

#### EXPLANATIONS ARE HOGWASH

The shutdown of Alder Springs and 58 other Job Corps centers is underway, by executive order of President Nixon. They are to be completely closed by June 30. Seldom before has an administration unleashed such a stream of verbal hogwash in an attempt to justify an unjustifiable move.

Secretary of Labor George Shultz, whose department has been made responsible for the Job Corps program, insists that the corpsmen will be taken care of either by transfer to the remaining centers or in 30 inner-city and near-city skill centers.

First, he fails to explain that these skill centers have not been authorized by Congress; not a dime has been appropriated for them.

Secondly, he fails to explain that the closing of the Job Corps centers will release more than 17,000 youths; yet the skill centers, even if authorized and financed, would provide only 4,000 openings. And how he would jam corpsmen from more than half the centers into the few remaining centers defies imagination.

Mr. Shultz must know, but neglects to say, that the single existing Job Corps inner-city skill center, located in Baltimore, has been, in the words of Senator Alan Cranston of California, "a tragic failure due to astronomically high absenteeism."

Even if this were not the case, the skill centers would provide no substitute for the Job Corps centers, whose success has been based on removing uneducated, often troublesome youths from their poverty-stricken environments not only to give them basic education and training in job skills but to raise their sights, to stimulate their ambition so they have the incentive to lead constructive instead of destructive lives.

It seems ironic that both a Senate and House committee were conducting hearings on the Job Corps program as the administration issued its order to close the 59 centers.

Led by Senator Cranston, 22 senators implored President Nixon to delay the action until the merits of the Jobs Corps program could be determined. They pointed out that "irreparable damage to the future lives of many thousands of disadvantaged young men and women, and substantial depletion of available trainers and instructors for such programs will be caused by the closing of Job Corps installations if Congress decides they should be retained."

The Administration has issued not a word of reply as it has rushed along a course of action which will dash the hopes of thousands of disadvantaged youths for constructive, self-respecting lives.

#### THE GOVERNMENT'S NONPROFIT HOTEL CHAIN

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

CXV—799—Part 10

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, some of the wondrous things we do in Government do not reflect with credit on Uncle Sam's business image.

In 1958, the Federal Government purchased the Congressional Hotel for \$1,680,000 then promptly leased the hotel back to a hotel corporation for \$21,000 a year. The lease contract asks the corporation to pay for decorating and furnishing, but Uncle Sam—out of his magnificent fee of \$21,000 a year—must take care of certain other matters. Records are not voluminous, but there is evidence that the Government has spent \$88,407 in repairs on the building. Even without this expenditure, the 1.25 percent return on investment is not in keeping with today's high cost of money. Please note that I am not in any way accusing the hotel corporation of any irregular or illegal dealings whatsoever. Nor do I challenge the corporation's business acumen.

However, motivation for these remarks today stems from the fact that the Government is apparently in the process of acquiring another hotel for its non-profit chain—this one a \$5 million structure known as the Willard, on Pennsylvania Avenue. In this case, the Interior Department—not the House Building Commission—would become the hotel operator, office manager, or custodian of open spaces.

It seems that GSA has three pieces of surplus property it is willing to trade for the Willard, an old VA building located at 210 Livingston Street in Brooklyn; the Calvert Building in downtown Baltimore; and some land on an old military base at Camp Parks, Calif. At this point we must assume that the value of the Willard is about \$5 million, the advertised figure, and that the three pieces of surplus total about the same amount. In light of previous hotel dealings on the Capitol campus, one might be crass enough to question some of the values involved, though I stress again that I am not in any way reflecting on the honesty or integrity of the Willard Hotel owners.

Of course, if the Government owned the Willard, it would not return taxes to the District of Columbia, which we understand would like more—rather than less—tax base.

The deal is part of the plan to beautify Pennsylvania Avenue, especially for those occasions when we inaugurate a new President—on which occasions we line the avenue on both sides with unpainted bleachers which have never been known for their esthetic contribution.

More seriously the avenue plan hardly seems a priority item when the District of Columbia includes a few miles of other thoroughfares which have been devastated by time, neglect, and more violent factors. Still more important are the human needs which remain unmet, and which will not be improved by a Pennsylvania Avenue facade.

The fear is that the Willard owners might tear down the hotel and build an office building, and that this construction might jeopardize future development of the grand design. Government acquisition would be step one of that development. Apparently, any other property

owner in the area would frighten the Government into taking similar action if said owner would threaten to add to the tax values of the District building something new on the site. I am sure there are some individuals who might even suggest that the Treasury Department might be leveled so there would be an unobstructed view from the Capitol to the White House.

At another time, when the Nation has met its genuine needs and when we have abandoned the annual ritual of increasing the public debt ceiling, we may better consider such matters. By not acquiring public properties in the meantime, we may save enough money to accomplish the desired task.

#### PROPOSAL FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ARMY FOR CIVIL WORKS

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1966 the Secretary of the Army released a very important report entitled "A Report to the Secretary of the Army on the Civil Works Program of the Corps of Engineers by the Civil Works Study Board." This report, which was published as a committee print by the Senate Committee on Public Works, is in my judgment a valuable and comprehensive review of the civil works program of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Many excellent recommendations were made. The great majority of these recommendations were susceptible to and received administrative implementation by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. At this time I would like to comment on one specific and very important recommendation of the Civil Works Study Board which requires legislative implementation. In the report submitted to the Secretary of the Army by the Civil Works Study Board in January 1966, it was recommended that an office of an Assistant Secretary be established to assist the Secretary of the Army in the administration of the civil works program.

At page 17, the report concluded as follows:

#### ROLE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY IN CIVIL WORKS

The need for personal participation by the Secretary of the Army and the Army Secretariat in civil works matters has increased in general relation to the increased scope and complexity of the program. The importance of the program to the Nation and to the Army warrant a higher degree of personal involvement in the conduct of the program at the secretarial level than has heretofore been considered necessary. The Secretariat should also maintain general cognizance of the interrelationships of the civil works and military missions of the Chief of Engineers. The Board believes that the Secretary's Special Assistant for Civil Works should have the rank of Assistant Secretary of the Army and that his responsibilities should be principally for civil works. Adequate staff action to enable the Secretariat to function effectively should be obtained by staffing the Office of Civil Functions to handle normal and continuing demands and by establishing specific procedures for use of OCE personnel

for temporary and unusual demands for staff work.

At page 18, the following recommendation was made:

RECOMMENDATION

3. The Secretary of the Army should seek to establish an office of an Assistant Secretary of the Army with responsibilities primarily for the civil works missions and, incidental thereto, to maintain general cognizance of interrelated aspects of the civil works and military missions of the Chief of Engineers.

In my opinion, the need for more effective interdepartmental coordination at top levels has become progressively more urgent during the 2 years since the Study Board submitted its report. The workload imposed by membership on the Water Resources Council and the emerging requirements of the Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, together with the problems stemming from the increasing involvement in water resources development of the new Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, are rapidly intensifying the demand for more effective interagency coordination at the Secretarial level. Moreover, the National Water Commission has been established, and this will throw another heavy load upon Army. Finally, it is being charged with increasing frequency that the Secretary of the Army is unable to give the civil works program the attention it would receive were it shifted to the Department of the Interior. All of these developments emphasize the need for early action to establish an Assistant Secretary who can devote himself primarily to the civil works mission.

I am convinced that the contribution of the Department of the Army in working with the President's staff, and in interagency bodies such as the Water Resources Council, would be more effective were the Department represented by an Assistant Secretary, as are most of the other departments participating in the Water Resources Council. Representation for the Army in these interagency activities has been assigned to the Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army for Civil Functions. The Army representatives have had additional time-consuming responsibilities in the Department. The last four special assistants also held the job of General Counsel of the Department. There is no question in my mind that the Army representation during the past several years would have been more effective in interagency negotiations had an Assistant Secretary of the Army been able, with the assistance of a small supporting staff, to devote a major part of his time to resource development activities.

The civil works program of the Army is important to the future of the Nation. The wealth and strength of our country, and the welfare of its citizens, depend in considerable part upon the wise development, conservation, and utilization of its natural resources. Moreover, the civil works program by itself exceeds in magnitude the total programs of several of the existing Federal Departments. From the standpoint of both size and importance, therefore, there is full justification in proposing that an Assistant

Secretary be made available to the Secretary of the Army to assist him in discharging his broad and vital responsibilities for the Nation's national resources.

For these reasons I am pleased to introduce with 11 of my colleagues legislation which would establish the position of Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works:

H.R. 11356

A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for an Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3013 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "four Assistant Secretaries" and inserting in lieu thereof "five Assistant Secretaries" and by adding at the end thereof the following: "One of the Assistant Secretaries shall be the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. He shall have as his principal duty the overall supervision of the functions of the Department of the Army relating to programs for conservation and development of the national water resources including flood control, navigation, shore protection, and related purposes."

Sec. 2, Paragraph (15) of section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)".

BLACK HISTORY—LOST, STOLEN, OR STRAYED

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a constituent who is employed at the National Institutes of Health has furnished me a copy of a memorandum to all NIH employees by the Director, urging them to see a series of films, the first of which is on "Black History: Lost, Stolen, or Strayed" and runs for 54 minutes.

According to the Director, it is a portrayal of some of the things that happen to an American if he is black. The Director states that this will be one of a series of films scheduled to be shown at noon and which will extend beyond the usual lunch hour. He urges supervisors to excuse employees for sufficient additional time to permit their attendance at the film showing.

It is interesting to note that this stationery has a motto at the bottom stating, "Help eliminate waste—HEW cost-reduction program," and raises the question which I feel the membership might want to ponder and that is whether citizens should be paying for Government employees to see films of this nature which, at most, portray a particular social point of view.

I am calling this memorandum to the attention of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and it is inserted in full at this point in the RECORD for the information of the House:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,

April 30, 1969.

To: All NIH Employees.  
From: Director, NIH.  
Subject: NIH Film Series.

Wednesday, May 7, 1969, with the showing

of "Black History: Lost, Stolen, or Strayed," in the Clinical Center Auditorium at 12 noon, the NIH will inaugurate a series of films focusing upon social issues critical in today's world.

This new education program at the NIH is an attempt to stimulate personal involvement in the broad and complex range of human problems. The films for this series will be chosen on the basis of their relevance to racial problems, their insight into the problems and their ability to stimulate creative dialogue. From time to time, resource people from the field of civil rights and special guests will be invited to attend and discuss the films.

Much of our problem of race relations in this country appears to be due to the lack of information and a paucity of communication between groups. It therefore seems important that with our commitment to racial justice we should attempt to create within the NIH community a warm climate conducive to an honest exchange of ideas and feelings.

This first film, "Black History: Lost, Stolen, or Strayed," (54 minutes running time) is a Bill Cosby guided tour through a history of attitudes—black and white—and their effect on the black American. It is a portrayal of some of the things that happen to an American if he is black. Cosby reviews black American achievements omitted from American history texts, the absence of recognition of Africa's contributions to Western culture, and the changing Hollywood stereotype of the black American.

The showing of this film will be repeated in the Clinical Center Auditorium Thursday, May 8, 1969, at 12 noon.

Since many of the films in this series will extend beyond the usual lunch hour, employees are requested to make advance arrangements with their supervisors for attendance. Supervisors are urged, where the work situation permits, to excuse those employees who have requested additional time for attendance at the film showings.

ROBERT Q. MARSTON, M.D.

ANOTHER IMPORTANT WEST VIRGINIAN

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to us professional West Virginians to hear of one of our numbers who has achieved distinction in some worthy calling.

This time it is a West Virginian—Joe Bartlett—who has won a "coveted patriotic award" given by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge. His story is well set forth in the Buckhannon, W. Va., Delta, a weekly newspaper published in my district, and edited by W. Herbert Welsh. The paper is outstanding in appearance, in news material, and in influence in the community. The editor is conspicuously alert in finding and in reporting news important to his readers.

The story includes a picture of the award winner taken with Senator DIRKSEN. I am sorry the RECORD cannot carry the picture. But I am proud to present the text of the article for the edification of my friends in the House. And I will let the editor of the Delta tell the story and the name of its subject in his own way.

Joe Bartlett is a friend of mine as I am sure he is of every Member of the House. We are proud of his achievement.

The article follows:

**JOE BARTLETT WINS HONOR MEDAL AWARD**  
(By Mary Liz Herndon)

A former Staff member of the Delta is to be the recipient of a coveted patriotic award, according to an announcement by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge.

Joe Bartlett, well-known in Buckhannon since his employment with the Delta some 20 years ago, is to receive the George Washington Honor Medal Award for an essay he wrote, entitled, "Strange Legend: Curious Riddle."

The essay was written in the form of a Biblical parable, and dealt with the dilemma of doing business with an enemy. The awards jury judged Bartlett's writing to be—"an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life."

A native of Clarksburg, Joe's family later moved to a farm home on Route 20, near Romines Mill, where his mother now resides. His father, the late F. Dorsey Bartlett, died in 1965.

Joe is presently Reading Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington, where he has served nearly 28 years since going to work for Congress as a Page in 1941.

Three years earlier, in 1938, Delta Editor Herb Welch, then a cub reporter for a Clarksburg newspaper, had gone to Washington to cover the story of a lone West Virginia representative at a massive schoolboy patrol convention. Eleven-year-old Joe Bartlett was that delegate, and the story as created by Reporter Welch, won for this littlest delegation, the mightiest title of "America's Typical Schoolboy Patrolman."

When, during the adjournment of Congress in 1947, Bartlett decided to take some classes at West Virginia Wesleyan, his friend, Editor Welch, asked him to come over to the Delta and get better acquainted with the newspaper business. During the period that followed, Joe did just about everything there was to do around a weekly newspaper but run the linotype.

Long associated in political activities and other common endeavors, the two recall when Reporter Welch was courting Joe's sixth-grade school teacher on a motorcycle. The very popular teacher at Clarksburg's Morgan school, Miss Katherin Anglin, is now, of course, Mrs. W. Herbert Welch.

During the intervening years Bartlett has spent two brief tours on active duty with the Marine Corps, and is presently a lieutenant colonel in the Reserve.

Joe is married to the former Virginia Bender, daughter of Mrs. Edna Bender of Chagrin Falls, Ohio, and the late Senator George H. Bender. "Jinny" was the Ohio Princess in the 1951 Washington Cherry Blossom Festival, and Marine Lt. Bartlett was her escort. A year later they became Mr. and Mrs. Bartlett and, subsequently, the parents of two daughters, Linda, age 15, and Laura, 11.

The actual presentation of the George Washington Honor Medal to Bartlett will take place at a later date to be announced by the Freedoms Foundation.

**OPERATION FORESIGHT**

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, now that most of the rivers and streams have returned to their channels and the flooding in North Dakota and the Upper Midwest is, for the most part, over, this is a good time to review the success of "Operation Foresight," the President's flood preparedness program initiated last February. At that time, the

Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness was instructed to coordinate the activities of all Federal agencies involved and to make sure that all possible action was taken against the threatened floods.

The Army Corps of Engineers embarked on an unprecedented flood preparedness program, protecting over 400 communities, building over 200 miles of levees and preventing damage estimated at approximately \$230 million.

Operation Foresight, as a whole, prevented untold personal hardships which are not measurable in dollars and, in those areas where the work was done, it was a most effective program.

The people in North Dakota who benefited from the protection provided by Operation Foresight are most grateful and I insert in the RECORD at this time a statement by Maj. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, U.S. Army, Deputy Chief of Army Engineers, on "Operation Foresight":

**OPERATION FORESIGHT**

We have no big announcement—but we do have some thoughts about Operation Foresight and the floods this past spring that we believe deserve consideration by the public.

This has been an unprecedented operation. While it did not involve any new laws, new policies, new operations, no startling new techniques, it was unprecedented simply in the applications which President Nixon made of existing authorities and policies.

In late February the President, having been continuously informed of the flood threat provided by the snowpack, directed the Director of Office of Emergency Preparedness to assure that all Federal agencies carry on all prudent activities to prepare against the threatened floods.

The next step was a White House meeting of representatives of the Federal agencies charged with responsibilities in a flood disaster situation. Insofar as the Army Engineers are concerned, a request was made to the Secretary of the Army for the aggressive use by the Corps of Engineers of their authorities under Public Law 99—in this case to prepare against a threatened disaster rather than waiting to react when the disaster actually happens.

Operation Foresight appears to have been a success. What we want to point out is that there was a large element of good fortune in that success, and that next time things might not go so well. We don't want people to think that Operation Foresight has revealed some quick, cheap, easy solution to the national flood problem.

But it was well worth doing. It saved property and, probably, some lives; it taught valuable lessons; it set valuable precedents. But we don't want it to create a backlash of overconfidence, complacency, or false security. I want to discuss with you what Operation Foresight was not, as well as what it was.

Let me tell you some of the unusually favorable aspects of this year's experience. Next I will tell you how the people of the flood area, aided by their Government, set about taking advantage of those favorable aspects. Then I will discuss the meaning of this experience in terms of future emergencies.

First, this was a snowpack flood. This means that we had a winter-long warning that the flood threat was gathering. We had a pretty fair quantitative estimate of the size of the threat in terms of volumes of water, timing, and demands on rivers and watercourses. There will be other similar situations in the future, and the "Foresight" experience will help us meet them. But it will not help us

cope with rainstorm floods of the kind that smash down the valleys of West Virginia, say, or the hills of the Los Angeles area, at almost any time of the year, with little or no warning. It will not help us deal with hurricane floods, such as the great floods of New England in 1955, or the flash floods which follow sudden downpours in Tucson. These take works in-being before the flood threat.

Second, by and large we knew this year's primary flood area pretty well. We had the experience of the 1965 floods in the Upper Midwest to guide us. We were all caught by surprise, however, at Minot, North Dakota based on a much lower forecast of a flood potential. But of the hundreds of towns that might have been damaged, this was the only one of size which suffered heavy damage. Our crystal ball isn't perfect and probably never will be—which is one of the cautionary things people should keep in mind. By and large, however, we, and here I mean both Federal and local people, knew the carry-off capacities of the natural channels in this year's flood area; we knew how the water moved in those channels; we knew where possibilities existed for by-passes and cutoffs; we knew where to go for sand and clay and emergency construction materials; we knew the region's resources of available machinery and equipment. We do not have exactly the same knowledge in all parts of the country. Each region is different with respect to the kind and nature of studies that have been Congressionally authorized and carried out, and with respect to the amount of experience we have derived from past emergencies. In the Midwest, the situation was unusually favorable in this respect.

Third, nature was generally kind. This is perhaps the outstanding fact about the 1969 flood. By and large, the water content of that tremendous snowpack came gently off the land. With different weather or heavy rains it might have stampeded. I doubt very much that the hasty, improvised emergency dikes and other works we put up under Operation Foresight would have withstood a stampede of waters as well as they did the more orderly run off that actually took place, generally in accord with the predictions. We want to explain to people that not all floods which invade their valleys will be as docile and tractable as this one was.

Fourth, the people of the flood area still had the memory of the 1965 disaster fresh in their minds. Operation Foresight was very largely and initially a local community effort, and I daresay never before have so many communities acted so energetically and cooperatively and unanimously over so large an area in such an endeavor. People pitched in, city fathers did not grudge money, Federal technical material and contractual help was welcomed and invited, and very, very few communities held back or grudged their share. Such energetic local participation was of great value in preventing loss and damage and disaster. I doubt you will find a single community throughout the flood area that regrets its effort or its investment in Operation Foresight now that it is all over. I hope that this lesson will be heeded in other times, perhaps in other areas, if a similar flood threat should occur again.

Fifth, but not least, we had unprecedented interest and alertness at the Federal, State and local levels. I am talking to you as a technician, not a politician. In the past two months I have met scores of political leaders in connection with Operation Foresight and I want to tell you that that Operation had no partisan labels. We face the fact that one of the valuable lessons of Operation Foresight was the lesson of whole-hearted support and initiative by all levels of Government.

The best way to present this point to you is to move now into the second phase of this presentation—the phase in which I tell you

how the Government and public officials took advantage of the warning provided, and the time available, and their knowledge of the area, and the willingness and concern of the local people, to put Operation Foresight together.

As I said, the agencies involved at various levels had been keeping an eye on the snowpack situation beginning in January. On February 28, President Nixon summoned representatives of the Federal agencies to the White House. The Department of the Army represented the Department of Defense; since the Army headquarters in the Pentagon is responsible for military support by all elements of the Defense Department in case of natural disaster. The Office of Emergency Preparedness was represented by Director George A. Lincoln.

On the following day, March 1, the President issued his order directing that Federal agencies take all feasible steps within their respective authorities to prepare for the flood threat; and this order in effect launched Operation Foresight. For one of the things it brought about was an unprecedented and aggressive application of Public Law 99 to prepare for an anticipated disaster before the disaster actually happened. Public Law 99 authorizes the Army's Chief of Engineers to spend emergency funds for flood emergency preparations, flood fighting and rescue work, and the repair or restoration of damaged flood control works. It had never before been invoked on such a scale so far in advance of a flood. This law provided the legal basis for, and most of the money for the before-flood-preparedness phases of the Federal part of Operation Foresight.

Precisely because it was unprecedented and unique, the nature of this effort which the Federal Government was prepared to offer in support of State and local activities had to be explained to the officials of the non-Federal levels of government. The first ten days or so of March were spent in coordinating the undertaking and mobilizing the effort. By mid-March my boss, Lt. Gen. Cassidy, Chief of Engineers, and I had met with the Governors or their representatives of a score of States, accompanied by representatives of OEP and the local Army commanders. These tours and visits continued throughout most of the flood fight to make sure that the Federal aid was fully understood and fully used. Our guidance to our field offices was simple and direct: do whatever makes sense before the floods occur. To make sense, our help had to be sound from both engineering and economic standpoints, and depended on local governments providing work areas and local labor either paid or volunteer.

I'm not going to repeat the story of this flood fight. The press did a wonderful job of covering most aspects of it, and for me to tell you about it would be carrying coals to Newcastle. To refresh your memories, I will just run down some of the basic statistics:

The damage suffered in the flood we estimate at about \$100 million, largely rural and highways and bridges. The damage prevented, at about \$250 million.

These are both "eyeball" estimates. We have crews in the field recording high-water marks, establishing flood profiles, and surveying damage from which more reliable estimates can be made, but these won't be available for some weeks. I don't want to leave the impression that all snowpack flood threats are over—we still have a dangerous situation which will continue through June in the San Joaquin Valley of California.

About \$19 million were spent by the Army Engineers on Operation Foresight. These expenditures included more than 400 contracts for emergency work in about as many communities, plus the procurement and deployment of supplies and equipment. About 10 million sandbags were procured—enough to

reach across the entire U.S.-Canadian border from Atlantic to Pacific—and about 200 miles of emergency levee were built, enough to reach from here to New York. More than 200 flood-fighting experts from all parts of the country were sent into the threatened areas to supplement our regular forces in those areas in advising and supporting local efforts.

There were just a couple of aspects that didn't catch the eagle eyes of the press corps, by and large, that I would like to call to your attention.

One is the story of the effort that didn't get made, because it wasn't needed. But it was ready, and I hope people will realize that Operation Foresight included some back-up preparations which, another time, might be more prominent.

The Army, as the agent for Department of Defense, for example, prepared for an all-out disaster relief effort. Every Army headquarters reviewed its plans for disaster emergency activities and made ready its manpower and equipment resources. From February through April, the Army's Operations Center in the Pentagon maintained a 24-hour-a-day coordination center to keep track of possible needs. As it happened, almost 2,100 Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard personnel and more than 1,700 National Guardsmen were used for evacuating stranded people, levee patrolling, sandbagging, prevention of looting, aerial reconnaissance, feeding volunteer workers, traffic control, and similar tasks. A special assist was provided by the young engineer officers, which the Department of the Army released from school assignments, to assist the Corps of Engineers in carrying out the emergency work. But this was a fraction of the service that was ready and available if it had been needed.

Similarly, OEP had alerted a very big, many-sided back-up preparation effort. The President declared a major disaster in five states, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa and Wisconsin making additional federal funds available under PL 875. I'm not going to try to tell their story. Suffice it to say for the present that it was there, and people should note and remember it.

The third phase of my presentation was to draw lessons and point warnings, but I find that I have largely done this as I went along.

I think we should include the Foresight-type use of Public Law 99 and the other preparatory activities launched this spring, as part of our national disaster emergency policy—part of our regular armory of flood-fight resources that can be drawn upon in circumstances appropriate for its use. At the same time we should recognize that in many circumstances, the Foresight type of approach will not be appropriate, so that we need other devices in our armory too.

One: We need to carry forward our regular Federal flood-control programs, at such rate as Congress and the Executive branch may determine in view of the total resources of the Government. Hurriedly-built emergency works of the kind put up under Operation Foresight are not good enough or strong enough to withstand the onslaught of a wild river on a rampage—even though they may have held out, shakily in some places, during this year's well predicted and well-ordered floods.

Two: Flood control and flood protection programs should be supplemented by flood-plain land-use regulations. Such regulations would typically include zoning ordinances and appropriate flood-proofing provisions in local building codes. These are not subjects for Federal legislation; but, as you may know, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to make flood-frequency and related studies for use by local communities in connection with such proposed ordinances. We believe this

kind of activity deserves much greater attention than it has been getting. Perhaps this year's floods will help stimulate such attention.

Three: We have to move forward with our comprehensive water-resource planning endeavors in the nation's major river basins. And in the light of our flood experience of this and other years, we should gear local and State and Federal flood-control and flood-plain regulation activities into over-all policies for the management of water and related land resources. This is a big topic, too big really to discuss today. I only want to point out that we of the Army Corps of Engineers are keenly aware of the fact that flood protection is one aspect—an important one, but only one—of many involved in water resource development and management, and that all must be considered together in all their mutually interacting relationships. We have just come through a dangerous flood experience and narrowly escaped a far worse one. We should heed the warnings it presents, but without either being stampeded into ill-considered actions nor lulled into false complacency. If we plan well, and plan together, we can avoid both kinds of error.

To sum up—the degree of our success this year in flood prevention is largely the result of warning, the bold and aggressive approach ordered by President Nixon, much initiative on the part of local and state governments, enthusiastic and altruistic participation by individuals, private enterprise, and government at all levels—proving, once again, that in a critical situation, people will work together in the common good.

#### PROPOSED INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, that no action will be taken this session to increase social security benefits concerns me greatly.

The need for an increase in social security benefits is urgent and immediate. For this reason I introduced on opening day of this Congress, H.R. 55 to provide for a 50 percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits with the resulting benefit costs being borne equally by employers, employees, and the Federal Government.

This legislation is a realistic one that deserves action.

The Social and Rehabilitation Service estimates that the passage of H.R. 55 would result in a total savings in public assistance expenditures of approximately \$370 million, of which \$250 million would be Federal and \$120 million State moneys. In terms of the number of public assistance recipients affected, it is estimated that around 400,000 small old-age assistance grants would be discontinued and that about 700,000 others would be reduced.

Mr. Speaker may I submit for the RECORD a news clipping entitled "Has Congress Forsaken Us," written by the Boston Globe staff writer, Joseph B. Levin that serves to illustrate the urgency of the problem:

## HAS CONGRESS FORSAKEN US?

(By Joseph B. Levin)

Chairman Wilbur Mills and his House Ways and Means Committee are in deep trouble with the elderly voters and their children. Take a look at these letters from the mailbag:

"I believe it is about time that leaders of the senior set throughout the land should single out Representative Wilbur Mills as their target of the day and focus attention on this dictatorial chairman who has announced his intention of delaying an increase in Social Security . . . As former chairman of the Winchester board of selectmen and as a retired dean I feel strongly that Mills can be challenged successfully. What we need is a march on Washington." (Col. J. P. (retired), Winchester.)

"I am 70. Like thousands of other senior citizens I am greatly concerned about the future. Despite enormous increases in Federal pay, Congress has not voted any increases in age 65 tax exemptions . . . Why has Congress forsaken us?" (letter to Rep. Mills from Paul G. Richter, Concord, N.H.)

"My mother, 83, is on Old Age Assistance and believe me, she cannot live on what she gets. Shame on this great and wealthy country that the old people, who have worked so loyally, should get such a reward." (Mrs. A. K. Nabnasset, Mass.)

"I am a widow, 70, living on \$117.80 Social Security in my own home. With high taxes, food and high prices generally, I need \$200 a month to get by on. Must one go on welfare after 42 years as a wage earner and taxpayer?" (Mrs. J. L. Malden.)

Senior Set gladly prints your protests but has no way of knowing whether Chairman Mills ever reads this column. Perhaps his fellow committeeman, Cong. James Burke of Milton, does. He might call it to Mr. Mills's attention. Or all of you folks could write to Mr. Mills direct.

As to the welfare question raised in several of the letters, it is my view that welfare is an honorable concept deeply embedded in the U.S. Constitution. Adequate welfare is as necessary to the security of America as money spent for the Armed Forces, the universities or the police. It helps society to stay together until a better system can be devised.

## LET'S NOT STOP WITH FORTAS

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I receive the announcement that Justice Abe Fortas has resigned. I say "mixed emotions" because we have only one out—that others should resign for similar reasons.

Apparently members of the high judiciary not only deliberate together, they profit together.

In yesterday's Daily News we learned that other members of the High Court have entangled themselves into holding partnerships in land companies for tax loophole benefits and for identity-concealing fronts. A form of judicial-investment conglomerate.

Here in Washington, D.C., alone, the dealings include not only the High Court, but spill down to the lesser lights—all of whom have been front-runners in revolutionary court decisions abusive of individual liberties and our basic constitutional law and traditional mores.

Little wonder urban renewal and model cities programs find favor under color of the law, in the eyes of some members of

the judiciary—some judges are not entirely disinterested.

For example, in Concord Associates, a partnership on record in Arlington County, Va., dealing in land and real estate, we find listed among the limited partners: Miss Carolyn E. Agger, wife of Justice Abe Fortas; Chief Judge David Bazelon, of the court of appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; Mrs. Bazelon, his wife; Justice William Brennan, U.S. Supreme Court; Justice Abe Fortas; former Justice Arthur Goldberg; and Court of Appeals Judge J. Skelly Wright.

In Arlington County, Va., Duke Associates, another limited partnership dealing in land transactions, we find, as partners: Justice Abe Fortas, Judge Bazelon, and Chief Judge Simon E. Sobeloff, of the fourth circuit court of appeals.

In the District of Columbia, on record is the Colorado Building Associates, whose purpose again is given as acquisition of land, and we find among the partners: Judge David Bazelon and Judge J. Skelly Wright, just to mention a few.

Again in Arlington County, Va., a partnership called Wilson Associates, listing as limited partners Judge David L. Bazelon, and showing that by an amendment in December of 1967 Justice William J. Brennan, who had been a limited partner, transferred his holding to a retirement fund.

I raise the question; to whom would property bids from HUD and model cities programs go?

Mr. Speaker, these records I have used as an example are by no means intended to imply that a complete search has been made. There may be others even more suggestive. Should not the American people be given a full disclosure?

Is it not conceivable that the Fortas resignation is intended only to frustrate further inquiry? We have the responsibility to our people not to permit ourselves to be pacified by the departure of one—Abe Fortas—while there remain in the Federal judiciary others whose similar interests damage the solemnity of the judiciary.

If corruption in the Federal judiciary exceeds one member, it is no less corrupt by merely losing one of several corrupting influences.

Public confidence in justice demands more than Fortas' resignation from the Federal judiciary.

I include survey sheets of the identified partnerships and a newsclipping from the Washington Daily News for May 14, 1969:

## ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA.

## SURVEY SHEETS

Name: Concord Associates.  
Partnership Agreement: 12/22/65.  
Agreement filed: 1/18/66 (Arlington Co. Partnership Book # 3/523).

Purpose: Leasing of parcels of ground, and the construction, development and operation of rental real property.

Second Amendment: 4/11/66; filed 5/4/66 (Partnership Book # 4/49).

Limited partners: Carolyn E. Agger (Mrs. Fortas), 3210 R. Street, N.W., 2.10 percent; David Bazelon, 4.16 percent; Miriam K. Bazelon, 2.30 percent; Wm. Brennan, 1.40 percent; Abe Fortas, 2.10 percent; Arthur Goldberg,

4.16 percent; Abraham Ribicoff, 4.16 percent; J. Skelly Wright, 1.40 percent.

## ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA.

Name: Duke Associates (originally recorded in Fairfax County Partnership book 31/425).

Amendment of 3/30/64 (filed in Arlington Co., 5/20/64; Book # 3/235).

Limited partners: David Bazelon; Abe Fortas; Roy Bazelon; Jeanette Bazelon; S. J. Bazelon; new partner: Simon E. Sobeloff, 1.4285 percent.

## WASHINGTON, D.C.

## D.C. RECORDER OF DEEDS

Name: Colorado Building Associates.

Filed: 2/2/65.

Instrument # 151.

Purpose: acquisition and operation of Colorado Building (1341 G. Street, N.W.).

General partners: Joel Kaufman; Stanley Rosenzweig.

Limited partners: David L. Bazelon, 8 percent; Simon Hirshman; Saul Feld, 1328 New York Ave.; Gerald Friedman, 4527 29th; David Sher; Robert Wolfson; ———, J. Skelly Wright, 2 percent.

## ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA.

Name: Wilson Associates.

Filed: 5/21/63 (Book #2/457).

Amendment: 5/28/63 (Book #2/463).

Limited partners: Miriam K. Bazelon, 2.88%; David L. Bazelon, 2.16%; Agnes M. Johnson, 2745-29th str., N.W., 0.72%; Charles E. Smith, 18.03%; Leonard A. Solomon, 12305 Greenhill Dr., Silver Spring, 6.48%; Myra S. Brill, 4095 Monticello Blvd., Cleveland Hgts., Ohio, 0.72%; Marvin Kogod, Miriam K. Bazelon and Arnold F. Shaw, Trustees for J. B. Trust, 503 D street, N.W., 1.08%; same Trustees for R. B. Trust, 1.08%; Arnold F. Shaw and David L. Kreeger, Trustees for J. A. B. Trust, 1.08%; same, Trustees for R. L. B. Trust, 1.08%.

Amendment: 11/21/63 (Book #3/63).

Charles E. Smith assigns to: David Kotkin, Trustee, 2.88%; Roy and Jeanette Bazelon, Riviera Dr., Golden Beach, Fla., 1.44%; Charles E. Smith, 13.71%.

Amendment: 4/15/64 (Book #3/239; filed: 5/20/64).

New limited partners: vice Charles E. Smith: Wm. J. Brennan, 2.16%; David L. Bazelon, 0.72% (together: 2.90%); Simon E. Sobeloff, 0.72%.

Amendment: 12/21/67 (Book #4/435; filed 1/9/68).

Brennan assigns 2.16% partnership to Charles E. Smith Retirement Fund.

Amendment: 11/19/68 (Book #5/171).

Robert P. Kogod, 9118 Redwood Dr., Bethesda—replaces David Kotkin, Trustee.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 14, 1969]

PROFESSOR CITES "PARTNERSHIP": FORTAS MAY SIT OUT CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY CASE

(By Dan Thomasson)

Besieged Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas' real estate interests here are expected today to bring a demand that he disqualify himself from ruling on an appeal motion brought by a university law professor.

Dr. William Roberts, professor of international law and relations at Catholic University, will file a petition with the Supreme Court seeking disqualification of Justice Fortas and a fellow associate justice, William Brennan, on grounds they are business partners with two lower court judges whose decisions in the case are under challenge by Dr. Roberts.

This latest challenge to Justice Fortas follows reports by congressional sources that the Justice Department has been checking into Justice Fortas' connections with real estate syndicates in the district area. The

sources said some of these associations might constitute a conflict with Justice Fortas' court duties.

#### RESIGNATION RUMORS

The continuing furor over Justice Fortas' dealings with jailed Florida financier Louis E. Wolfson produced a new round of reports today that Justice Fortas' resignation is "imminent."

In his petition to the high court, Dr. Roberts will charge that Justice Fortas and Justice Brennan are limited partners in a Virginia apartment complex with David E. Bazelon, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and J. Skelly Wright, also a Court of Appeals judge here.

The Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers disclosed in November that Justice Fortas, Justice Brennan, Justice Wright, Judge Bazelon, Mrs. Bazelon, Mrs. Fortas (Washington tax attorney Carolyn Agger), former United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, all had an interest in Concord Village Associates, which operates a 531-garden apartment complex in Arlington.

The project was described by tax experts as a legal "tax shelter" in which the partners could deduct from taxes on ordinary income their share of theoretical depreciation losses on the apartment complex.

Dr. Roberts also will note in his petition to the court that Judges Bazelon and Wright, who ruled on his case, are limited partners in a downtown Washington office building.

Dr. Roberts' petition stems from his efforts to prevent the university from abolishing an Institute of International Law and Relations which Dr. Roberts had a contract to head.

Two motions filed in 1967 and 1968 asked the District Court here to issue an injunction halting the dissolution of the institute. Both motions were rejected and Dr. Roberts appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals headed by Judge Bazelon.

After numerous delays, the appeals were denied and Dr. Roberts turned to the Supreme Court, asking for a writ of certiorari. His impending petition seeks to disqualify Justice Fortas and Justice Brennan from taking part in the court's decision on whether to grant the writ and go into the case.

As partners in the Virginia complex, Dr. Roberts charges, Justice Fortas and Justice Brennan should not be sitting in judgment of decisions made by two other partners in the same venture, Judge Bazelon and Judge Wright.

In addition to his holdings in Concord Village, Justice Fortas also has a limited partnership in Duke Associates, which also operates a Virginia apartment complex.

Last fall, Justice Fortas conceded to Scripps-Howard Newspapers that he was interested in obtaining the tax breaks such ventures offered. He said this was particularly true when he was practicing law.

Last night, almost at the last minute, Justice Fortas cancelled a scheduled appearance before the First Circuit Judicial Conference in New Castle, N.H. No reason was given.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL

(Mr. HAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise again to bring to the attention of my colleagues the serious and growing prob-

lem of alcoholism. The Public Health Service and the Crime Commission have described alcoholism as the Nation's fourth most serious health problem ranking behind heart disease, mental illness and cancer. Alcoholism afflicts an estimated 5 million Americans and roughly 250,000 persons join the ranks of alcoholics each year.

For many years I have been working on developing a comprehensive program to deal with this disease on a national level. As a member of the Georgia Legislature I was instrumental in creating the Georgia Commission on Alcoholism which has become one of the finest programs of its kind in the country today. Beginning with the 87th Congress and in successive Congresses, I have introduced legislation dealing with alcoholism. I am pleased that the 90th Congress passed two significant pieces of alcoholism legislation, one, the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Act of 1968 and the other, my own bill, establishing a program of alcoholism care and control for the District of Columbia. The former, which is contained in Public Law 90-574 is a good beginning for a national program but so much more needs to be done. Let me bring out a few revealing factors on alcoholism.

The Crime Commission reported that in 1965 one out of every three arrests, some 2 million, were for public drunkenness, thus placing a heavy burden on the courts, the police and the penal system, all of which are already overburdened with the increasing crime rates. It should also be noted that only 3 to 8 percent of all alcoholics fall in the so-called skid row category.

The costs of alcoholism run high. It has been estimated that the cost to business and industry from absenteeism, inefficiency, and accidents due to alcoholism runs to some \$2 billion annually.

Traffic accidents cost the Nation some \$9 billion annually in property damage, wage losses, medical expenses and insurance costs, according to the National Safety Council. Alcohol is reliably believed to have a major role in this tragic toll. The Public Health Service has pointed out that half of all fatal motor vehicle accidents have some association with alcohol.

The life expectancy of an alcoholic has been estimated to be about 10 to 12 years less than the average.

Recognizing these facts and their tremendous impact on our people, I am introducing today the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1969. This measure provides for a system of incentive grants for constructing, staffing, operating and maintaining alcoholism prevention and treatment facilities and it will increase Federal participation in constructing these facilities. It will encourage the development of expanded programs of alcohol education and will establish a system of centers throughout the country for much-needed research in alcoholism and alcohol-related problems.

It also provides emphasis to the area of personnel development in the field through the mechanism of fellowships and training grants.

The provisions of this bill are needed, in fact, they are essential, if we are to involve the Federal Government in a meaningful way. If this first national breakthrough is made, our Nation will soon have a comprehensive program to treat alcoholism as a disease and not as a criminal problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would welcome any of my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

#### THERE MUST BE SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES THIS YEAR

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I joined with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) in the introduction of a bill to increase social security payments for our senior citizens. I am sure we have all read that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has urged that an increase for social security recipients go over to next year. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio. A 15-percent increase at first consideration might seem quite substantial, but compared with some of the increases in compensation for others it is quite modest. Let me first admonish and then go further to warn the Members of this House that if we fail to consider and to approve an increase in social security before we adjourn this session and go home as the recipients of a large salary increase for ourselves, we deserve the wrath that will come down on our heads.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for his position and say that I join with him and the gentleman from Ohio. This Congress must act on raising social security.

#### COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the committees of the House and Senate are winding up their hearings in consideration of coal mine health and safety legislation. I trust that this legislation will be passed by the Congress early next month.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there can be health, safety, and security for coal miners as long as the top officials of the United Mine Workers and the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund put their plush personal comforts way ahead of the protection of the men who actually mine the coal. Evidence has been presented that very high salaries and pensions have been accorded to the top officials of the Washington headquarters of these two organizations. Last year over a quarter of a million dollars in salaries and

expenses went to six members of two families, the families of President W. A. Boyle of the UMW and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens. UMW Secretary John Owens drew salary and expenses of \$44,888 for 1968, while also having two sons on the UMW payroll as follows: Attorney Willard Owens, \$43,178 for salary and expenses; and District Secretary-Treasurer R. C. Owens, \$28,377 for salary and expenses.

The Department of Labor records filed under the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act and under the other reporting requirements of Congress show that UMW President W. A. Boyle drew \$62,442 for salary and expenses in 1968, with his daughter, Miss Antoinette Boyle collecting \$43,517 as an attorney, and a brother, R. J. Boyle, collecting \$36,174 as an international executive board member. Thus, the two families of Boyle and Owens collected the grand total of \$258,576 in salaries and expenses for 1968 from the treasury of the international union, United Mine Workers of America.

Not satisfied with their current salaries, Messrs. Boyle and Owens, along with the vice president, George Titler, set up for themselves and for President Emeritus John L. Lewis a very private and personal pension fund which enables them to retire at total annual pensions of \$40,000 to \$50,000 per year for life, or 100 percent of their current salaries, not contributory.

This pension fund for the three top officials and retired UMW President John L. Lewis was set up out of the pennies, nickles, and dimes of coal miners paying union dues.

The Internal Revenue Service refused to grant special tax status to this special pension fund because it was judged to be discriminatory against employees receiving considerably less than 100 percent of their salaries in pensions. So in 1960 the top officials of the United Mine Workers took \$850,000 out of the UMW treasury and deposited that in the UMW-controlled National Bank of Washington as a very special pension fund designed for only four people. The value of this trust fund has now increased to well over \$1.5 million. In 1966 the agent's fee for administering this very special fund amounted to \$1,993.98, well above the \$1,380 which a retired coal miner draws from the welfare and retirement fund if he is lucky enough to surmount all the hurdles and to qualify for his \$115 a month pension.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the president of the United Mine Workers of America and the top officials ought either to reduce these plush 100-percent-of-salary retirement nesteggs to the meager \$1,380 which a coal miner is supposed to receive, or else liberalize the coal miners' pensions.

It might be contended that under the law the United Mine Workers of America and the United Mines Workers' welfare and retirement fund must be kept separate and distinct. Yet we all know this welfare and retirement fund came at the initiative of the sweat, blood, and sacrifice of many coal miners who went out on strike in the late 1940's in order

to obtain the royalty per ton of bituminous coal mined in unionized mines to be contributed to this fund. That royalty now amounts to 40 cents a ton, and the total amount placed into the welfare and retirement fund each year is well over \$160 million.

Roughly averaged, this amounts to approximately \$1,600 for every coal miner in a unionized bituminous coal mine. If we could imagine for a minute how much private insurance, retirement, disability, and medical, one could purchase on the private market for \$1,600 a year annual policy, we could imagine that those for whom this royalty is contributed should be fairly well taken care of.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is not true. Many, many miners are deprived of their pensions. I have stacks and stacks of letters from those who have applied for their pensions in the belief that they had qualified for them by the amount of time they had put in. Many others have had their medical cards taken away from them shortly after their retirement. Everyone knows that when a coal miner retires that is the time when he really needs his medical card more than ever for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the UMW headquarters and the fund must legally remain separate, inasmuch as it was at the union's initiative that this fund was set up, I cannot understand why the royalty of 40 cents a ton has remained 40 cents for the past 17 years. It has not been raised since 1952. If there is any difficulty in obtaining sufficient funds to take care of retired and disabled coal miners and their families, and their widows, then the union certainly should take the initiative to raise this royalty.

There are interlocking directorates between the union and the fund, however, that would seem to indicate there is a little closer relationship.

The 1968 report of the National Bank of Washington, which is the bank controlled by the United Mine Workers of America, reveals that the bank's board of directors includes UMW President W. A. Boyle—annual salary and expenses: \$62,442—and UMW General Counsel Edward L. Carey—annual salary and expenses: \$43,872.

In addition to that, members of the board of directors of the welfare and retirement fund are Welly K. Hopkins, general counsel of the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund—salary and expenses: \$50,345.38—and Thomas F. Ryan, Jr., comptroller of the fund—salary: \$50,000.08.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, one can have effective protection of the coal miners when their union is arbitrary and dictatorial and also cannot even recognize the difference between truth and falsehood in what its officials print and say.

In the March 6 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 5431-5432, Mr. Speaker, I included the text of a telegram which I had sent to Mr. W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers, asking for an apology and correction for what was essentially a false, malicious, and clearly libelous article which appeared in the March 1 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my telegram to Mr. Boyle, along with the appended documents, be reprinted with my remarks at this point.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

TEXT OF TELEGRAM FROM REPRESENTATIVE HECHLER TO UMWA PRESIDENT BOYLE  
MARCH 6, 1969.

W. A. BOYLE,  
President, United Mine Workers of America,  
Washington, D.C.

Page 13 of the March 1, 1969, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal contains a false and malicious article signed by Rex Lauck and entitled "Ken Hechler's credo is Revealed." This article purports to quote what are alleged to be "Hechler's own ideas" as allegedly expressed in the April, 1959 issue of Pageant magazine. The United Mine Worker's Journal article concludes: "That explains much about how this man Hechler operates. Shades of Joe McCarthy!"

I trust that you are aware of the fact that the article in the United Mine Workers Journal is worded in such a fashion as to be designed to defame my character. Thousands of readers of the journal, including a large number in my Congressional District, are being fed these deliberately falsified statements which bear no resemblance whatsoever to anything I said in the Pageant article, or anything I have ever either said or thought before or since the appearance of that article.

Even if you should remove the direct quotation remarks and present this material as a paraphrase instead of an allegedly direct quote, the entire article in the journal is false, malicious and designed to defame my character.

I trust you do not condone the printing of such malicious misinformation by a man listed on the masthead of the journal as "assistant editor." I demand an immediate apology for this false quotation, attribution and characterization in the article, and the opportunity to present my views on health and safety legislation in a future issue of the journal as well as a reprint of the April, 1959, Pageant article.

The cause of health and safety legislation is far bigger than any personal differences which may have arisen between us. We cannot afford to continue to divide the forces supporting effective action to clean up the coal mines, protect the safety of thousands of coal miners and prevent the occurrence of black lung. We must seek out and welcome new recruits in this fight instead of condemning those who may not have carried the battle as long as others. Only through the aroused conscience of millions of Americans can effective legislation and sound administration be obtained. Over 40,000 coal miners in West Virginia alone are determined to obtain the protection they have failed to enjoy, and without which they will continue to suffer the risk of being burned, buried, crushed or gassed.

I appeal to you to declare a moratorium on these personal attacks and issue a call for all forces to join in a cooperative effort to win the fight still ahead of us.

REPRESENTATIVE KEN HECHLER.

[From the United Mine Workers Journal,  
Mar. 1, 1969]

KEN HECHLER'S "CREDO" IS REVEALED  
(By Rex Lauck)

We found it hard to understand the reasoning behind Rep. Ken Hechler's sudden attacks on the United Mine Workers and its leadership until a friend with a long memory and a good filing system called our attention to an article in the defunct Pageant magazine.

In its April, 1959, issue the magazine described with Hechler's consent: *How To Get Elected To Congress*.

The following quoted sentences are Hechler's own ideas, not something somebody else said about him. He advised:

"First you pop off to get attention, regardless of the merit of your ideas.

"Then you pose as the champion of the average man against the 'interests.'

"Then after you are rebutted, no matter how strong the facts against you you reply at once as the single, 'lonely campaigner' seeking the sympathetic support traditionally given the underdog.

"The truth of your statement or the merit of your argument has nothing to do with your response or your conduct.

"Finally, you adopt the imaginary 'we' as the shining knight defending the oppressed people against imaginary brutalities of the 'interests.'"

That explains much about how this man Hechler operates, Shades of Joe McCarthy!

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 15, 1959]

#### HOW TO GET ELECTED TO CONGRESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the April issue of Pageant magazine there appeared an article entitled "How To Get Elected to Congress." This is a story of a campaign by KEN HECHLER which resulted in his election to Congress from West Virginia's Fourth District.

I was privileged to visit West Virginia during the campaign and, in a small way, to participate in it. I was impressed, as the author of the article was obviously impressed, with the vigor, the dedication, and the ability of the college professor who decided he wanted to take an active part in the political life of the country rather than merely teach others about it.

KEN HECHLER proved it is no obstacle to start without widespread support and the handicap of only a brief residence in the community is not insuperable. He proved that strength of character and an interest in the people who make up the constituency are more persuasive than opposition jibes.

I commend this article to all persons interested in political science and I congratulate the voters of West Virginia upon their wisdom in electing KEN HECHLER.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 24, 1959]

#### HOW TO GET ELECTED TO CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there were a good many highly interesting political campaigns last fall. One in particular was that of KEN HECHLER, who was elected to Congress from West Virginia's Fourth District. KEN HECHLER, in winning had to overcome the distinct handicap of having lived in the State for little more than a year when he announced as a candidate in the Democratic primary against two native-born sons.

The story of KEN HECHLER's campaign to victory appears in the April issue of Pageant magazine. It is fascinating reading and should give encouragement to others who have wanted to take an active role in politics.

Last Saturday it was my privilege to address the Democratic Women's Day program in Charleston, W. Va. I always enjoy visiting the Mountain State. It is truly a lovely part of our country, and its people are warm and generous. West Virginia can be proud of the men and women who have represented the State in the Congress throughout the years. They can take special pride in our colleagues, Senator BYRD and Senator RANDOLPH, and of men in the House such as Representative KEN HECHLER.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article from Pageant magazine entitled "How To Get Elected to Congress" be inserted at this point in the Record.

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

#### "HOW TO GET ELECTED TO CONGRESS

"(By Howard Cohn)

"There is a theory that college teachers are cloistered, impractical men. Like theatrical critics who write no plays and book reviewers who write no books, they are suspected of being head-in-the-clouds idealists who could never successfully practice what they preach.

"It is easy to visualize, then, the smiles that creased the faces of seasoned politicians in West Virginia early last spring when a lanky, effervescent political science professor named KEN HECHLER, who had lived in the area only a year and had never run for office in his life, boldly declared himself a candidate for the Democratic nomination for congress in the State's Fourth Congressional District.

"The skeptical smiles have since disappeared. For the professor is Representative HECHLER now, as the result of what one veteran newsman called "the shrewdest personal electioneering I've seen in 23 years of campaign coverage."

"Mr. HECHLER went to Washington, where he is now starting his 2-year term, despite the absence of many of the qualifications practical politicians clutch closest to their hearts. He was a stranger in a section of the State where residents take deep pride in local ancestry. He was a plain-looking, bespectacled bachelor of 44 with no pretty wife or adoring children to parade before the television screens. He entered the primary against two native-born sons without the backing of any local politician and lacking the support of organized labor, which is a power in West Virginia Democratic circles.

"Opposing HECHLER in the general election was a two-time Republican Congressman who was also a distinguished obstetrician. Dr. Will E. Neal had been bringing West Virginia babies into the world for more than 50 years. 'I delivered the voters,' the incumbent Representative would remind his campaign audiences. 'It is up to you to deliver the votes.'

"Because HECHLER overcame all of these handicaps—and even managed to turn some into assets—it is safe to say that if he ever finds time to teach another class in political science, the front-row seats will be filled with hard-bitten politicians anxious to absorb knowledge from a person who proved that his theories about winning elections are as valid as their rules ever were.

"KEN HECHLER—he never uses his baptismal name of KENNETH—says that the incredible idea of his running for Congress probably took root in the give and take of teacher-student discussions that have always featured his college classes.

"He had come in January 1957 to Marshall College in Huntington, W. Va., as a substitute for a political science professor who was taking a one-semester leave of absence. HECHLER's arrival was greeted with interest because he already had a sturdy and rather picturesque reputation in academic circles.

"Born in Roslyn, N.Y., of parents who were and are staunch Republicans, HECHLER received his bachelor's degree from Swarthmore College in 1935, and a master's the following year from Columbia University in New York. His master's thesis, titled "Will Roosevelt Be Re-elected?" is remembered at Columbia for its great over-all length—350 typewritten pages—and the brevity of its final chapter, which contained the single word: 'Yes.'

"In 1937 HECHLER became an instructor in political science at Columbia. A friendly, informal man, he made a practice—which he continued throughout his teaching career—of developing unusual stunts to enliven his subject matter. One of his most popular gimmicks was making phone calls

to leading political figures which his classes could overhear by means of an amplifier hooked onto the telephone.

"While teaching at Columbia, the young instructor earned a Ph. D., making him Dr. HECHLER, and went on to aid Judge Samuel Rosenman, Franklin Roosevelt's principal speech writer, in compiling several long volumes of F.D.R.'s public papers and addresses. HECHLER already had left the party of his parents to become a confirmed Democrat.

"HECHLER entered the Army as a private at the outbreak of World War II, earned a commission in the tank forces, and eventually became a major and combat historian in the European Theater of Operations. After the war he taught at Princeton where, again, his classes were tremendously popular. There followed, in succession, jobs as a researcher-writer on President Truman's White House staff, associate director of the American Political Science Association, and research director for Adlai Stevenson's 1956 Presidential campaign.

"It was with this varied and impressive scholarly background that HECHLER accepted his temporary assignment at Marshall, a medium-sized, State-supported college in southwestern West Virginia. When surprised friends asked why, HECHLER replied that he had wanted for a long time to savor life in a small community. In his White House job, he had prepared briefs on every area the President planned to visit. West Virginia, with its mountainous scenery and natural resources, had struck him as a State with an undeveloped, potentially great future.

"HECHLER quickly became a student favorite at Marshall. Though Dr. HECHLER in class, he was usually "KEN" outside.

"He was," says a fellow faculty member, "the type of professor students consider a regular guy. But while he may have won some of his popularity with gimmicks, once he served breakfast in class—he never forgot his role as a teacher. The students really worked for him."

"HECHLER's cardinal principle as a political science instructor was to try to make his students active participants in the processes of government, regardless of which party they supported. 'You are in politics whether you like it or not,' he'd say. 'If you sit it out on the sidelines, you are throwing your influence on the side of corruption, mismanagement, and the forces of evil.'

"But as I urged my students to become active politically, my conscience started to bother me because I was not participating very directly myself," HECHLER says, "I liked Huntington and its people and had decided to settle in the city permanently. When a few students started suggesting—some laughingly and some seriously—that I should run for Congress, I brushed off the idea. Actually, though, I began to find the notion pretty appealing.

"I had been on the fringes of politics, except for the war interval, for almost 20 years without ever once experiencing the excitement that only a candidate for elective office can have. I felt I knew the congressional ropes because of my work in Washington. I had firm political ideas, and I frankly thought that I could be a valuable servant to the people of West Virginia if given the opportunity. Besides, I was intrigued by the possibility of seeing how well some of the theories I stressed as a teacher would work in a real campaign."

"But under the pressure of earning a living, these thoughts almost faded from HECHLER's mind in the autumn following the end of his teaching semester at Marshall. Settling down in Huntington as he had said he would, he served as a public affairs commentator on a local weekly television program. More important financially, he completed a book he had been writing about the dramatic crossing of the Ludendorf Bridge at

Remagen, Germany, which gave Allied troops their first foothold on the east side of the \* \* \*

"The Bridge at Remagen," published late in 1957, was an immediate success. A movie option was taken on it and it was sold to network television. With money coming along in sizable amounts, HECHLER began thinking again about politics. West Virginia was slated to be an important State nationally in the 1958 elections. There were two Senate seats at stake, in addition to the State's six seats in the House of Representatives.

"HECHLER began suggesting to friends and local politicians that he might want to run for a House seat. They said the idea was crazy. Then late in March 1958, with the primaries 4 months off and election day more than 7 months away, the Huntington Advertiser listed him as a possibility for the race.

"HECHLER reviewed the situation briefly. He had lived in West Virginia only 14 months. He was barely known outside Huntington. No one, except for a few students, had shown any interest in seeing him run.

"The day after the newspaper speculation appeared he gave the Advertiser a statement. 'I never sat on the fence on any issue in my life and don't intend to start now,' he said. 'Sure I plan to run for Congress. That is definite. I will file for the Democratic nomination in the August primary.'

"The Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia sprawls over 10 counties in the western part of the State and touches both the Ohio and Kentucky borders. It is a diversified region of heavy and light industrial plants and a large farm population. Huntington, with some 90,000 residents, is by far its largest city and generally favors the Democratic line, but the district as a whole usually has gone Republican.

"No sooner did he announce his intention to make the race than HECHLER proceeded to startle the district again by displaying the tireless energy of a professional basketball player. He was up every morning at dawn, rarely went to bed before midnight. In the long hours between, he toured every cranny of the 10 counties, ringing doorbells and stopping at stores, plants, on street corners to introduce himself to voters.

"Like everyone else," says Robert Burford, Democratic chairman of Cabell County, where Huntington is located, "I hadn't given KEN a chance for the nomination. Then one day in Charleston, I dropped in to chat with one of our candidates for State office. 'Who in hell is this HECHLER?' he asked me. He went to say that KEN had been dropping into creeks and hollows of his home county that no candidate for anything had bothered to visit in years. For the first time it dawned on me that he might win."

"In some respects HECHLER was the prototype of the old-fashioned political campaigner. He toured the district in an attention-getting, red-and-white convertible covered with bold lettering announcing his name and candidacy. He had a campaign song to the tune of 'Sugar in Morning' that was as delightfully corny as campaign songs have been for generations. Sung usually by four Marshall coeds, it went in part:

"Put your 'X' on the ballot,  
And if you do your part,  
You'll have a darned good Congressman,  
Who's for the young at heart."

"There was no sense of conformity, however, in other HECHLER maneuvers. 'I had always felt from my studies,' he says, 'that a candidate could win a good many more votes by stressing his own virtues than by leveling personal attacks on the opposition's character.'

"HECHLER not only refrained from attacking his opponents personally—he praised

them. He described his two foes in the primary as 'good, fine Democrats.' In the general election HECHLER termed Republican Dr. Neal 'an honest man of conviction. I respect him for his principles, even if I may not always agree with what he stands for.'

"HECHLER also took pains to stress his virtues in unique ways. By passing out hundreds of free copies of his book, 'The Bridge at Remagen,' he emphasized that he was an author of note. He ran newspaper ads carrying letters of praise from Harry Truman and former members of the White House staff to indicate his familiarity with national affairs. He referred again and again to his primary campaign as 'the lonely battle' to point up the fact that he was running without any organized support, to win the sympathy he figured would be given an underdog. He produced character references showing that he had compiled a splendid war record and was an assiduous churchgoer.

"The college professor who had launched his campaign without a prayer of success won the Democratic primary by carrying 7 of the district's 10 counties.

"And you know what he did the next morning?" says one surprised Huntington politician. 'Why, he was standing outside a factory at 5 o'clock in the morning, thanking men who were reporting for work for voting for him and asking for support in the general election.'

"By winning the primary, HECHLER now had the backing of the regular Democratic organization and organized labor. He responded by forgetting his 'lonely battle' to go straight down the line for the entire Democratic ticket.

"Politically, HECHLER was a professed liberal Roosevelt-Truman Democrat who spoke frequently on the need to elect Democrats to cure 'the Republican recession.' And he still had a number of new tricks to unveil. He had campaign cards printed on the cheapest stock available. Printed under his name was the notation: 'The recession makes it tough to print a better card.'

"When campaign funds ran low, he bought 10-second television spots instead of the 5-minute shows Dr. Neal was putting on. 'We can't afford more television time,' HECHLER would tell audiences solemnly in the few seconds at his disposal, 'but I hope you'll vote for me anyhow.'

"The maneuvers brought appreciative smiles from the electorate. They also brought the kind of retaliation HECHLER expected and almost welcomed.

"Early digs that he was a Johnny-come-lately, suitcase politician became more strident. In contrast to HECHLER's courteous references to Dr. Neal, the Republicans made it a point to misspell his name at times as 'Heckler,' and one GOP campaign song ran in part:

"Visitor Hechler, we've been thinking,  
What a State we'd really be,  
If all the New York office seekers  
Came to save us just like thee."

"Replied HECHLER sweetly: 'Isn't it wonderful that we live in a country where we are able to circulate such poems about our present and prospective public officials?'

"Late in October, a Republican woman member of the State legislature leveled the bitterest attack yet. Asserting in a statement 'that New York already has 43 Congressmen; why should we give them another one?' She charged that HECHLER had been sent to West Virginia by Americans for Democratic Action, the extreme left wing of the Democratic Party, to run for Congress.

"HECHLER answered with a paid newspaper advertisement. He was not, he said, a member of ADA, and no individual or group had sent him to the State to run for Congress or any other purpose. Moreover, he expressed deep regret that the lady, 'who was not herself born in West Virginia,' had seen

fit 'to make statements which becloud the real issues.' He also managed to weave in the Biblical commandment: 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'

"HECHLER believes that his statement caused the attack against him to backfire into one of the most effective issues of his campaign.

"Undaunted, the Republican leadership saved their heaviest ammunition until 4 days before the election. Now it was the Governor himself, Republican Cecil Underwood, who called a press conference to cut HECHLER down to size.

"An investigation had shown, said the Governor, that campaign literature for HECHLER and copies of his book had been stuffed into surplus food packages the State distributed to the needy. Calling this 'the most despicable display of political chicanery I've ever seen,' the Governor said that 'anybody who would play on the hardship of our people for his own benefit isn't worthy of West Virginia citizenship.'

"HECHLER still feels badly about this particular attack. He thinks it was pretty rough politics of the sort that keeps too many capable people from seeking public office. But publicly, the would-be Congressman again treated observers to the value of the nice-guy, high-level reply.

"First of all, HECHLER disclaimed responsibility for putting campaign literature in food packages. Then he said that the Governor was a very fine gentleman who unfortunately had stooped to using words thrust in his hands by mud-slinging ghost writers. Finally, he brought out an autographed picture Underwood had given him before he entered the congressional race. 'To Dr. HECHLER,' read the inscription, 'with appreciation for intellectual leadership you are giving to West Virginia—Cecil H. Underwood, Governor.'

"HECHLER spent most of election night and morning sweating out the returns at the Democratic county headquarters in Huntington. For several hours the race seasawed, but around midnight HECHLER forged into the lead. The professor from New York who had launched his campaign with little more than his own ballot to count had received more than 60,000 votes and won by 3,500.

"After the election, HECHLER was back on the road again. Now the signs on his convertible had been changed to read: 'Dr. KEN HECHLER—Your Servant in Congress,' and he was busy thanking voters and asking them about their problems. 'He's the only successful candidate I know who spent as much time seeking out people after the election as he did during the campaign,' says County Chairman Burford.

"Excluding money he would have earned if he had been working rather than campaigning, HECHLER figures the election cost him about \$5,000-\$6,500 for the primary in which he did not receive a single financial contribution, and another \$1,500 in personal expenses for his battle against Dr. Neal.

"He considers that the money was well spent for what he terms 'the most exciting adventure of my life.' And now that he has won his seat in Congress, he says that the campaign taught him nothing that differed very greatly from what he had observed in his years as a political science professor.

"'Sure you need luck to win an election, and I had my share of it,' he says. 'But I believe more strongly than ever that, whatever the odds against him, a candidate has his best chance of winning by waging a clean campaign; by anticipating and taking advantage of attacks which are made by the opposition and by remaining honest to himself and his personality.'

"HECHLER says his goal now is to be an effective representative for the people of West Virginia's Fourth District. 'After what he showed us as a candidate,' says Burford, 'we're expecting he'll prove to be quite a Congressman.'

*"Ken Hechler's 10 rules for campaigners"*

- "1. Pay attention to the average person.
- "2. Be true to your own personality.
- "3. Be constructive and campaign cleanly.
- "4. Turn every attack on you into an asset. Couple an immediate answer with your own constructive approach to the problem.
- "5. Remember—your most effective workers are under 20 (they're enthusiastic) and over 60 (their word is respected).
- "6. Avoid "strategy meetings" that cause dissension, waste time.
- "7. Venture forth around the district every day. Don't be "deskbound."
- "8. Don't tie your hands with job promises.
- "9. Don't promise the moon to pressure groups.
- "10. Be able to laugh at yourself and enjoy it."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey) in congratulating Representative KEN HECHLER and to commend the fine article about him published in Pageant magazine. It was most fitting that Mr. HECHLER be recognized in this fashion, because he represents what a real citizen should be in this country of ours. KEN HECHLER, before he was elected to Congress from West Virginia, gained widespread recognition as a stimulating and outstanding professor in the field of political science.

Through his teaching career, he used the vivid device of making phone calls to leading political figures which his classes could overhear by means of an amplifier hooked onto the telephone. This was an effective method of breathing life into issues of the day and bringing political leaders and students into close contact.

Time and again, he pounded home the basic lesson of good citizenship to his students in many classes:

"You are in politics, whether you like it or not. If you sit it out on the sidelines, you are throwing your influence on the side of corruption, mismanagement, and the forces of evil."

Then KEN HECHLER took his own advice and ran for office himself. His honest and forthright campaign won the respect of the voters in his district—and won him the seat he now holds. I have known KEN HECHLER personally for many years. His is an example of citizenship that is well worth the praise of his constituents, his fellow citizens all over America, and of his colleagues in Congress.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the publication of this article Mr. Rex Lauck, assistant UMW Journal editor, who had signed the article, indicated, "We will explain it in the next issue." When asked further how he could excuse the printing of such a false and malicious article he said he had an "emotional fixation" against Congressman HECHLER.

Four issues of the UMW Journal have been published without reference to the article despite the fact that other corrections have been made as to the misspelling of names in other articles.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the United Mine Workers has dragged its feet for years in failing to press for effective health and safety laws that will really protect those who mine coal in this most dangerous and hazardous occupation.

In the crucial period between 1966 and 1968, in frequent meetings with the coal operators, the UMW agreed not to ask Congress for more than a pitifully poor minimum of new protection for the coal miners. Even after the disaster at Farmington last November 20, 1968, the UMW leadership sent word to Capitol

Hill and to all coal State Congressmen that the bill to protect the health of coal miners was too "controversial" and the UMW felt it might interfere with the success of a safety bill. It took an enraged public opinion in non-coal-mining States, Mr. Speaker, to force the UMW to profess support for stronger and more effective legislation and to move out in support of both health and safety laws. Once the bill passes Congress, as I have no doubt it will pass the Congress, and is signed into law, the coal miners of this Nation will never be fully protected on the job or in retirement as long as the top officials of the UMW and the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund appear more interested in feathering their own nests than in getting out where the action is and fighting for the interests of the men who actually mine the coal. Down through the years many people have asked, why is it our laws and their administration have been so weak; why is it so many people have been killed and injured in the coal mines? The great missing balance wheel is the weakness and lack of aggressive effort by the UMW. This has been the missing element which more than anything else resulted in coal mine deaths and injuries, black lung disease, and disabled or retired miners who were cast aside like debris without any further effort to fight for their protection.

Mr. Speaker, some people have suggested that I am a union buster. All I am trying to do is to see that this union becomes a strong, effective, and clean union which helps in the process of enforcing health and safety legislation so that all coal miners active and retired will be treated with the dignity which they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a somewhat symbolic issue which not only affects the coal miners but affects all people throughout this Nation. I say this because it means whether or not individuals in this Nation will be treated like human beings. I think, too, it also is symbolic of the renewed interest of the people of this Nation in their environment and the health and safety of the places they work, the air they breathe and the water they drink, as well as the dignity with which they are treated as individuals.

In addition to that I believe it symbolizes the necessity for us to examine very carefully in this Congress the great new technology which has developed and to be sure that this technology is applied not only in order to enrich certain individuals primarily interested in production, but also in a manner to protect those who work with their hands and work with these new machines.

Mr. Speaker, the continuous miner is a highly efficient mining machine which enables an individual coal miner to produce 20 tons of coal a day. It has been said that the continuous miner was invented primarily because of the pressure for higher coal production. Someone has observed that this was not designed as a life-saving machine and in my opinion that is a very pertinent observation. It was not designed as a life-saving ma-

chine, but as a production machine. As a result, this continuous miner gouges out the coal in such a manner as to leave the roof of the mine unsupported which can cause many more deaths and accidents in the mines and to stir up the dust so that it is suspended in the air. As a result, coal miners contract the deadly disease of pneumoconiosis, or black lung.

The one missing element here is that the union and its leaders which should have been representing and fighting for these men down through the years have neglected their duty.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe anything this Congress does in the way of so-called stringent coal mine health and safety legislation can fully succeed unless the United Mine Workers of America and the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund take an aggressive position on behalf of the protection of the health and safety and security of the coal miners.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks certain documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RECORD FILED UNDER WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN DISCLOSURE ACT—1966  
RECORD OF PENSION PLAN FOR 4 MEN (W. A. BOYLE, GEORGE TITLER, JOHN OWENS, AND JOHN L. LEWIS)—INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Report filed on July 20, 1967, for the year beginning Jan. 1, 1966, and ending Dec. 31, 1966]

	End of prior year	End of reporting year
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Cash.....	\$18,165	\$20,887
Stocks:		
(1) Preferred.....	14,750	19,814
(2) Common.....	654,008	800,835
Bonds and debentures:		
Government obligations:		
Federal.....	267,956	267,360
Common trusts:		
Real estate notes (17).....		
1st trust notes, District of Columbia real estate.....	704,759	550,327
Total assets.....	1,659,638	1,659,133
<b>LIABILITIES</b>		
Reserve for future benefits.....	1,659,638	1,659,133

**Cash receipts—Jan. 1, 1966, to Dec. 31, 1966**

Receipts from investments:	
Interest.....	\$44,417.05
Dividends.....	31,366.26
Gain on sale of Treasury bonds.....	1,116.25
Total receipts.....	76,899.56
Cash disbursements	
Benefits provided directly by the trust or separately maintained fund.....	35,599.92
Administrative expenses:	
Fees and commissions: Agent's fee.....	1,993.98
Postage and insurance.....	14.56
Total disbursements.....	37,608.46

Fees and commissions paid and charged to the plan.  
Agent's fee.  
To whom paid: The National Bank of Washington.

JOHN OWENS,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

## THE UMW

The nation's coal miners are struggling through and rebelling against one of the shabbiest chapters in the modern history of the labor movement. Their tormentors are those who should be their best friends: the United Mine Workers union and the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund.

The men who burrow in the earth for coal are far removed from the exalted world in which officials of the union and its related welfare fund operate. This shows up in numerous ways, but none so painfully as in the rewards provided for loyal and faithful service to the union.

The most a miner can expect from his pension fund at retirement, after a career in the most dangerous occupation in the country, is \$115 monthly.

The officers and employees of the fund, whose very jobs exist because of the miners' sweat, draw benefits which are lavish by comparison. Top officers of the fund can retire at half- or even full-pay, based on annual salaries of \$30,000 to \$60,000. Even the lowest-paid file clerk in the fund's offices can expect a monthly pension of \$200 at retirement. That compares with the miner's \$115.

That's not all. Officers and employees of the UMW itself have their own separate pension plan which also provides benefits on a generous scale.

So there isn't one retirement plan—there are three. And the coal miners, whose labor in the mines produces revenue for all three, are far and away the least provided for.

This is only a fragment of a very murky iceberg. The huge financial reserves maintained by the UMW fund beg justification. The poor investment record of the fund is unexplained. There's quite a story in the cozy alliance among the fund, the union, and the union-controlled National Bank of Washington.

All of these matters, which will be the subjects of future WTOP editorials, are traceable to the almost autocratic role the UMW leadership plays with its own members.

Congressman Ken Hechler of the coal-mining state of West Virginia has urged Congress to undertake a full-scale investigation. Congress owes it to the nation's long-abused miners to heed Hechler's advice.

This was a WTOP editorial . . . Norman Davis speaking for WTOP.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 7, 1969]

## UMW DOESN'T DIG HECHLER

(By Shirley Elder)

The United Mine Workers Journal comes out every two weeks, and every two weeks lately it has attacked a West Virginia congressman named Ken Hechler.

Hechler, a Democrat, has been called a Johnny-come-lately and some other things for embarking on a crusade for stronger health and safety laws in coal mines.

The UMW is angry because Hechler went off on his own, rejecting ideas from a proud union that has been fighting for mine safety for 79 years.

Hechler compounded the problem of stumping the coal regions of West Virginia, rallying miners to defy their union and press for reform. Hechler kept saying the union was not trying hard enough.

Now, a UMW writer, Rex Lauck, reports in the current UMW Journal that he has found out what makes Hechler run. He cites a 1959 article in Pageant magazine which he says contained Hechler's "ideas" on how to get elected to Congress.

## HIS 10 RULES

But Hechler denies the quotes the Lauck article attributes to him. He refers to a copy of the Pageant article, which includes "Ken Hechler's 10 Rules for Campaigners."

For example, Hechler's first rule, "Pay attention to the average person," comes out in the journal as, "First you pop off to get attention, regardless of the merit of your ideas."

The Hechler rules continue in the same vein: "Be true to your own personality" and "Be constructive and campaign cleanly" and "Turn every attack on you into an asset," and so on.

Lauck's report of these rules: "Then you pose as the champion of the average man against the interests."

"Then after you are rebutted, no matter how strong the facts against you, you reply at once as the single lonely campaigner seeking the sympathetic support traditionally given the underdog."

"The truth of your statement or the merit of your argument has nothing to do with your response or your conduct."

## NO QUOTATION MARKS

"Finally, you adopt the imaginary 'we' as the shining knight defending the oppressed people against imaginary brutalities of the interests."

Interviewed after the paper was distributed, Lauck said his article should not have contained quotation marks. "They just got on there at the print shop" he said. "We'll explain it in the next issue."

Lauck said he had not read Hechler's actual statement when he wrote the article. Instead, he said, he printed an "analysis" by a "friend with a long memory" who recalled the Pageant piece.

Did he now, after reading Hechler's 10 rules, think the analysis was fair? "Well," said Lauck, "it depends on your emotional fixation. If you don't like Ken. . . ."

Hechler, in a telegram yesterday to UMW President W. A. Boyle, demanded an immediate apology for what he termed a "false and malicious article." He asked for an opportunity to reprint in a future issue of the journal his 10 rules as actually written.

The telegram also included an appeal for unity in the campaign for mine safety legislation.

"We cannot afford to continue to divide the forces supporting effective action to clean up the coal mines, protect the safety of thousands of coal miners and prevent the occurrence of black lung."

He suggested proponents should welcome recruits rather than "condemning those who may not have carried the battle as long as others."

## HECHLER INSISTS UMW APOLOGIZE

(By John W. Yago)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Ken Hechler demanded Tuesday that the United Mine Workers apologize for what he said was a false and malicious article about him in a union publication.

The article, which appeared in this week's issue of the United Mine Workers Journal, was intended to defame his character, Hechler said in a telegram to W. A. "Tony" Boyle, president of the UMW.

The article is entitled "Ken Hechler's 'Credo' Is Revealed." The journal said it was based on a story about Hechler's first election campaign that appeared in the April, 1959, issue of the now-defunct Pageant magazine.

The journal lists what it said was advice from Hechler on how to get elected to Congress. This includes such things as "pop off to get attention, regardless of the merit of your ideas" and "the truth of your statement or the merit of your argument has nothing to do with your response or your conduct."

The Journal article, written by assistant editor Rex Lauck, ends with this observation: "That explains much of how this man Hechler operates. Shades of Joe McCarthy."

The original Pageant article was reprinted in the Congressional Record 10 years ago at the request of then Sen. Hubert Humphrey who also praised the new congressman.

It contains no quotations from Hechler similar to those in the union publication.

Hechler's rules for campaigning, as listed in Pageant, were not untypical of those that might be expected from a political science professor, which Hechler was before running for Congress.

"Even if you could remove the direct quotation marks and present this material as a paraphrase instead of an allegedly direct quote, the entire article in the journal is false, malicious and designed to defame my character," Hechler told Boyle.

The Fourth District congressman said he hoped Boyle didn't condone the printing of "such malicious misinformation."

In addition to an apology from the union, Hechler demanded an opportunity to have his views on mine health and safety as well as the original Pageant article printed in the UMW Journal.

Hechler and Boyle have clashed several times recently over their views toward mine health and safety. Hechler has said the union doesn't do enough to support its members, and Boyle has described the congressman as an "instant expert" in the field.

The union had no official comment Thursday on the Journal article, and Lauck was unavailable to explain its source.

The union newspaper said only that the alleged quotes from Hechler were provided by "a friend with a long memory and a good filing system."

Hechler called for this friend to identify himself.

There were reports of high-level meetings at UMW headquarters Thursday on how to handle this latest offshoot of the drive for stronger mine statutes.

"Thousands of readers of the Journal, including a large number in my congressional district, are being fed these deliberately falsified statements which bear no resemblance whatsoever to anything I said in the Pageant article or anything I have either said or thought before or since the appearance of that article," Hechler said in his telegram to Boyle.

Hechler also held out an olive branch to the union chief.

"I appeal to you," he said, "to declare a moratorium on these personal attacks and issue a call for all forces to join in a cooperative effort to win the fight still ahead of us."

The cause of health and safety legislation is bigger than personal differences, Hechler declared. "We cannot afford to continue to divide the forces supporting effective action to clean up the coal mines, protect the safety of thousands of coal miners and prevent the occurrence of black lung" he continued.

## APOLOGY DESERVED

WASHINGTON.—Prior to last week much of the difference of opinion surrounding the mine legislation debate was just that, compounded by rising tempers and personality clashes.

The strong feelings on the subject were enough to erupt in a heated clash several weeks ago between United Mine Workers President W. A. Boyle and Rep. Ken Hechler, who once was strongly supported by the union. Boyle, who is not noted for his even temper, was really set off when Hechler allied himself with consumer advocate Ralph Nader in taking the union to task for not doing enough for its members.

The rule of the United Mine Workers, for years a powerful force in West Virginia, and its relations not only with the mine operators but with its own members, are valid topics for discussion, even though the discussion sometimes has been little more than name-calling.

But a new aspect was added last week when a UMW publication printed what was evidently a totally false attack on Hechler, quoted him as advising other office-seekers on tactics that were cruelly cynical gutter politics and compared him to the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

The quotes, the UMW publication said, were from an article in a 1959 Pageant magazine about Hechler's first congressional campaign.

There was an immediate search of the Library of Congress for a copy of the magazine to see if Hechler did indeed say these things. The library's file copy was there, but it had been mutilated sometime in the last decade and the Hechler story was missing.

A reprint was turned up, however, in a 1959 Congressional Record where it had been placed by none other than former Vice President Hubert Humphrey when he was a senator. Humphrey and another senator at the time, John F. Kennedy, both praised Hechler as a new representative and his campaign as a professor challenging the established political interests and winning by taking his campaign to the people.

Some of the animosity against Hechler, even within his own party, dates back to the first campaign.

Nowhere in the article did Hechler say anything remotely like what the UMW had printed.

Hechler wronged and justifiably irritated, has demanded a public apology from Boyle.

The whole affair contains elements of mystery. Who, for instance, is the "friend with a long memory and a good filing system" who provided the union newspaper with the supposed Hechler advice. Some at union headquarters say they don't know, and those who should know won't say anything. At best, the union's editors are guilty of careless journalism.

Whoever he is, the "friend" is obviously no friend of Hechler, but he has done the union considerable harm and put it even further out on a limb than it was.

The upshot is likely to be that Hechler won't be damaged but now actually has the upper hand in the feud. He even took the opportunity last week, while demanding an apology, to make peace overtures to in the name of the common cause they both support.

While these personal arguments among Boyle, Hechler and others are offshoots of the central issue, they could affect the serious business of writing new legislation to improve the odds of getting through a career in mining alive and healthy.

While they may differ over some points, everybody involved—even the most feudal coal baron remaining—at least says they favor a better shake for the miners. Some of Hechler's tactics may seem like comic relief to an otherwise grim subject, but he is deadly serious in his concern for the welfare of West Virginia's miners.

If the congressman's opponents would reread the Pageant article they would recognize that his methods in the mine health and safety campaign aren't too different from those that have gotten him elected to Congress six times.

Boyle and his associates certainly have the right to disagree, although some of the recent snorting could hardly pass for constructive criticism, but last week they got caught with their ethics down.

Hechler deserves his apology and he should get it.

#### ARE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE TOLD TO LOOK THE OTHER WAY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WAGGONER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri

(Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, there are two ways a Member can react to the things he reads in our newspapers. One way is to be silent which could be interpreted as agreement. The other way, and by far the most appropriate way to react to news accounts of events here in Washington, is to call these to the attention of fellow Members by timely comment and inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On the front page of the Washington Post this morning is a picture of Marion Barry with the headline that 300 Pride, Inc., leaders staged an angry protest in the City Council chambers against the arrest Tuesday night of Marion Barry.

The article points out that the Mayor of the city of Washington has ordered an investigation into the arrest of Marion Barry on Tuesday night because he assaulted a policeman. The article goes on to point out that 300 followers of Barry, who is, as you know, director of Pride, Inc., came down to City Hall and proceeded to stage a demonstration in the District of Columbia Building.

After the conference with Marion Barry, Mayor Washington announced there would be a civilian investigation of the arrest incident headed by Acting Public Safety Director Charles T. Duncan.

Well, I suppose an investigation will take place.

The more important question is whether Mayor Washington is going to investigate the conduct of some officers on Pennsylvania Avenue that same afternoon, who stood by observing acts in violation of law and did nothing. Certainly we have reason to believe the Washington Post reported the facts accurately.

It is reported that as 20 or 30 followers of Marion Barry came down the stairs in the City Hall they were cursing and making obscene gestures. They smashed a half dozen soft drink bottles in the District Building. Is this not disturbance of the peace, disorderly conduct in a public building and destruction of property?

Then as these youths moved further on east on Pennsylvania Avenue "shouting as they walked, they pushed and shoved several white pedestrians, cursing them and making more obscene gestures." Were the police ordered to ignore these violations of law. Why does the Mayor not ask for an investigation of the conduct of the officers who saw these violations and made no arrests?

Then, at 13th and Pennsylvania Avenue they struck a news vendor in the face and went onto 12th and Pennsylvania Avenue where they stole several bouquets from a flower vendor. Was this not unlawful assault and petty larceny?

The article states a police car was following them, all students, allegedly from Federal City College. These students jeered at the two police officers inside the car. Yet the officers did nothing

according to the newspaper story.

But listen to this:

At 3d and E Streets, Northwest, a youth stole a carton of beverages from a station wagon parked outside a market—

In the words of the reporter of the Washington Post.

It causes shock and dismay to read the account of the reporter:

The officers did not leave their car.

Mr. Speaker, whenever the police department hires new members for the police force, about the only training they get is to come to the Hill, and learn to ticket the cars of our innocent constituents who come to visit the Nation's Capital and are not familiar with our parking regulations. It seems these same police cannot determine a real violation of law when it occurs before their eyes. Or could it be they are under orders to ignore such acts by the followers of Marion Barry?

Here were clear violations of the law on three or four counts—disorderly conduct, destruction of property, and petty larceny for taking the flowers and beverages.

If Mayor Washington is going ahead with his investigation of the alleged assault by the police officers upon Mr. Barry he should certainly investigate and find out upon whose orders, or whose instructions it was that these officers in these patrol cars on Pennsylvania Avenue took no action against violations that the Washington Post reports were clear violations of several different city ordinances.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about home rule. A few years ago there was a change in District of Columbia government. I am not convinced the new is an improvement over the old.

Today we have a Mayor appointed by the President and a new City Council. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this is an example of the progress we have made in this city—if what happened Wednesday afternoon on Pennsylvania Avenue is an illustration of the progress we have made under our new city government then the Lord save us if we ever have full home rule.

I would hope I am not the only Member who will take note of what happened. I hope our District of Columbia Committee and the Committee on Appropriations—makes it a point to interrogate the Mayor and his police department about what happened on Pennsylvania Avenue Wednesday afternoon when these officers remained in their car and made no effort to apprehend those committing crimes before their eyes. The Mayor must be called upon to investigate this failure by his police if he intends to have his investigation of an alleged assault by a police officer on Marion Barry—when the officer was simply doing his duty, if we believe the content of the newspaper account.

Let me repeat once again may the good Lord help us if the happenings of Tuesday night and Wednesday afternoon are measures of the progress we have made in the government of Washington, D.C.

**NATION AWAITS ADMINISTRATION'S DECISION ON VIETNAM**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in a decade a new administration has entered office faced with the problem of Vietnam, and the Nation anxiously awaits its decision on the future course of American policy. But the situation in 1969 is far different from that of 1961 or 1963. Today the United States has about 540,000 men in South Vietnam and has suffered over 35,000 casualties killed in the war.

The Vietnam conflict has produced deep divisions among the American people and has greatly weakened America internally:

It has alienated thousands of American youth. They must be brought back into the mainstream of our political and social structure so that they can make the contribution to American life of which they are capable.

It has stifled the growth of those social welfare programs which originally held such great promise of ending poverty and bringing the benefits of the affluent society to all of our citizens.

It has accentuated the concern and resentment of the Nation's poor, who see billions of dollars spent in a faraway land while they are unable to share the fruits of America's bounty.

In 1961 President Kennedy spoke of America's commitment to South Vietnam's defense. President Johnson expressed similar sentiments many times. I can only wonder if both men would have reached the same decision as they did then if they could have foreseen the disastrous consequences of this so-called commitment. The escalation of this commitment year after year has long since brought us to the point of diminishing returns. If President Nixon chooses to follow the old policies of escalation and unqualified commitment, he will find the returns meager, not only in Vietnam but also at home where the priorities of 1969 domestic problems demand attention.

Until the present burden of Vietnam is at least partially lifted from our shoulders it will not be possible to move forward and effectively cope with the problems that we face at home. The war simply cannot be allowed to continue at its present level. I, therefore, join with those distinguished colleagues of mine, in both the House and Senate, who are similarly proposing that the Nixon administration begin the withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam. The administration should immediately begin the shift from the old policy of escalation to a new policy of extrication.

Today, the size of the American commitment in Vietnam is totally out of proportion with our avowed purposes and objectives. President Johnson ostensibly sent combat troops into the country in 1965 to prevent a Communist takeover and give the Government and people of South Vietnam time to build a viable

self-sufficient national structure. We have prevented a Communist military victory and have given the South Vietnamese almost 5 years. We have accomplished our objectives.

The stationing of 540,000 men in South Vietnam can only be further justified by the objectives of a military victory, which the United States has consistently stated is not its goal. For years our officials have told us on the one hand that the eventual outcome in Vietnam would depend on the South Vietnamese Government; on the other hand they have increasingly Americanized the conflict.

Both American and South Vietnamese officials have of late spoken in glowing terms about Saigon's increased political and military strength. Both President Thieu and Premier Huong have publicly declared that the United States can begin to withdraw its troops. I can only second this recommendation. It is time to let the Thieu government stand on its own; the United States can accomplish this best by beginning an orderly withdrawal of its forces.

In November 1967, General Westmoreland described to the National Press Club a four-phased plan under which in phase 3—to be implemented in 1968—the United States would "provide the new military equipment to revitalize the Vietnamese Army and prepare it to take on an ever-increasing share of the war" and "turn a major share of frontline DMZ defense over to the Vietnamese Army." In phase 4 Westmoreland declared that:

U.S. units can begin to phase down as the Vietnamese Army is modernized and develops its capability to the fullest.

The implementation of this plan is long past due. The American people—after 4 long years of war—have a right to know precisely when it will become a reality. It should be carried out now.

Hopefully, the beginning of a troop withdrawal on our part will serve as a catalyst to reduce the scale of fighting and ultimately the casualty rate. North Vietnam has in the past shown some willingness to limit its military activities in return for U.S. deescalation. Hanoi has, for example, generally abided by the October 1968 understanding with the United States with regard to the demilitarized zone. No major North Vietnamese units have crossed the zone into South Vietnam since that time. It may well be that Hanoi will respond in a similar positive fashion if the United States initiated a troop withdrawal.

Today, President Nixon stands on the threshold of a great opportunity: an opportunity to correct the errors of the past. By initiating the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam, he will give the American people new hope. He will show the alienated and downtrodden of this Nation that their Government is now ready to fully confront our pressing domestic problems. If President Nixon adopts this course, he will restore the kind of enlightened leadership this Nation has so sorely lacked in recent years: a leadership founded upon commonsense and realism. I urge the President to begin at once.

**AWARD TO HOUSE READING CLERK JOE BARTLETT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is always a source of great satisfaction when we learn that a member of the congressional family has distinguished himself in a creditable manner.

It is all the more gratifying when that person is one of our most faithful aides, and a friend we hold in fond esteem.

This is why I took special pride in the ceremony on Tuesday afternoon at which Dr. Kenneth D. Wells presented to House Reading Clerk Joe Bartlett, the George Washington Honor Medal on behalf of the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge.

This coveted patriotic award was presented to Joe for an essay entitled, "Strange Legend: Curious Riddle," which was judged to be "an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life."

The essay, written in the style of a parable, was intended to assist one of our Members in dealing with a difficult question with which he was confronted. The parable came to the attention of our colleague, Representative DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri, who caused it to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There it was read by my distinguished fellow Ohioan, Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN of the Seventh District, who commended it to the consideration of the Freedoms Foundation awards jury. It is a delightful irony, it seems to me, that what was done by Joe as a service for another, should rebound to him with such a fitting tribute.

I wanted my colleagues to share in the awareness of this happy event. I know you join me in congratulating Joe, and extending to him, and his lovely wife, Jinny, and to their charming daughters, Linda and Laura, our very best wishes on this noteworthy occasion in their lives.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and to say too that we are very honored to salute Joe Bartlett on this particular occasion.

Mr. Bartlett certainly has always conducted himself in the very finest professional manner. He has also seen fit, as your remarks suggest, to tell the story of democracy to our country and to tell the American people of the importance of our heritage of freedom and democracy.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yielding.

I too would like to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman has made, most appropriately about our esteemed reading clerk. He has served the House so well, I know of no one who loves the Capitol and the representative processes of government as Joe Bartlett. This love comes from the fact that he has been a marine and knows why he deprived himself and fought for the maintenance of freedom in our country. But more particularly he loves those with whom he works and holds them dear in his heart as they participate in the process of good government. For all of these reasons we not only salute Joe Bartlett on the occasion of my good friend, Dr. Kenneth Wells, recognizing him with the Washington Honor Medal Award of Valley Forge from the Valley Forge Freedom Foundation, but we salute him because we find it no surprise that he should write a parable so beautifully expressing as did the Master long ago. One would not intend to imply that Joe would be likened to the Master of Galilee in every respect, but insofar as his perception of need is concerned and his loyalty to his friends is concerned and his ability to speak in a parable, the likeness is not too far drawn.

So I join with my worthy colleague in saluting an outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of the American way of life and to say, Mr. Speaker, this is our friend, Joe Bartlett. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio advising us of the honor which has come to the minority reading clerk, Mr. Joe Bartlett. I understand that the gentleman himself called Mr. Bartlett's essay to the attention of the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, which subsequently chose to award this work its George Washington Honor Medal.

We, of course, know that the House has many able and dedicated staff members and certainly Joe is one of these. We are always pleased when recognition comes to an employee of the House. I am happy to join the gentleman in complimenting Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have among us a gentleman who each day faithfully and skillfully performs the duties of reading clerk. Our own Joe Bartlett is a man of many talents which go far beyond those involved in his everyday duties. Two days ago some of those talents were recognized officially by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa. It is with appreciation for his many abilities that I join with my colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Representative CLARENCE MILLER, in congratulating Joe Bartlett upon being awarded the George Washington Honor Medal.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Bartlett won the George Washington Honor Medal for an essay which is not only exceedingly well written but is a penetrating analysis of one of the most controversial issues arising from the Vietnam war. That this analysis is presented as a parable in modern dress makes it all the more impressive. Joe Bartlett's "Strange Legend" parable appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 19, 1968. I commend it to

those who have not read it and suggest that for others a rereading of it would be profitable. Again, my congratulations to Joe Bartlett—congratulations which I know are echoed among all of my colleagues in the House.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join in saluting the House Reading Clerk, Joe Bartlett, and appreciate the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Miller, calling the attention of the House to the honors bestowed on Joe Bartlett.

I want to include a further recognition. The U.S. Jaycees recently paid tribute to Joe Bartlett for his "unselfish service" to the Jaycees.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the inscription on the plaque presented by the Jaycees along with an article from Roll Call and a letter from President Nixon:

THE U.S. JAYCEES—A TESTIMONIAL OF A GRATEFUL ORGANIZATION

Presented to Joe Bartlett in honor and with deep appreciation of the distinguished and unselfish service given to the United States Jaycees while serving with outstanding leadership, vision and ability, 8th Annual Governmental Affairs Leadership Seminar, 1969.

[From Roll Call, Mar. 20, 1969]

JOE BARTLETT ADDS NEW AWARDS TO COLLECTION

Joe Bartlett, Senior Reading Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, was honored by The United States Jaycees for outstanding service to the young men's organization during a session of the 8th Annual Governmental Affairs Leadership Seminar at the Capitol, Monday.

Bartlett, who began his career as a House page at the age of 14, was cited for his distinguished service in helping formulate the Governmental Affairs Awareness program and continued support of this Jaycees involvement effort since its inception in 1962.

In 1965, Bartlett was honored by a resolution before the House body by the State of Georgia for his assistance to the young men of that State. In 1967, he was presented the Georgia Jaycees Distinguished Service Award.

Bartlett, a native of Clarksburg, West Virginia, first got his start in Washington as a result of a trip to the Capitol as "America's Typical Schoolboy Patrolman." As a result of this selection, he was given a 30-day appointment as page, which has evolved into a career of nearly 28 years of public service in the House.

His career, which began in 1941, was interrupted twice by stints in the Marine Corps during World War II and the Korean Conflict. Upon his return from service at the end of World War II, Bartlett, then 19, was selected as chief page. He served in that capacity until called back into active service with the Marine Corps during the Korean Crisis.

It was during the second tour of duty that he met his bride-to-be, Bartlett, stationed in Virginia, was assigned as one of the Cherry Blossom Festival escorts in 1951 and met Ginny Bender, daughter of the late Senator George H. Bender of Ohio. They were later married and presently make their home in Chagrin Falls, Ohio with their two daughters, Linda and Laura.

In 1953, Bartlett was chosen as the youngest reading clerk in the history of the House. In 1960, 1964 and 1968, he was selected as Chief Reading Clerk for the Republican National Conventions.

Bartlett was recently honored by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge which awarded him the George Washington Honor Medal Award for an essay, "Strange Legend: Curious Riddle."

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, March 26, 1969.

Mr. JOE BARTLETT,  
Senior Reading Clerk,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: I was pleased to see that you have been honored for outstanding service by the United States Jaycees at their 8th Annual Governmental Affairs Leadership Seminar.

You can take great pride in this award, yet I know your greatest satisfaction must come from knowing you have given so generously in the service of our nation over the years.

Pat and I join in sending our congratulations and very best wishes to you and Ginny.  
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

The record of Joe Bartlett is outstanding and his service to young people sets a high example for all of us.

The recognition by the U.S. Jaycees is but another tribute paid to Joe Bartlett by those he has served.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to express my congratulations to our esteemed reading clerk, Joe Bartlett, on receipt of the George Washington Honor Medal Award from the Freedoms Foundation.

This is a great honor from a distinguished organization. I know Joe is justly proud of the recognition accorded his essay, "Strange Legend: Curious Riddle."

As many of you know, Joe and his charming family reside in Chagrin Falls, Ohio, in the 23d Congressional District which I represent. The Chagrin Falls Herald, one of the outstanding suburban Cleveland newspapers, took note of Joe's award in the following article:

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION HONORS JOE BARTLETT

Joe Bartlett, reader of the House of Representatives, and Chagrin Falls resident, has been awarded the George Washington Honor Medal Award by the National School Awards Jury for his essay "Strange Legend: Curious Riddle," which he wrote in 1968.

Bartlett's essay was written as a parable on a young congressman who is fighting with his conscience on the advisability of voting on a bill which would OK trade with an enemy power.

He falls asleep pondering the question and dreams of an expert woodworker, Naivius, who lives in the land of Samaria. His trees were of the straightest quality and his talent with the wood unsurpassed.

Learning of his great skill and quality wood, Roman authorities in Judea ordered a shipment of his finest timbers. His reaction was one of doubt, as he did not know for what use the lumber was meant.

His colleagues and family argued with him that the wood would surely be used to build housing for the poor, hospitals for the sick and schools for the children. And besides, he would be paid well for his work.

Placated, Naivius consents to the transaction and the lumber is sent on its way.

Still disturbed by the question, Naivius decides to go to Jerusalem to see first-hand what good works his timbers had performed.

He becomes weary after a climb up a steep hill. He sits to rest on a wooden crossbeam and senses that the wood is his own. He gropes for some meaning of the structure.

In the darkness he is able to make out words written on the wood, "King of the Jews."

When in Chagrin Falls, Bartlett lives at 600 North St., with his wife, daughter of the late Senator George Bender.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I want very much to associate myself with the remarks being made today in behalf of Joe Bartlett, a man for whom all of us who serve in the House have such great respect.

It is one measure of Joe's many talents that he has received the Freedoms Foundation's George Washington Honor Medal for his essay "Strange Legend: Curious Riddle." I am pleased to join in this salute to a dedicated servant and articulate student of the House of Representatives.

As another measure of the affection with which we in the Cleveland, Ohio, area hold "our own" Joe Bartlett, I want to share with my colleagues in Congress a newspaper column by George Condon of the Cleveland Plain Dealer dated February 26, 1969. Under unanimous consent, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE FACE IS FAMILIAR, BUT . . .

(By George E. Condon)

WASHINGTON.—Partying is almost a way of life in Washington, but every now and then there is a wingding here that is entitled to be described as something special. The "Bash for Bartlett" a few years ago was in that category.

Joe Bartlett was the guest of honor at that Capitol Hill party, and among those who came together to salute him were many of the most famous names in Washington. It was timely and appropriate recognition for a personable man who, for 25 years, has been one of the unsung heroes of Congress.

Joe Bartlett, who now calls Cleveland his home, came to Washington from the West Virginia Hills in 1941, the holder of a 30-day appointment as a page in the U.S. Senate. He somehow has managed to extend his association with the government in a way that suggests he is on his way toward becoming a career man, if more than a quarter of a century ago can be regarded as a beginning.

Bartlett's achievements include being the youngest chief page in the history of the Senate and being the youngest man ever to be named reading clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives when he was given that appointment in 1953.

It is one of the happy surprises you uncover when you search into the murky area of Washington officialdom, that the governmental monster can be reduced to the simple, essential element of men—especially anonymous career men like Bartlett who still have stars and stripes in their eyes after many years of close association with the nation's leaders. They are the ones, of course, who keep the wheels turning; who provide needed continuity to the political process.

Bartlett, incidentally, is in the puzzling position of the supporting actor whose face is familiar to millions, but who still remains an anonymous, indistinct figure on the national scene. Whenever the President, or a visiting ruler, or a home celebrity, addresses a joint session of Congress which is televised, Bartlett usually is prominent in the closeup scene, being seated on the level just below the speaker of the House.

If the general public doesn't know Joe Bartlett, the men and women who run this government of ours do. And when he speaks, the House of Representatives listen—the ability to command such attention being one advantage that a reading clerk has in this parliamentary system. A reading clerk actually does more than read the roll call of the House; he has to be aware of what is in the legislative hopper and he has to have an intuitive knowledge of the turns and twists that the large deliberative body is likely to take. But reading the roll call of

the House membership is a terrifically demanding duty in itself because there are 435 names to be read, and in the course of an average roll call, the reading clerk will call out 800 names.

One student of the Washington political scene once got out his slide rule and figured out that during more than one-fourth of the time that the House of Representatives is in session, the roll of members is being called; over 428 calls in all, with each one taking about 27 minutes. The senior reading clerk recalls one 32-hour period when there were 40 roll calls and he clutched his throat as the memory swept over him.

Bartlett's association with Cleveland, and, specifically, Chagrin Falls, came through marriage. While still in Marine uniform, he met and married Virginia (Jinny) Bender, the daughter of the late former U.S. Sen. (and former representative) George H. Bender. They have two children, Linda and Laura. And although they live in Washington, home is where grandma lives—Mrs. George Bender's home at 600 North Street in Chagrin Falls.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in praise today for one of the people who makes service in this body much easier than it might otherwise be. I refer, of course, to Joe Bartlett, one of the two reading clerks of the House. Joe is sometimes referred to as the minority reading clerk but that is not exactly accurate because, like all employees of the House, he serves all Members equally and well. While Joe holds his post at the designation of the Republicans in the House, he is technically named by our distinguished Speaker. Joe and his colleague, friend, and fellow reading clerk, Charlie Hackney, are equals in their role, even though Joe has a few years of seniority. But they share their responsibility so well that many who hear them think they sound alike and some have even said that as time takes its toll of their hairline, they look something alike.

Suffice it to say, since we are all proud of the good job they do in the House, it is also a particular pleasure for me to have had a small part in honoring Joe for his outside accomplishment in the literary area. I am proud of him for his achievement, for the sentiment it expressed, and for the fact that he is a fellow Ohioan by adoption if not birth.

As my tribute to Joe on the occasion of this honor he was rendered by the Freedoms Foundation and in appreciation to both him and Charlie, I should like to insert for the edification of my colleagues two articles which recently appeared in the public press about our reading clerks. The first is by Aldo Beckman in the Chicago Tribune on December 8, 1968, and the other is a wire service story put together by Frank Eleazer and his UPI staff for distribution to UPI clients across the country. The insertion that I include is the article as it appeared even around the world in Vietnam in the Stars and Stripes edition of March 16, 1969:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 8, 1968]

READING CLERKS—THEY MAKE THE HOUSE A HOME FOR ALL 435 REPRESENTATIVES

(By Aldo Beckman)

WASHINGTON, December 7.—Joe Bartlett and Charles W. Hackney Jr., the reading clerks in the United States House of Representatives, have it made this year.

They have only 37 new faces that they must recognize immediately when they see them and 37 new names to learn to pronounce correctly.

For that is the number of new congressmen that will begin serving here next Jan. 3. Although there actually were 40 new congressmen elected last November, 3 of them are "retreads," men who have served in an earlier Congress and now are returning after an interruption in their service.

MUST KNOW ALL NAMES

In addition to knowing the new members by sight, the two reading clerks also must recall the names of all the other members of the 435-seat legislative body.

While it seems like a herculean task for the average man who has difficulty remembering the name of the one new man on office staff, Bartlett and Hackney, both long-time veterans of Capitol Hill service, take it in stride. This year's memory task is simple, they said, when one recalls there were 92 new faces in the House after the Democratic landslide in 1964.

Their first test will come shortly after the House convenes and the first roll call is taken. It is the clerk's job to read the roll, either during a vote on a bill or on a quorum call.

VOICE STANDEE NAMES

After reading thru the names twice those answering on the first round are, naturally, not read during the second round, their memory tests occur when members not answering the first two rounds stand in front of the clerk's podium in the "well" of the House chamber.

Then Bartlett or Hackney, whoever happens to be conducting the call, voices the names of the members standing there.

Both have reputations as never having missed, but Bartlett confided, during an interview that he has slipped up a time or two. "I've never missed under pressure," he said, "but I have called out the wrong name a time or two, when I was relaxed and not concentrating."

"But I quickly recovered each time, and the member who was the subject of my fumble always thought I had just seen someone else and called his name."

"On occasion, I've drawn a blank on a name and as I go down the line in the well calling names, it's a little scary as I get closer to the man whose name I can't recall," he said. "But I've been lucky. Every time it's happened, the name has popped into my mind just before I had to identify the member."

GETS PICTURES, BIOGRAPHIES

Bartlett and Hackney send for pictures and biographies of the new members shortly after the election, and enclose a request for the proper pronunciation. New members, proud of their recent election to the Congress, can get pretty disturbed if their name is mispronounced the first time it is spoken in the House.

And with a Congress including a Kuykendall, Schneebell, a Frelinghuysen, a Gallifanakis, and a Kluczynski, pronunciation can be a problem.

Most of the pictures have arrived and the two clerks will be spending much of their time the next three weeks studying them. "The biographies are about as important as the pictures," said Bartlett, who has been reading clerk since 1953, when, at the age of 27, he was the youngest man ever named to the post.

"It helps divide the chicken farmer from the banker," he explained. "And I don't mean to belittle either occupation."

"But a man's looks are influenced by his background, and the biographies are a real big help."

CALL TAKES 28 MINUTES

The average time for a roll call is about 28 minutes, but last Oct. 8, when Repub-

icans were stalling in an effort to force the Democratic leadership to call up a reorganization bill, one roll call took more than two hours. The speaker needed that much time to round up enough members to make a quorum, and the clerks were ordered to slow down their reading.

During that same session, which ran more than 33 hours, a modern record, Bartlett and Hackney called 46 roll calls, an all-time record. Since Senate-type filibusters are impossible under House rules, any filibuster, such as the one instigated by the Republicans during that all-night session, simply exploit the use of the reading clerks, with repeated demands for roll calls.

During such sessions, the clerks keep medicated cough drops handy, and gargle at regular intervals.

Altho neither Bartlett nor Hackney has had much formal speech training, both have superb speaking voices, with extreme clarity, volume, and perfect enunciation. Without such traits, they would not have their current jobs.

#### KNOW HOUSE PROCEDURES

Both also have intimate knowledge of legislative procedures in the House, another absolute must for a reading clerk.

While Bartlett was named by Republicans and Hackney by Democrats, they are non-partisan while on the job. They draw identical salaries [just under \$20,000 a year] and share all duties.

Both served their political parties as reading clerks in the national nominating conventions last fall.

Altho they have been partners only since 1963, when Hackney was appointed to the post, their voices sound so much alike that it is impossible to tell who is reading a bill, if the listener is out of view of the podium.

Bartlett expressed some surprise upon learning this, insisting there has never been any effort to make the voices sound alike.

#### SERVED IN MARINES

Hackney worked as a cloak room clerk before being named House reading clerk, while Bartlett was chief of pages in the House. He first came to Washington from his native Clarksburg, W. Va., in 1941, as a House page, an honor he won after being named "America's typical schoolboy patrolman." Altho the appointment was for only 30 days, he has been here ever since, taking time out to serve two hitchhikes in the marines, once during the Korean war.

Both Bartlett and Hackney enjoy their jobs and have nothing but praise for the members.

"Anybody that says nice guys finish last is just wrong," said Bartlett. "There are lots of great guys here and they all came in first."

"After all, every member here was sent here by half a million Americans."

[From Stars & Stripes, Mar. 16, 1969]

#### HANDY MAN AROUND THE HOUSE

(By Frank Eleazer)

WASHINGTON.—Congressmen pay Joe Bartlett, of Chagrin Falls, Ohio, \$20,000 a year because he can remember their names every time. And in 16 years nobody has had occasion to demand a refund.

How does he do it?

"I sweat a lot," says Joe, who with his fellow reading clerk, Charles W. Hackney Jr., of Lexington, N.C., alternated last year in calling the roll of the House 428 times.

Actually it isn't the call of the roll that's so tough. All this takes is good voice, clear diction, and basic knowledge of a few incidents like the fact Kuykendall has to come out "Kirkendall;" that Hébert really spells "Ay-bear"; and that Sebellius is pronounced "Sebeellius," instead of that other way.

The problem is that anywhere from 40 to more than 150 members fail to answer when called. Instead they present themselves en masse in the well of the House at the end of

the call, there to be individually identified, addressed and recorded, either as present or as voting for or against.

Thus Bartlett, 42, and Hackney, 46, become the only two people in the world who can, do, and must recognize on sight each of the 435 House members, and be prepared to call him by name, properly pronounced.

They know all the tricks in the memory trade, and think little of them. Joe recalls his first meeting with a House member now departed who, upon being introduced to "Mr. and Mrs. Bartlett" at a pre-session social event, subsequently introduced them to another guest as "Mr. and Mrs. Pear."

Association is an important part of the name-calling game, Bartlett concedes. For instance, unlike some others around the Capitol, he has never confused Rep. Don Clausen and Rep. Del Clawson, both Republicans, both Californians.

"Don is a pilot," says Bartlett, "while Del is a Mormon and a former mayor." And if that's not enough explanation to help you sort out the guests at the next neighborhood party, don't feel too badly about it.

Bartlett concedes he's no whiz kid himself at that kind of event. And Hackney admits that at private social affairs he sometimes flounders along with the rest of us trying to catch and hold fast to new names and hang them onto new faces.

However, both Bartlett and Hackney, naturally more name-conscious than the average person, offer some hints that might be helpful to harried hosts, guests, traveling salesmen, Rotary clubbers and others given to mumbled introductions and all-purpose greetings.

1. Get the name, if it means asking for it a couple of times. Repeat it.
2. Look—really look—at the guy (gal) who goes with it.
3. Exchange enough chitchat to fix in your mind, in case nobody told you, and generally nobody does, who your friend is or what he does for a living.
4. If you really mean business, write the name down the first chance you get.

Meantime, like Bartlett and Hackney, there are sometimes other steps you can take. Joe, a Marine reservist, was invited the other night to a fancy dinner at the Marine headquarters here.

"It was a great party," said Joe, happily recalling afterwards that he had every name and connection in mind before he walked in the door.

Hackney says when he enters a roomful of people many of whom he knows, or is supposed to know, he keeps his eye roving over the group picking out and mentally affixing name tags to those he will be greeting shortly. That way he avoids last-minute panic.

Getting back to those roll calls, Bartlett, who's been at it since 1953, and Hackney on the job now for six years, admit they still get knots in their stomachs every time that mass of members presents itself in the well.

The custom is to start at the right and work to the left, taking the members, in turn, picking out for special advance recognition only the ladies and the more elderly or infirm of the men.

"I am always working three faces ahead," reports Bartlett. "I have never yet drawn a blank that didn't clear up before I got there."

Because of recent roll call scandals involving the improper recording of members not actually present, House leaders are currently seeking bids on an electronic tally system, built around a computer, to record and count votes as they are cast.

The reading clerks (who were not involved in the ghost-voting practice) welcome this advance. However, it will not change their basic function of calling the roll, or relieve them of many related reading and paperwork duties.

And it won't cut down a bit on the sweat

during the big stampede to the well. The new computer is guaranteed never to forget a name. But it is no good at all at remembering faces.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and that other Members may have the same permission with respect to this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RUPPE), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE, Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Federal Financial Disclosure Act of 1969. This bill is the most stringent financial reporting legislation to be presented to Congress to date. This is legislation to bring all policymaking officials of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government under strict reporting requirements. It is neither a clever nor a devious bill. It is straightforward and to the point. It is designed to obtain reports on all sources of income, direct and indirect, by covered individuals and members of their immediate families.

There is coincidence in my presentation of this legislation today. This morning we received word that Justice Abe Fortas is resigning from the Supreme Court. This is a man proposed by former President Johnson for Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Today his resignation comes in the wake of evidence that Mr. Fortas found it difficult to separate his public trust from his desire for personal gain. Before we in the House of Representatives cast too many stones, however, let us not forget that the other branches of Government, Congress and the executive, have not been free from the type of stigma which has afflicted the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis of confidence shaking the very foundations of American government. We must move during this session of Congress to reestablish the faith of the American people in their national leadership. When I was elected to Congress in 1966, the American people were stunned by stories of influence peddling and abuse of the public trust by individuals in positions of power. Members of the Republican Freshman 90th Club banded together and proposed a package of new ethics legislation. Others in Congress joined our cause, and we accomplished what had not been possible for 180 years of congressional history. We succeeded in establishing an ethics code, and Ethics Committee, and a system of partial financial disclosure. During the 90th Congress we took a step forward. Now it is time to build on that foundation.

The public portion of the House of

Representatives financial statement, under reporting procedures established during the last Congress are little better than a sham and a facade. A listing of holdings without accompanying financial statements is next to meaningless. Loopholes under the present reporting procedure are legion. For example, when is a company doing substantial business with the Federal Government? In my case I made a decision to report everything in which I might conceivably have even an indirect interest. However, I strongly suspect that with a rearrangement of my finances—butting items in trust or corporate entities—it would have been possible to sharply reduce my public disclosure. It was after studying and filing the report that I decided on the necessity for drafting strict reporting requirement legislation. It also seemed logical to me that all high officials in Government should be covered by the requirements.

The Washington Post was absolutely correct when it stated in an editorial Wednesday:

The portion of the member's report that is made public is both superficial and incomplete. . . . The facade must give way to the reality of candor with the public.

Mr. Speaker, the public is losing patience, and it is tired of the "put on" and the half measure. Allegations and controversy surrounding Bakers and Dodds and Longs and Powells and Fortases and mink coats and freezers and vacuna coats and beachside motels are eroding public respect for the principal institutions of democracy. We must act. If we fail to act, our failure will lead to ever-greater public cynicism, and the residue will flow as a pollutant into all facets of American life. Can we expect from our Nation and the younger generation better than the example we in this Chamber provide? Can any man doubt that we are in trouble in this Nation? A whole generation of Americans is losing patience with double standards, demagoguery, and hypocrisy. There are those of increasing prominence who would rip our society asunder and tear our institutions to the ground. We in Government cannot succeed in asserting effective leadership in this age of moral turbulence and spiritual crisis if we fail to lift ourselves above any hint of suspicion. Adoption of the Federal Financial Disclosure Act of 1969, which I am introducing today is the logical step forward.

This act is simple. It calls for full financial disclosure by Members of the House, Senators, Justices, and judges of the U.S. court system, the President, the Vice President, Cabinet members and other policymaking officials of the executive branch as determined by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Under the act the following items must be reported:

First. Gross income of principal person and members of his immediate family.

Second. All honorariums and compensation payments, including names of sources and amounts—includes commissions, salaries, fees, and so forth.

Third. Gross income from business enterprises, including amounts, addresses,

and names of businesses, and nature of the businesses.

Fourth. Itemization of gains from dealings in property, including names and addresses, and brief description of each transaction.

Fifth. Income from interest, including sources and amounts.

Sixth. Sources of income from rents, royalties, and dividends.

Seventh. Indebtedness, including names and addresses and aggregate amount.

Eighth. Itemization of income from partnerships or memberships in professional groups. Names and addresses for such payments that exceed \$1,000.

Ninth. Itemization of income from estates or trusts in which principal has an interest, and nature of that interest.

Tenth. Report on all gifts exceeding \$100 in value, including names and addresses of donors, amount or value of gift, and description thereof. Report shall also contain a list of gifts to the principal and his family which exceed \$500 in value, including names and addresses of donors.

Eleventh. Report to contain list of assets held by principal and his immediate family. List to include value of each asset and brief description. Household furnishings and personal effects excluded.

Twelfth. Report to include names and addresses of each person or organization to whom the principal and his family owe at least \$5,000. It also includes statement of total indebtedness.

Thirteenth. Report to include all funds used to defray expenses incurred by reason of his being an official member candidate or judge, including names and addresses of all persons contributing to the funds, the amount of each contribution, the amount of each expenditure and the purpose of each expenditure.

I urge early congressional consideration of this legislation and request that the full text of the Federal Financial Disclosure Act be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks.

The bill follows:

H.R. 11380

A bill to provide for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives, Members of the United States Senate, Justices and Judges of the United States Courts, and policymaking officials of the executive branch as designated by the Civil Service Commission, but including the President, Vice President, and Cabinet members; and by candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency; and to give the House Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Senate Select Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the Attorney General of the United States appropriate jurisdiction.

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Financial Disclosure Act".

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Member" means a Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

(b) The term "Judge" means a Justice or Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Judges of the United States

District Courts and the United States Courts of Appeals.

(c) The term "Officer" means the President, the Vice President, Cabinet Members, and any Presidential Appointee who has been designated as a policymaking official by the Civil Service Commission.

(d) The term "candidate" means an individual who has taken the action necessary under the laws of a State to qualify him to be a candidate either in a primary election held to nominate a candidate for election to the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, the United States Senate, or the House of Representatives, or in a general election or special election held to fill any of these offices.

(e) The term "election" means a general or special election held to select a Member, President, or Vice President and a primary election held to nominate candidates for the office of President, Vice President, or Member.

(f) The term "gift" shall refer to something of value voluntarily transferred from one party to another without compensation or monetary consideration.

(g) The term "fund" shall refer to a sum of money or other material resources available for use by Member, judge, officer, or candidate or anyone acting on his behalf.

(h) The term "asset" shall refer to an item of value owned or in which exists a beneficial interest.

SEC. 3. (a) Each person serving as a Member, each judge, and each officer designated by the Civil Service Commission as a policymaking official of the executive branch shall file on or before April thirtieth of each year with the appropriate person, a written report containing the information required by this Act covering the preceding calendar year. The Members of the Senate shall file such reports with the Secretary of the Senate and the Senate Select Committee on Standards of Conduct. The judges shall file such reports with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Officers shall file such reports with the Attorney General of the United States.

(b) Each candidate for the House of Representatives or the Senate who is not a Member of the House or the Senate shall file with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate at least fifteen days before the date on which is held the first election in which he is a candidate a written report containing the information required by this Act covering the preceding calendar year. Where an individual becomes a candidate after the beginning of such fifteen-day period, he shall file such a report within twenty-four hours after becoming a candidate.

(c) Any candidate for the Office of President or Vice President who is not President or Vice President shall file such report with the Attorney General within fifteen days after his nomination by his party, but not less than thirty days prior to the general election.

(d) The report required to be filed under subsections (a), (b), (c) of this section shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report.

(e) All reports required under subsections (a) of this section shall be maintained by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate for the duration of the Member's consecutive terms in office as public records available for inspection at reasonable times by the public. All reports required under subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be maintained for a period of one year by the appropriate person as public records which shall be available for inspection at reasonable times by the public.

SEC. 4. (a) The report required under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of this Act shall include a complete account of the Member's, judge's, officer's, or candidate's gross income and that of his spouse

and dependent children. For the purposes of this Act, gross income shall be defined as set forth in section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C. 61). The report of income shall specifically include, though not to the exclusion of other items listed in section 61, the following information:

- (1) the names and addresses of all persons and organizations from whom was received by the Member, judge, officer, or candidate, or on his behalf with his knowledge and consent, any honorarium or compensation for services, including fees, commissions, salaries, and similar items, and the amount of such honorarium or compensation for services, or if not money, the substance of the honorarium or compensation and the appraised value thereof;
- (2) gross income derived from business enterprises including the amounts thereof, the nature of his interest in the business, and the names and addresses of each such business;
- (3) an itemization of all gains derived from dealings in property, including the names and addresses of other parties involved and a brief description of the transaction which took place;
- (4) the sources from which were derived income from interest and the amounts thereof;
- (5) the sources from which rents were derived and the amounts thereof;
- (6) the sources from which royalties were derived and the amounts thereof;
- (7) the sources from which dividends were derived and the amounts thereof;
- (8) the names and addresses of all persons and organizations from whom he received assistance in the discharge of indebtedness and the aggregate amount or appraised value thereof;
- (9) itemization of income or benefits derived from distribution of the Member's, judge's, officer's, or candidate's share in any partnership or professional group, and the names and addresses of all person and organizations from whose payments such distributions are made: *Provided, however,* That no such names and addresses need be furnished when the distribution to the Member, judge, officer, or candidate from any such person or organization in said year is less than \$1,000;
- (10) itemization of income derived from an estate or trust in which the Member, judge, officer, or candidate has an interest and the nature of that interest.
- (b) The report shall list all gifts to the Member, judge, officer, or candidate which in aggregate value exceed \$100 in the year from a particular source. Included in the report shall be the name and address of the donor, the amount or value of his gifts, and a description thereof. The report shall also contain the name and address of a donor to the Member, judge, officer, or candidate, his spouse and his dependent children when the amounts or values of such gifts given in the course of a calendar year from a particular source exceed \$500, and shall describe each such gift and the value thereof.
- (c) The report shall list assets held by the Member, judge, officer, or candidate, by his spouse or dependent children, or by any of them jointly. The list shall include the value of each asset and a brief description thereof, but household furnishings and personal effects need not be reported.
- (d) The report shall include the names and addresses of each person and organization to whom the Member, judge, officer, or candidate, his wife or dependent children, or any of them jointly owe an aggregate amount in excess of \$5,000, and include a statement of the total aggregate indebtedness of the Member, judge, officer, or candidate and such family members.
- (e) The report shall include a statement of any funds established by the Member,

judge, officer, or candidate, or on his behalf, to assist him in defraying expenses which may be incurred by reason of his being a Member, judge, officer, or candidate. The report shall set forth the names and addresses of all persons contributing to the funds, the amount of each contribution, the amount of each expenditure from such funds, and the purpose of each such expenditure.

Sec. 5. (a) The Senate Select Committee on Standards of Conduct shall have jurisdiction to review the report filed with it by a Member of the Senate under this Act, and shall recommend to the Senate appropriate disciplinary action against any Member of the Senate who it determines has failed to file any such report or knowingly and willfully filed a false report. Such violations shall be reported to the Attorney General. The committee shall develop and prescribe the forms to be used in making such reports.

(b) The House Committee on Standards of Conduct shall have jurisdiction to review the report filed with it by a Member of the House under this Act, and shall recommend to the House appropriate disciplinary action against any Member of the House who has failed to file any such report or who has knowingly and willfully filed a false report. Such violations shall be reported to the Attorney General. The committee shall develop and prescribe the forms to be used in making such reports.

(c) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall have jurisdiction to review a report filed with it by a judge under this Act, and shall recommend to the Judicial Conference appropriate disciplinary action against any judge it determines has failed to file any such report or knowingly and willfully filed a false report. Such violations shall be reported to the Attorney General. The Judicial Conference shall develop and prescribe the forms to be used in making such reports.

(d) The Attorney General shall have jurisdiction to review a report filed with him by an officer and shall take appropriate action against any officer he determines has failed to file an appropriate report or who knowingly and willfully filed a false report. The Attorney General shall develop and prescribe the forms to be used in making such reports.

(e) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section are enacted as an exercise in the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, with full recognition of the right of the House and Senate to make changes therein at any time in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate and House.

Sec. 6. Any Member, judge, officer, or candidate who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act, or who knowingly and willfully files a false report under this Act, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

#### THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

(Mr. RUPPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUPPE, Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) recently spoke to the New York State Maritime College Alumni Association's 50th anniversary dinner, at the Hotel Statler in New York.

Mr. KEITH's interest in maritime matters predates—by many years—his coming to Congress, and predates, too, his relatively recent appointment to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

His congressional district has probably

launched as many ships as any other coastal area of a similar size—in the United States—or perhaps throughout the world.

In Mr. KEITH's speech he summarizes the situation that confronts our merchant marine—and points up the need for action in the years ahead. Mr. KEITH's speech follows:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS KEITH

Admiral O'Donnell, Captain Maley, Toastmaster Mueller, and Alumni of the New York State Maritime College. I am honored to be here for your 50th Anniversary Dinner.

My Congressional District has a long seafaring tradition. There is hardly a tidal river south of Boston, that hasn't at one time or another, been the scene of a ship launching. The whaling ships are no more—but New Bedford still is a busy port, eager to play a major role in an industry that, in our national interest, should be revitalized, and the General Dynamics in Fore River is one of the major ship builders for our Navy. It should and will play a major role in the longed for era when our Merchant Marine can take its place along side of our naval forces under the American flag. Carrying the products of American enterprise to the other nations of the world.

And so, I'm pleased to talk to you about a subject which, besides being of great personal interest, is, in my view, going to become relatively fashionable in the near future.

In my years on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I've been in a position to observe what's been happening to our industry. In 1966, for example, I served as a member of a Congressional delegation which went behind the Iron Curtain to observe the Russian's effort to win control of the oceans. Upon my return I added my voice to those of others who, through the fog which historically enveloped our Maritime policy, have warned America that—"Soviet Maritime policy already has gone a long way toward achieving supremacy at sea, and, unless effectively challenged by the Free World, can be expected to achieve this strategic objective well before the end of this century."

I further warned that the Russians had 10 times as many Merchant ships on order as we did. Our predicament now is well known. America is becoming one of the smaller boats on the World's oceans. So much so that the *New York Times* has said: "The current state of the Merchant Marine represents a genuine crisis for the United States as a maritime power." It is further pointed out that since 1947, the percent of foreign trade carried aboard U.S. Flag ships has dropped from 58% to less than 6%—with 10,000 tons of commercial cargo lost to foreign flags every month. Our fleet is not only antiquated—but it's shrinking, and now consists of some 800 fewer ships than in 1950.

What's more, a history of the last 70 years of our Merchant Marine shows a lack of National planning similar in some respect to that of our earlier defense establishments.

For example, at the time of the Spanish-American War we were without a Merchant Fleet. We had to buy and charter vessels from foreigners—at exorbitant prices and rates.

During the first world War the Merchant Marine didn't do much better, although we tried. Wilson got the Shipping Act of 1916 through. It authorized, as you know, a ship-building program and shipping board to run things. But the vessels weren't ready until it was time to bring the troops home!

In the meantime, the United States, once again, bought ships from foreign nationals. At the end of hostilities we found ourselves with another rag-tag fleet consisting of ramshackle Japanese freighters and nu-

merous old Austrian and German ships, ships seized by the Allies but sold to us only following our entry into the War.

And what about the roaring 20's and the early 30's? What Maritime policy there was, could be summed up by "scrap 'em or sell 'em"! With it faded any vision of a strong fleet which the Merchant Marine Acts of 1920 and 1928 were powerless to revive. As if to finish things off—the shipping board was abolished in 1933 and its responsibilities turned over to the Department of Commerce.

As we all know, the efforts of the Merchant Marine during the Second World War were heroic, so heroic, in fact, that statistics to show how many ships were built, and how many tons of material were transported, became somewhat insignificant. Suffice it to say that at war's end we had approximately 60% of the World's merchant tonnage, compared to 13% before the War.

We also had a headstart on every other shipbuilding nation, our Merchant Marine, a relatively small industry in America, stood ready to play a disproportionately large role in National and International affairs.

During the post war period, however, new pressures arose, and I'm afraid that we'll have to admit that neither government nor industry responded adequately to them. Labor was restless, management faced stiff competition, restrictive regulations sprang up like weeds, and the fleet, of wartime vintage, rapidly became obsolete.

In looking at the various proposals to get us out of the maritime mess, I am struck by the number of imaginative ideas and statistics which are used to draw an extraordinary profile of America's future on the seas.

We hear market forecasts saying that during the 70's the ocean movement of tanker cargoes will grow by at least the same 9% per year as it is now, that dry cargo tonnage will grow by 4% to 5% each year, and package freight by 20%.

We hear that atomic propulsion will be economically feasible by 1973 and our more creative designers are proposing tankers so large that the Queen Mary could fit on their decks.

We hear more and more about "value engineering" which will cut costs and the land bridge concept which, along with the expected discovery of new ore deposits, may cause the trade routes to be rewritten again.

We hear that within the next five years, probably 40 to 50% of the world's freight items will be packaged—opening the door for an even quicker exploitation of such things as long and short haul vessels—in short, a systems approach will be employed.

And, perhaps most astounding of all, is something I only discovered on the plane from Washington this afternoon—the fact is that technology currently available would permit the use of a steel tube 38 feet in diameter and 1400 feet long and which would travel 200 feet below the surface at a speed of 40 to 50 knots. Dubbed the "eel", this vessel, and I use the term advisedly, could be instrumental in bringing to the ocean an application of the automatic distribution revolution which has already occurred on land. A new total approach will then be possible. The automatic loading and unloading of homogenous cargoes such as coal, ore, sand, and oil, can occur. Additionally, dry cargo could be carried in containerized ships and ocean-going catamarans. However, the conclusion of the article brought an abrupt end to the fantasies it had created for me . . . by reminding that there were: "A number of almost insuperable obstacles" still remaining before such a scheme becomes operational.

All of this reminds me of a fact very often forgotten in discussions about the future of the Merchant Marine. The most important ingredient for the revolution which is to come is Men . . . men trained in the unique technology of the sea.

Who . . . is to loosen the bureaucratic strings which have tied the Merchant Marine down like Gulliver . . . bound down by the Lilliputians . . . ?

For . . . who is to pilot and service the gigantic underwater bullets I have decried. Which are to be driven by small crews which sit in front of an instrument panel no bigger than that of a light plane?

Who . . . can best develop new and applicable mechanical inventions—who but those who know the sea and her habits most intimately?

Who . . . will know how to manage the sea as a course of natural wealth and as a profitable commercial highway better than those who know how to capitalize on her quirks, utilizing her strengths and avoiding her weaknesses?

These questions, and many others, point up the need for a highly trained group of ship officers and men, scientists, technicians, vessel captains, operations men, planners and visionaries to turn the oceans into bountiful commercial lakes. And without an educational system geared to this massive task . . . the ship of state will continue to be a . . . shrimp boat!

I want to make one thing perfectly clear. "The maritime industry has been permitted to decline to a point at which the nation's defense and economic welfare are imperiled. We must set as our goal a sharp increase of the transport of U.S. trade aboard American flagships. The present rate is 5.6%; by the mid-seventies, we must see that rate over 30% and the growth accelerating. I support a building program to accomplish that objective."

So said Richard Nixon in Seattle last year and it's beginning to look as though the Nation may cash in on this campaign promise. My discussion with the leaders of the new Nixon Maritime team, including Andy Gibson . . . A graduate of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Rocco Siciliano, the Undersecretary of Commerce and spokesman for the Administration's special maritime planning council, leads me to believe that before many more months pass we are likely to see the results.

During the last few years, 11 separate proposals for rebuilding the fleet have come from the Federal bullhorn, but nothing has been done. The Nixon team, culling the usable from this storehouse of information and, by adding a dash of creativity of its own at long last . . . can bring the nation to the beginning of a new maritime era.

Maybe there's some life left in the old bureaucracy after all. Personally, I'm delighted because it has always been my approach that after some initial studies have been made, we would learn more . . . by doing than by studying further. I remember when I first began in the Insurance business . . . studying estate planning, I can say now there was no classroom lesson as valuable as getting on with a job—I can say too, that in the Merchant Marine, we've studied it enough. There's been enough planning—on a horizontal plane—and at the highest level. It's time we got on, with some part, at least, of the job.

We have to jump in and swim . . . or we'll never get anywhere.

What's needed to get us headed in the right direction? I always hesitate before answering such as this because there are those who suggest that Congress has had a hand in bringing about the downfall of the Merchant Marine.

But the Congress has been active. Only this week the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in Executive Session reported out unanimously a bill that will authorize Uncle Sam to really move toward a meaningful maritime program. We on that Committee—Republicans and Democrats, representing East and West, North and South—Coastal districts, as well as the Heartland of Amer-

ica—All of us share the concern and the hope that this country resume its rightful role as a maritime power.

We believed President Nixon's campaign promise—

We trust his appointed leaders, Rock Siciliano and Andy Gibson—

We know they have made big plans, that they must move forward and become a reality—we expect the Congress to act favorably on our legislation, and more importantly on the President's program when it comes to us. It is to this end—to have the ships officers ready to man this fleet and to manage its ocean related industries, that I introduced earlier this session a bill which would change the \$600 grant given to students in our maritime academies to a \$1000 grant/loan which would also require the recipient to serve in the Merchant Marine or in the Armed Forces if he didn't go in the Merchant Marine.

Six other Members of Congress joined me as co-sponsors. Now when I think about it, I wonder if the bill shouldn't have stipulated that those who receive the stipend must serve their nation in a marine related enterprise, never mind the Armed Forces.

May I take this opportunity to urge my partisan audience to write to their Congressman urging their vote for my bill or Congressman Hathaway's bill which is somewhat similar to mine. Even better—write to the Chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to ask him to take it up at his earliest convenience. Right now, isn't too soon.

There is the problem of course, that at present we are still working with the Johnson Budget and we will in effect be doing so, until 1971. What we're after now is to get the most ships for our subsidy dollar and to get rid of the bureaucratic constraints to which I have already alluded earlier.

Obviously, there's no simple outline of what's needed.

While the problem is complex, some basic things can be easily seen as necessary for its solution.

1. Money—clearly the first order of business. Red Ramage of the MSTTS told me the other day that "money is the answer" and at first I thought he was wrong. Of course, many other ingredients must be present, but I'm beginning to think Red was right in the sense that if Congress doesn't appropriate what's needed nothing will be accomplished.

2. Second, of course, more unanimity is needed in the industry, particularly between those who are subsidized and those who are not. Over the years the fractionalism of the industry has been a major cause of its decline, and I'm told that in many respects things aren't much better today.

3. Third, we must find some way to achieve more stability of labor, both shoreline and sea-going.

4. Fourth, a massive education program, both of citizens as to the importance of the oceans, and of the future servants of the seas—the technicians, designers, and managers of the future.

I read recently that by 1975 it will be possible to sail a ship of 20 or 30 thousand tons with a crew of 18, all of whom will be dressed in Brooks Brothers Uniforms. Times . . . they are changing, and the needs of modern technology and economics must be served. I can't emphasize enough how important the training of our seamen of the future is—its a job we must get on with right away.

It has another, perhaps more potent, meaning for modern men who are beginning to see that the soil will not be able to feed humanity forever. There will be many seamen in the future because the day is rapidly approaching when the chief source of protein may be the sea; and a day, too, when the chief source of minerals, as yet undiscovered, will be necessary to satisfy the growing appetite of an ever industrializing society.

Looking far into the future the U.S. will

have to be among those nations with the best Merchant fleet—both in men and ships. If we aren't we will find ourselves having to go, hat in hand, asking the more advanced maritime powers for food, natural resources and, perhaps, trading rights—May I call your attention to a statement—a statement not appropriate to our present status, but reflecting instead the status of another nation—a rival whose goals and methods of achieving them are in sharp contrast to our own.

I quote: "the fleet has been joined by hundreds of new and improved vessels of various types. The creation of a Merchant Marine has made it possible to free the nation from dependence on foreign vessels for maritime shipping. Today, the nation can deliver any cargo—to any point on earth, using high speed ships." This passage could and should be a description of America's Maritime goals. Unfortunately, however, it is, in fact, a statement of Soviet maritime achievements.

This, gentlemen, in part at least, is a measure of the task.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the President has made three recent statements which are extremely significant to the country and the world.

First, and foremost, was yesterday evening's talk on Vietnam in which his firm but conciliatory and flexible position proves his sincere desire for bringing peace and withdrawal of American involvement in the Vietnam conflict, as well as ending the loss of American lives.

I commend the President on the most forthright statement to date on this subject. He has given us assurance that he will pursue every possible avenue for a just peace. Anyone watching him on television knows his credibility, his leveling with the American people. From now on we should know the successes and the reversals that are bound to occur.

Closely tied to the war in Vietnam and a subject of interest to every parent and draft-age young person was his message of May 13 proposing changes in the Selective Service Act.

Studies that we have made at the Education and Labor Committee of the House indicate to me that it is untenable to hold over the head of every young man 7 or more years of draft vulnerability. We must go to a prime age group with vulnerability for 1 year. Entering at age 19 and leaving at age 20 is the right age.

I have now come to concur that we should move away from undergraduate deferments.

We cannot do this immediately. I would suggest it be accomplished over a 4-year span—that each person deferred now for undergraduate study become vulnerable for the draft for 1 year when he completes his undergraduate work. I feel there should be no new deferments for undergraduate study after this year. This would eliminate all deferments for undergraduate study after 4 years.

Also, from our studies in the Education and Labor Committee, I must conclude that the Nixon proposal to continue deferments for graduate students for the full academic year for which they are called is excellent.

If deferments for undergraduate students should someday be terminated as I have suggested, then they, too, should be permitted to finish the full academic year for which they are ordered for induction.

With the prime age group being 19–20, as the President suggested, of course a large number of those drafted would be in undergraduate study.

And, finally, one of the great concerns of the American people is that we spend too much on the military and not enough on the needy. If we are to help poor people, the first order of priority ought to be feeding the hungry and malnourished.

President Nixon's recent message on this subject proposing increases in food assistance, I believe, is superb. It touches every area of change that ought to be made in the present programs.

It would provide poor families enough food stamps to purchase a nutritional complete diet.

It would provide food stamps at no cost to those in the very lowest income brackets.

It would provide food stamps to others at a cost of no greater than 30 percent of income.

It would insure that the food-stamp program is complementary to a revised welfare program, which the President will propose to the Congress this year.

And, it would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to operate both the food stamp and direct distribution programs concurrently in individual counties, at the request and expense of local officials.

For some time I have advocated that both food stamps and direct distribution programs be permitted to be run concurrently in all counties.

The record shows that, when a county moves from direct distribution to food stamp program, a heavy falloff of poor people who participate in the program occurs.

The Department of Agriculture under previous administrations said the reason for this condition is the fact that so many people receive food under direct distribution who really are not poor enough to be eligible under the food-stamp program.

While there may have been some cases where individuals should not have received direct distribution, I doubt that this generally is the case.

In fact, the number of participants began increasing after a food-stamp program had been in effect for awhile. The delivery system has been very poor in some counties.

The proposals of the President committing his Office of Economic Opportunity to assistance in delivery of food stamps and commodity packages is a move in the right direction. If anyone knows where the poor really are located, local community action agencies ought to be in the forefront.

What we have learned through administration of the emergency food and health services program, which was my amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, has shown us the way to provide improved food services to the most needy so that it has the greatest

impact in solving their nutritional needs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President on both the timeliness and the substance of all three of these messages which shows so clearly his awareness of the vast concerns facing this Nation and his determination to take forceful steps dealing with these problems.

#### IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF MASS TRANSIT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Secretary John A. Volpe announced that the Nixon administration would soon be submitting a proposal to establish a mass transportation trust fund to deal with the long-neglected need for mass transit in the urban centers of this country.

As one who has been working to enlist support for such a trust fund, I am more than pleased that the Secretary has decided to push ahead with this program, one that will be so vital for our metropolitan areas.

On February 18, I introduced my first mass transit bill which would establish a trust fund and provide \$10 billion over the next 4 years for mass transportation facilities. The trust fund will be financed by using the existing 7 percent automobile excise tax; these excise taxes now go directly into the General Treasury.

While I am encouraged that the Nixon administration has finally endorsed the mass transit trust fund concept, I am concerned that the proposal currently being drafted by the Department of Transportation does not provide the amounts needed to deal with the problem of mass transit so long neglected by the Federal Government. It has been reported that Secretary Volpe plans to ask for only \$300 to \$400 million for the program's first year. The bill I have introduced and which is now cosponsored by 74 of my colleagues, provides for \$1 billion for the first year, \$2 billion the second year, \$3 billion the third, and \$4 billion in the fourth making a total of \$10 billion over a 4-year period. It is a modest program when contrasted with the \$4.5 billion which will be spent this year alone on highways.

One of the more unique features of the proposal I have introduced is the Federal participation to the extent of 90 percent. This is the same degree of Federal support given to the highway program. Currently, whatever small mass transit Federal funds that are available are doled out with only a two-thirds Federal contribution. If we are to make mass transit competitive with highways we will have to give it the same degree of assistance as we give our highways.

It would appear that Secretary Volpe is thinking in terms of a Federal participation of somewhere between 60 and 80 percent. I hope that he will reconsider this decision. To make mass transit competitive for the near bankrupt cities, the Federal participation must be 90 percent in both cases.

I am pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that there has been an enthusiastic response to my bill. As I have said, there

are now 75 Members of the House supporting it. In addition, I have received numerous letters from all over the country affirming the need for an expanded program of assistance for mass transit and expressing enthusiastic support for the mass transit trust fund bill.

Those of us supporting this bill have founded a mass transportation action alliance, ZOOMass Transit, to coordinate the broad "grassroots" support that this kind of legislation has. I have written to the mayors, city and State legislators, and chambers of commerce from the Nation's 25 largest cities, and I should like to submit for the RECORD some of the statements made by these supporters:

I have heard from Mayor Joseph L. Alioto of San Francisco who is interested in the trust fund with respect to what help it might bring to the Bay Area Rapid Transit System; Ivan Allen, Jr., mayor of Atlanta, who expressed his "support and cooperation" in my efforts "to establish an urban transportation trust fund"; former mayor of Seattle and now Assistant Secretary of Transportation, J. D. Braman, who has also been an active proponent of an expanded mass transportation program in the U.S. Conference of Mayors; Thomas D'Alesandro, mayor of Baltimore and chairman of the Transportation Committee of the National League of Cities which has endorsed the mass transportation trust fund concept; Mayor W. H. McNichols, of Denver, who while still interested in the highway trust fund noted that "we also need assistance in developing an adequate mass transportation system" and agreed that the \$10 billion suggested amount is not "out of line" and that the Federal participation in mass transportation should be increased to 90 percent; Mayor Erik Jonsson who commenced his letter with:

You have the strong support of the City of Dallas for legislation now pending in Congress for the establishment of an urban mass transportation trust fund.

Mayor Eugene P. Ruehlmann who said:

Cincinnati is indeed interested in the solutions of the mass transit problem.

Carl B. Stokes of Cleveland who said:

I wholeheartedly support you in your efforts to make urban mass transportation more realistic and to provide the necessary tools to enable the cities to start work on this overwhelming problem.

Mayor Sam Yorty who noted:

The City of Los Angeles and the surrounding communities have an urgent need to expand and improve their mass transit facilities . . . You may be assured that I wholeheartedly support the principal of establishing a federal trust fund for improving the urban mass transit.

Mayor Alfonso J. Cervantes of St. Louis, Missouri who said:

We who are aware of the critical need for public transit service must certainly support a bill of this nature. Transit is an essential element in the balanced efficient and orderly development of our metropolitan areas.

Mayor Louie Welch of Houston acknowledged my letter and said that he would have his departments look into the matter.

Support for ZOOM and the bill has

also been secured from over 200 city councilmen and State legislators representing districts in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Milwaukee, San Francisco, Boston, Cincinnati, Dallas, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, San Antonio, Seattle, Buffalo, Memphis, Denver, Atlanta, and Minneapolis.

We hope to receive more support from other cities and urban towns, unions, civic organizations concerned with mass transit, and mass transit authorities.

In conclusion, may I say that the mass transportation trust fund has now been endorsed by this administration and the previous administration. It is time that we move on from endorsements and proposals and implement the program by passing legislation in this Congress.

**SPONSORS OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION FUND (H.R. NUMBERS: 7006, 9661, 10554, 10555, 11079, 11080)**

**California:** Glenn Anderson, Alphonzo Bell, Phillip Burton, Don Edwards, Richard Hanna, Gus Hawkins, Chet Holifield, Harold T. Johnson, John E. Moss, Thomas M. Rees, John V. Tunney, Jerome R. Waldie, Charles Wilson, Lionel Van Deerlin.

**New York:** Joseph P. Addabbo, Marlo Biaggi, Frank J. Brasco, Daniel E. Button, Hugh L. Carey, Shirley Chisholm, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Leonard Farbstein, Hamilton Fish, Jr., Jacob Gilbert, Seymour Halpern, James M. Hanley, Edward I. Koch, Allard K. Lowenstein, Richard D. McCarthy, Martin B. McKneally, Richard L. Ottinger, Bertram L. Podell, Adam C. Powell, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, James Scheuer, Lester Wolf.

**New Jersey:** Cornelius Gallagher, Henry Helstoski, James J. Howard, Joseph G. Minish, Edward J. Patten, Peter Rodino, Frank Thompson, Jr.

**Michigan:** John Conyers, Jr., Charles C. Diggs, Jr., John D. Dingell.

**Florida:** J. Herbert Burke, Dante B. Fascell, Claude Pepper.

**Illinois:** Frank Annunzio, Abner Mikva, Melvin Price, Sidney Yates.

**Ohio:** Michael Feighan, Louis Stokes, Charles Vanik.

**Massachusetts:** James A. Burke, Harold D. Donohue, Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

**Indiana:** John Brademas, Andrew Jacobs, Jr.

**Minnesota:** Donald Fraser, Joseph E. Karth.

**Maine:** William D. Hathaway, Peter Kyros.

**Colorado:** Frank E. Evans, Byron C. Rogers.

**Maryland:** Samuel Friedel.

**Missouri:** James Symington.

**Pennsylvania:** Gus Yatron.

**Rhode Island:** Robert O. Tiernan.

**Connecticut:** Emilio Q. Daddario.

**Washington:** Brock Adams.

**Wisconsin:** Henry S. Reuss.

#### THE END OF A COLORFUL ERA IN CALIFORNIA POLITICS

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the end of a colorful era in California politics. State Senator Hugh M. Burns of Fresno, a longtime friend of mine and of many other members of the California delegation from both sides of the aisle, has been ousted from his office as president pro tempore of the California State Senate and chairman of the State senate committee on rules.

The ouster was accomplished by a

coalition of eight of his fellow Democrats and 13 Republicans.

Hugh Burns is not what you could call a noncontroversial figure. In 1959, he shocked and stunned his Democratic colleagues by endorsing Earl Warren for Governor of California and in 1968 publicly endorsed Richard Nixon for President. These acts brought anguished cries of "Treason" from many of his fellow Democrats.

But in between he served Democratic Governor Pat Brown well and he campaigned actively for Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Hugh Burns is the kind of politician many of you here in the House of Representatives would appreciate. He places the desires of his constituents above considerations of party policy. His philosophy, expressed on more than one occasion, is that an elected official's first responsibility should be to the people who voted him into office. Then, he says, the next priority should go to the State of California. Finally, he says, you should do what you can for your party.

He works at politics with an intensity that few can match and even fewer can understand. His word is his bond, and in his scheme of things, loyalty to the people who have been loyal to you is the highest of virtues. He is completely lacking in pretense and has never sought to create an image of greatness or statesmanship about him.

Hugh Burns has served the State of California loyally and well for more than 33 years since he was first elected to the State assembly in 1936. I am sure that many of you who know him will join me in wishing him the best for the remaining year and a half of his present Senate term. It is safe to assume, I believe, that the unflappable Irishman from Fresno will get in a few more good knocks before the new leadership of the State senate has had the reins in its hands for very long.

#### HALF THE POOR FORGOTTEN

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, 19 months ago the President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty issued one of the finest reports ever made on the subject. Among other things, the Commission stated:

Rural poverty is so widespread and so acute as to be a national disgrace, and its consequences have swept into our cities, violently . . . It may surprise most Americans to know that there is more poverty in rural America, proportionately, than in our cities. In metropolitan areas one person in eight is poor, and in the suburbs the ratio is one in fifteen. But in rural areas one of every four persons is poor.

The report pointed out that since passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, antipoverty programs of unusual scope and variety have been developed and put into effect, but it added that most of the antipoverty effort has been aimed at the urban poor.

That report was issued in September 1967, and was entitled, "The People Left Behind." The lack of concern reported about rural poverty then remains at least

equally true today. The Commission's recommendations have never been given the public exposure they deserve and the fate of the report is now described by its title. It too has been left behind.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere is the "disgrace" of rural poverty more pronounced than in housing. The Department of Agriculture reports that there are 8.2 million substandard occupied dwellings in the Nation and that over half this total, 4.8 million, are in rural America which has less than one-third of the Nation's population, but nearly half of its poverty stricken.

#### HUD PROJECTS FOR RURAL POOR

Of all the federally assisted housing programs, the low-rent public housing projects of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, together with the insured home loan, rental housing and labor housing loan, and grant programs of the Farmers Home Administration and the Department of Agriculture, provide the bulk of the service extended to those at or below the poverty line in rural America. But to realize what these programs have provided for rural America as compared with urban centers is to mock the desperate requirements of the rural poor. Such a comparison forces admission that federally assisted housing programs have not even begun to draw close to the number of dwellings that are falling into the substandard category in rural America.

Indifference to rural housing needs seems to have become a nonpartisan tradition in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Its failure to exert an equal effort in rural America is currently reflected in the public utterances of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Romney who spent 3 hours testifying about the Nation's housing goals to the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing and mentioned rural needs casually and only once, in reply to a question which pointed out to him that rural housing requirements are greater than those of urban centers. Nowhere in Mr. Romney's written statement, dealing with his "Operation Breakthrough," designed to develop low-cost manufactured housing for the Nation, is there any mention of rural America. A foreigner, sitting in on this portion of the subcommittee's hearings on housing goals, would undoubtedly come away with the impression that the housing needs of the Nation are almost entirely centered in the cities. An examination of where the resources of our housing programs have been invested would confirm that opinion.

#### NO RURAL-URBAN DISTINCTION

A further indication that rural America has been "left behind" by HUD is the fact that it makes no distinction between what is invested in low-rent public housing projects in urban and rural America. HUD staff members can easily recite figures which show that a total of more than 680,000 units of low-rent public housing are in use or are under construction in the Nation, but they are unable to say what part of this total applies to rural areas because they do not refine their statistics to reveal such information.

They merely hand over their latest public housing project directory, dated December 31, 1967, and leave it to someone else to develop this information.

Mr. Speaker, a study of that directory shows that HUD has practiced tokenism toward rural America regarding its low-rent housing program. But to arrive at this conclusion it is necessary to establish arbitrary criteria which determines what is rural and what is urban. The Bureau of the Census uses communities of 2,500 or less in designating rural areas. Farmers Home Administration serves communities which are basically rural in character and have populations of 5,500 or less. Both of these standards are widely viewed as being unrealistic in measuring the dimensions of rural America and its problems. A more accurate yardstick to mark the boundary between rural and urban America should utilize communities of at least 10,000 population, outside of standard metropolitan statistical areas; that is to say, outside of contiguous counties which are socially and economically integrated and have at least one city of 50,000 residents or more.

Using communities of 10,000 population or less outside of standard metropolitan statistical areas as a designation for rural America shows that less than 10 percent of HUD's low-rent public housing units—66,443 out of a national total of 680,664 units under management or under construction—were located in rural areas as of December 31, 1967. The ratio undoubtedly has not improved and, if anything, has probably gotten worse since then.

The following, Mr. Speaker, is a State-by-State breakdown, using the criteria of communities of 10,000 population or less outside of standard metropolitan statistical areas, showing the number of units in use under management or under construction in rural and urban centers:

State	Under construction	Under management	Total
Maine:			
State total	307	396	703
Rural		162	162
New Hampshire:			
State total		1,590	1,590
Rural		120	120
New Jersey:			
State total	3,482	35,418	38,900
Rural	165	100	265
New York:			
State total	6,329	78,922	85,251
Rural		60	60
Rhode Island:			
State total	608	6,595	7,203
Rural	136		136
Vermont:			
State total	60	178	238
Rural			
Connecticut:			
State total	501	12,433	12,934
Rural			
Massachusetts:			
State total	1,305	22,071	23,376
Rural			
Pennsylvania:			
State total	2,067	46,404	48,471
Rural	210	1,768	1,978
Delaware:			
State total	122	1,496	1,618
Rural		106	106
Maryland:			
State total	342	12,201	12,543
Rural	100	100	200
Virginia:			
State total	219	13,607	13,826
Rural		50	50
West Virginia:			
State total	330	2,573	2,903
Rural		402	402
District of Columbia:			
Total	485	10,056	10,541

State	Under construction	Under management	Total
Alabama:			
State total	2,072	22,871	24,943
Rural	458	6,220	6,678
Florida:			
State total	441	20,169	20,610
Rural	46	1,942	1,988
Georgia:			
State total	1,290	36,076	37,366
Rural	442	9,338	9,780
Kentucky:			
State total	1,999	14,074	16,073
Rural	849	2,940	3,789
Mississippi:			
State total	67	6,098	6,165
Rural	67	2,208	2,275
North Carolina:			
State total	748	15,981	16,729
Rural	390	2,186	2,576
South Carolina:			
State total	286	6,745	7,031
Rural	100	1,330	1,430
Tennessee:			
State total	907	24,536	25,443
Rural	386	4,838	5,224
Illinois:			
State total	2,866	50,580	53,446
Rural	728	4,309	5,037
Indiana:			
State total	1,910	6,725	8,635
Rural	50	95	145
Iowa:			
State total	446	78	524
Rural	246	78	324
Michigan:			
State total	1,742	12,999	14,741
Rural	589	757	1,346
Minnesota:			
State total	1,280	6,704	7,984
Rural	279	212	491
Nebraska:			
State total	279	4,346	4,625
Rural	235	1,656	1,891
North Dakota:			
State total	180	416	596
Rural	120	316	436
South Dakota:			
State total	168	428	596
Rural	168	428	596
Ohio:			
State total	1,667	26,856	28,523
Rural		100	100
Wisconsin:			
State total	1,614	4,216	5,830
Rural	425	138	563
Arkansas:			
State total	1,120	6,699	7,819
Rural	526	2,818	3,344
Colorado:			
State total	140	4,310	4,450
Rural	40	200	240
Kansas:			
State total	467	1,043	1,510
Rural	24		24
Louisiana:			
State total	871	18,689	19,560
Rural	284	1,895	2,179
Missouri:			
State total	1,571	11,827	13,398
Rural	612	454	1,066
New Mexico:			
State total	164	1,047	1,211
Rural	110	529	639
Oklahoma:			
State total	276	970	1,246
Rural	224		224
Texas:			
State total	1,474	37,360	38,834
Rural	776	5,363	6,139
Arizona:			
State total	348	3,051	3,399
Rural	348	304	652
California:			
State total	266	31,282	31,548
Rural	46	2,028	2,074
Idaho:			
State total	60	259	319
Rural	50	20	70
Montana:			
State total	165	967	1,132
Rural	165	280	445
Nevada:			
State total	185	1,405	1,590
Rural	35	50	85
Oregon:			
State total	142	2,518	2,660
Rural	82	142	224
Utah:			
State total		30	30
Rural		30	30
Washington:			
State total	387	7,689	8,076
Rural	60	287	347
Wyoming:			
State total	20	20	40
Rural	20	20	40
Alaska:			
State total	103	517	620
Rural	15	230	245

State	Under construction	Under management	Total
Hawaii:			
State total.....	151	3,114	3,265
Rural.....		228	228
Total for United States:			
State total.....	44,029	636,635	680,664
Rural.....	9,606	56,837	66,443

ROLE OF FARMERS HOME

Mr. Speaker, additional housing units provided for the rural poor by Farmers Home Administration, despite assertions by its staff members that it is the only vehicle providing housing of any consequence in communities of 5,500 or less, hardly changes the picture at all. As mentioned earlier, the housing programs this agency administers to serve the poor consist of insured home loans, rental housing, and farm labor housing. However, farm labor housing is the only one of the three utilized solely by the rural poor. The other two serve both low- and moderate-income families. Farmers Home estimates that half its rental project units, 2,127, are occupied by people at or below the poverty line. It does not know how many poor families are served by its insured home loan program. To give Farmers Home the benefit of the doubt, it is assumed that all insured loans to families with incomes of \$5,000 or less are at or below the poverty line—something that is theoretically possible since the poverty line moves to higher income brackets as the size of the family increases. For example, HUD's approved income limits for admission of families to low rent public housing in many communities, in many states, allows admission of families of six members with incomes exceeding \$5,000. Making this assumption for Farmers Home insured home loans produces an estimate of 15,066 family housing units as of last year. When all three Farmers Home programs benefitting the poor are added together, the total is 21,096 family units over the entire history of the program.

When the HUD low-rent public housing program is combined with Farmers Home Administration programs providing dwellings for the poor the total is 87,533 units for rural poor families. This is about 2 percent of the 4.8 million occupied substandard dwellings and six-tenths of 1 percent of the 14 million poverty stricken in rural America. At this rate of progress it will take more than a thousand years to eliminate present substandard housing in rural America.

Mr. Speaker, this is not to say that Farmers Home is unaware that its programs are totally inadequate to meet the housing needs of the rural poor. In his testimony on housing goals, James V. Smith, Farmers Home Administrator, said that although its 1970 budget estimate for rural housing authorization was nearly tripled to \$1.2 billion, this still is only half the annual funding required to achieve the level of 3 million units for low-income families in 10 years. Mr. Smith goes on to make the observation that he realizes that the Federal Government alone cannot solve the rural housing problem, that in fact it can only

make a minor contribution to filling the overall need and that, in view of what he calls "present circumstances," the bulk of the job must be handled in the traditional manner by private enterprise.

CREDIT FLOW INADEQUATE

Mr. Smith apparently forgot that elsewhere in his statement he pointed out that the flow of housing credit in rural areas is often inadequate, sporadic, and sometimes nonexistent. He asserts that local lenders are just unable to tie up their limited lending resources in long-term housing credit and that rural resources for tapping the credit of larger institutions in larger places are inadequate. He adds that repayment terms in rural areas are often less favorable, interest rates are generally higher and the loan to value ratio is lower. Consequently, he says, a large and very real housing credit gap exists for rural people.

Given Mr. Smith's "present circumstances," how is the private sector expected to handle the bulk of the job of providing adequate housing for rural America, let alone housing for low income families?

It is obvious that, at this rate of progress, the amount of substandard housing in rural America will never be eliminated—that, in fact, it will double and triple in the years ahead.

SITUATION COULD WORSEN

Moreover, there are indications that the Nation may even build less public housing in the future. The January issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Planners contains a report by Chester Hartman, Assistant Professor in the Department of City and Regional Planning, Harvard University, and Gregg Carr, a graduate student at the Department of Architecture and Social Relations at Harvard, indicating just that. They conducted a survey among public housing authority commissions and concluded that a substantial portion of the commissioners do not favor adding to the stock of publicly subsidized housing either through traditional programs or through new forms that are emerging. The authors tend to support assertions that most commissioners are conservative, almost obstructionist.

Mr. Speaker, their report follows:

HOUSING AUTHORITIES RECONSIDERED

(By Chester W. Hartman and Gregg Carr)

The local public housing authority is a product of the "good government" ethic of the 1920's and 1930's, which postulates that certain public welfare programs should be run by disinterested laymen—representing "the best of the community"—who will keep these programs "out of politics." A nationwide survey of authority commissioners indicates widespread lack of knowledge about and sympathy with the housing programs they administer and the low-income families they serve. Inherent disparities between the commissioner group—who are white and of high socioeconomic status—and public housing clientele—largely low-income black families—are one possible source of this conflict. It is suggested that the housing authority system currently acts as a barrier to expanded and improved housing programs for the poor, and instead agencies, which will aggressively advocate the interests of those in need of decent low-cost housing, are

needed. Possible alternatives to the quasi-independent housing authority include establishment of a department directly responsible to the elected chief executive, greater federal and/or state involvement, and decentralization of housing program administration to give greater control to community organization.

The 1960's have seen a modest resurgence of interest and activity in the field of low-rent public housing. Following its doldrums phase in the 1950's, the public housing program has increased its output—although by no means spectacularly—and has been the object of renewed interest on the part of government officials and housing experts. New techniques are being tried to replace and supplement the traditional housing project approach; new ideas are springing forth. In his 1968 Housing Message, President Johnson called for six million units of low- and moderate-cost housing to be built in the next decade; the Kerner Commission showed an even greater sense of urgency when it advocated producing the same number of units in five years. In short, there are signs that both the will and the techniques to achieve the 1949 National Housing Goal—"A decent home and suitable living environment for every American family"—may finally be emerging in our society. This is attributable not only to the racial conflicts that beset our nation, but also to an increasing awareness of the contradictions and tensions inherent in a society of such great affluence which allows over 20 percent of its people to live in substandard homes and neighborhoods. We also note that those newer techniques for providing and operating low-rent housing—joint public-private sponsorship, rent supplements, leasing, rehabilitation, scattered-site development, the various forms of "turnkey" development and management—are more satisfactory to low-income families and more acceptable to the community.

ISSUES IN HOUSING AUTHORITY ADMINISTRATION

Questions about scale and nature of low-rent housing programs are intimately tied to the issue of who is going to carry out these programs. In recent decades this has been virtually the exclusive province of local public housing authorities, established to carry out the provisions of the 1937 Housing Act and its subsequent amendments. From its inception, the federal low-rent housing program has been basically local in character, administered through quasi-autonomous local bodies responsible for fundamental decisions such as, whether there will be any public housing at all, how much and what kind there should be, where it should be located, whom it will serve, as well as more detailed operational decisions.<sup>1</sup> Reliance on the device of an independent authority to administer the public housing program was in part fiscally motivated: establishment of an independent authority permitted municipalities to raise money for specific purposes, retaining the tax-related advantages of public purpose borrowing, without endangering local debt limits or burdening local tax structures. The move toward special purpose independent authorities was also rooted in the "good government" thinking of the 1920's and 1930's, which postulated that an independent citizen-governed agency would be more efficient and public-regarding, less corrupt and subject to political influence than other agency forms, such as a department directly under the control of the mayor or local governing body. The notion was that men of probity and wisdom, imbued with concern for the public welfare but not necessarily possessing any expertise other than sound general knowledge and common sense, would be the best repository for certain kinds of public wel-

Footnotes at end of article.

fare programs.<sup>2</sup> The two salient characteristics of the housing authority, then, are its relative independence from the normal political processes and reposition of power in the hands of a lay board which is intended to represent a cross section of the best of the community.

There are at present some 2,200 local housing authorities<sup>3</sup> in the country, operating nearly 700,000 units of federally aided<sup>4</sup> low-rent public housing.<sup>5</sup> The number of authorities has rapidly increased in recent years.<sup>6</sup> Local housing authorities naturally vary widely with respect to size of the programs they administer: from small town authorities which administer as few as 20 or 30 units to the New York City Housing Authority, which currently manages 145,000 low-rent units.<sup>7</sup>

Local housing authorities are usually governed by a five-man board,<sup>8</sup> in whom virtually all legal and discretionary powers reside.<sup>9</sup> In most states members of municipal authorities are appointed by the mayor, members of county authorities by the county board of supervisors, with a multitude of variations on this dominant pattern.<sup>10</sup> Appointments are generally for four or five-year terms (several states stipulate two, three, and six-year terms). Generally speaking, state laws make no provision for compensation except for expenses of housing authority commissioners—a feature of the housing authority system closely related to the "good government" notions embodied in its origins.<sup>11</sup> The housing authority board is generally regarded as a policy-making body, with the actual administration of that policy to be carried out by a staff under an executive director.<sup>12</sup> According to the standard guidebook on housing authorities:

The commissioners' responsibilities are directly parallel to those of the directors of a bank or board members of a private corporation . . . It is the responsibility of the commissioners to:

1. Set basic local policy and approve major program undertakings for their agency or authority and see that they are carried out by the staff in the most effective and efficient way possible;
2. Assume fiscal responsibility for program funds and assure their judicious expenditure;
3. Promote the interests of the program and the agency or authority they serve at the community, the state, and often at the national level; and
4. Provide personal leadership for the economic, social and physical development of the community as a whole.<sup>13</sup>

More recently, some of the newer ideas and programs in the low-income housing field have involved curtailing the local housing authority's traditional role as developer, owner, and manager of public housing. In some instances new programs have bypassed the housing authority altogether in favor of new public, quasi-public, or private agencies. The so-called "turnkey" program cedes to the private sector the development function, placing the housing authority in the role of purchasing completed developments, which it then owns and manages. Under the so-called "Turnkey II" program, the housing authority would turn over the operation of public housing projects to private realty management firms or nonprofit groups. New experimental programs authorized by HUD and OEO call for establishment of tenant management corporations for public housing projects. Under the leased housing program, ownership of public housing remains in private hands. The 1965 Rent Supplement Program ignores the housing authority in favor of direct negotiation between the private developer and FHA. In several cities housing development corporations have been estab-

lished to perform many of the functions traditionally performed by the housing authority.<sup>14</sup> These moves stem in part from the traditional American preference for the private sector and from a vague belief that the costs of achieving housing goals will thereby be reduced.<sup>15</sup> In large part they represent both a general dissatisfaction with public housing in the past and a specific lack of confidence in the local housing authority as a vehicle capable of doing the job that needs to be done. While the failures of American housing reform have been many and complex,<sup>16</sup> a large number of persons familiar with the housing field have suggested that local housing authorities themselves (notwithstanding some outstanding examples to the contrary) have been a principal hindrance to progress. The issues are whether local housing authorities have been aggressive advocates of larger and better low-rent housing programs, have shown willingness to try out new ideas and programs, have been adequate interpreters to the community of the need for public housing and of the alternative ways of meeting this need.

Very little is known about the persons who make policy for and run local housing authorities. These men and women have vast powers, potential and actual, over the program they presently run and over the future of public housing. Yet we lack the elementary knowledge about who these persons are, their training and background, their values and attitudes.<sup>17</sup> Some insight into these issues is essential if we are to form views on the adequacy of the local housing authority system to act as the administrative vehicle for the kinds of housing programs that must be implemented in the next decade.<sup>18</sup> In an effort to obtain answers to these questions as a basis for evaluation, the authors, with the cooperation of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials,<sup>19</sup> in the summer of 1967 mailed a survey to all 10,276 housing authority commissioners in the country (excluding Puerto Rico). Eighteen hundred and ninety-one commissioners returned usable questionnaires, giving a fairly representative sample.<sup>20</sup> The sixty-item questionnaire asked for basic demographic data about the commissioner; information about the nature of the commissioner's job and the way in which the authority operates; plans regarding the future of the low-rent housing program in the commissioner's area; and attitudes toward the public housing program and its clientele.<sup>21</sup>

#### WHO ARE THE HOUSING AUTHORITY COMMISSIONERS?

The basic demographic facts about housing authority commissioners, as reported by the respondents, are shown in Table 1.<sup>22</sup> A general description of a housing commissioner is a white male, in the middle or upper-middle income ranges, well educated, in either business or a profession, middle-aged or elderly.

This contrasts sharply with the tenant group for whom commissioners are responsible and whose interests they presumably represent. For example, 26 percent of all public housing families lack a male head of household, yet few women serve as housing authority commissioners. Over 55 percent of all households in public housing are nonwhite—a proportion which is steadily increasing—yet only six percent of the commissioners are nonwhite.<sup>23</sup> Only 11 percent of public housing commissioners have incomes anywhere near the public housing range (and most of these have incomes so low only because they are retired): the median annual income in public housing nationally is \$3,132 for nonelderly households and \$1,468 for elderly households, compared with \$11,700 for the commissioners.<sup>24</sup>

TABLE 1.—HOUSING AUTHORITY COMMISSIONERS' BACKGROUND  
[In percent]

	Authorities with over 1,000 units	Total
<b>Sex:</b>		
Male.....	90	91
Female.....	10	9
<b>Age:</b>		
Under 35.....	2	6
35 to 44.....	17	23
45 to 54.....	33	33
55 to 64.....	28	24
65 and older.....	21	13
<b>Race:</b>		
White.....	89	94
Nonwhite <sup>1</sup> .....	11	6
<b>Annual income:</b>		
Less than \$5,000.....	5	11
\$5,000 to \$7,499.....	5	13
\$7,500 to \$9,999.....	8	18
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	16	24
\$15,000 to \$19,999.....	13	14
\$20,000 or more.....	53	20
Median.....	+\$20,000	\$11,700
<b>Occupation:<sup>2</sup></b>		
Business executive.....	27	36
Banking and finance.....	10	10
Public official.....	8	7
Insurance.....	5	6
Real estate.....	10	6
Education.....	4	5
Medicine (includes physicians, dentists, nurses, and pharmacists).....	4	5
Lawyer.....	11	4
Clergyman.....	3	4
Other white collar.....	3	4
Farmer or farm organization official.....		3
Labor union official.....	5	2
Skilled laborer.....		1
Official of private civic organization.....	3	1
Other.....	7	8
<b>Education:</b>		
No high school diploma.....	8	11
High school diploma but no further education.....	10	18
Some college education or a college degree.....	39	44
Postgraduate training or a graduate or professional degree.....	43	28

<sup>1</sup> Of the nonwhite commissioners, 4.4 percent were Negro, 1.5 percent other races.

<sup>2</sup> 14 percent of the commissioners indicated they were presently retired. Those who were retired were asked to indicate their former occupations.

<sup>3</sup> Includes a very small number of respondents who checked more than 1 occupation, such as real estate and insurance or real estate and law.

Two related issues are raised. First, under the theory of cross-sectional community representation, are the interests of public housing clientele—present and potential—adequately represented on housing authorities, even if one makes the assumption that their interest in the program is no greater or smaller than that of other segments of the community? The very small number of poor and nonwhite commissioners suggests that this is not the case.<sup>25</sup> An additional datum dramatizes this conclusion: of the 1,891 respondents, less than 3 percent had ever lived in public housing and not a single respondent was currently living in public housing. Such a situation seems at odds with current thinking about maximizing participation of the poor in guiding policies and operations of programs intended for their benefit.

The original notion of citizen boards and independent authorities was not intended to comprise representatives of the full range of community interests. Rather, the original notion was somewhat elitist and paternalistic in concept: the board would be comprised of distinguished community representatives (not unsurprisingly gauged by such criteria as occupation, wealth, and "place in the community") who would have the capacity and desire to incorporate in themselves and rep-

Footnotes at end of article.

resent the multiple interests which the community had in the public housing program. There were to be no interest groups represented per se.<sup>26</sup> The "better people" in the community could be counted on not only to adequately represent the interests of the poor but to refrain from representing their own personal interests or those of their class or reference group. This apolitical—some might say naive—notion of human behavior and social institutions underlay the housing authority concept. The predominance, therefore, of conservative interests and occupations among housing authority members—business executives and persons associated with banking and finance, insurance and real estate—required no apology and could impart to the local public housing program only the stamp of responsibility and competence.<sup>27</sup> In the early years of the public housing program, as it was originally intended to serve the "submerged middle class" of the Depression years and exclude the true poor,<sup>28</sup> authority board members probably had interests and values quite similar to those of the program's clientele. As the program increasingly is called upon to serve the needs of the "permanent poor," and as the life styles and interests of the program's clientele and its governors increasingly diverge, the original concept of the housing authority becomes less and less adequate. It may be asked whether a group which is so completely unrepresentative, in basic demographic terms, of the clientele it serves can adequately understand, sympathize with, serve and protect that clientele. In the following sections, which deal with the operations of the housing authority, details of its programs, and that views of the commissioners, this issue will be treated more directly.

THE PROGRAMS THE COMMISSIONERS OPERATE

With the exception of a handful of affluent suburbs, there is probably not a city or town in the United States that does not have a substantial housing problem, and the 20 to 25 percent national rate of substandard housing probably does not vary greatly from community to community. There are few, if any, communities in which the public housing program has effectively "conquered" the slum problem. One can well ask why communities do not build more public housing, since it is the principal means, public or private, through which low-income families can be housed decently at rents they can afford. One obvious answer is the limitations imposed by federal appropriations, both in the aggregate and in terms of allocations of these funds to regions and localities. Another reason is doubtless to be found in the community itself: general opposition to public housing and specific objections to locational proposals may serve to keep down the number of public housing units in any given community.<sup>29</sup>

The results of this survey indicate that opposition to additional public housing on the part of the housing authority commissioners themselves is a further explanation of the lethargic rate of low-rent housing construction. In response to the question, *If you (personally) could have your way, how much public housing would you like to have in your community*, one-third of the commissioners indicated that, in their opinion "the present number of [public housing] units is just about right." Probably they would not favor or vote for any additional low-rent public housing units at the present time. While the proportion of commissioners who presently want no more public housing was somewhat lower among the larger housing authorities, more than one out of every four commissioners (26 percent) among authorities with over 1,000 units under management expressed opposition to additional public housing.

The commissioners were also asked, *What would you cite as the two principal reasons*

*why more public housing has not been built in your community?* The factors indicated as primary explanations<sup>30</sup> are listed in Table 2. Again, nearly one third of the commissioners cite the housing authority itself as the reason why more public housing has not been built. The most frequently cited reason—indicated by almost two out of five commissioners—was the absence of pressure from low-income families and their advocates. This highlights the fact that in most communities there exists very little organized pro-public housing sentiment. Low-income families themselves tend to be poorly organized and frequently apathetic. Few cities have citizens' organizations, such as a housing and planning association, to carry on the fight for decent housing. Failure of the housing authority itself to play an active role in advocating more comprehensive and varied solutions to the community's housing problems (and in some cases, outright hostility to expanded programs on the part of housing authority commissioners) leaves a vacuum in the political process with respect to housing reform.<sup>31</sup>

TABLE 2.—REASONS FOR NOT ADDING MORE PUBLIC HOUSING

(In percent)

	Author-ities with over 1,000 units	Total
Lack of pressure from families in need of decent housing (and from organizations which represent their interests)	125	139
Housing authority itself feels there is enough public housing at present	35	32
Lack of support from mayor or public officials	18	20
Not enough Federal funds	15	19
Unwillingness of people in existing neighborhoods to allow public housing	27	17
Lack of land or high cost of land	27	17

<sup>1</sup> Percentages add up to more than 100 percent, since commissioners in many cases indicated more than 1 reason.

Other reasons cited by the commissioners largely have to do with the generally negative climate of community opinion with respect to public housing: neighborhood hostility to the incursion of public housing, reluctance to use scarce land, and lack of support from public officials. What is clear from these responses, and from our more general information about community attitudes, is that the housing authority commissioners frequently are operating in a hostile environment, and their mixed feelings about the program reflect overt and implicit pressures on them at integral parts of their communities. Only one-fifth of the commissioners cite lack of federal funds as the principal reason why more public housing is not built. The conclusion that must be drawn from these responses is that even if sufficient federal funds were now available

for a massive low-rent housing program, it is most likely that in a great many communities local directors would be unwilling to make use of these funds.

As we noted earlier, the public housing program is flowering with new ideas about how to use public subsidies to produce housing that is more satisfying to its low-income occupants and more acceptable to the entire community. It has also been suggested that there is an intimate relation between magnitude and quality of public housing programs: until we are capable of producing publicly assisted housing that is a considerable improvement over past efforts, a vastly expanded program will—and perhaps should—meet great opposition. The newer programs in the low-rent housing field have been moving away from the "project" approach—relatively large developments for the exclusive occupancy of subsidized low-income families, owned and operated by the housing authority—toward forms of housing and forms of subsidization that are more "anonymous" and dignified: housing that is physically less distinctive from nonsubsidized housing, that is smaller in scale, that is managed in a fashion not notably different from management practices in the private sector, and that attempts some mix of low-income subsidized families with non-subsidized families of various incomes and social groups. The various newer techniques—leasing, rehabilitation, "turnkey," "scattered-site," mixed public-private sponsorship, and the like—all share one or more of these characteristics to a greater or lesser extent. Efforts to turn the public housing program in these new directions have come primarily from more progressive figures and forces in the low-rent housing field; upper echelon officials in HUD have been particularly eager to bring about these changes (within limitations imposed by the inherently decentralized nature of the low-rent housing program). Enthusiasm decreases as one moves down the line to the regional and local levels.

Not surprisingly, few commissioners reported that these new approaches are already in use or that plans exist to use them, as shown in Table 3.<sup>32</sup> Few of the new techniques have been used to date. Even among very large authorities only a minority have used these devices. (It should be noted that a housing authority can report use of a given technique even if only a few units out of the authority's total development program are in this category; the figures therefore by no means should be taken to signify the percentage of units provided under the newer programs.) Only the so-called "scattered-site" approach has been used to any extent to date, but this is an imprecisely defined concept, which takes on less meaning in small communities, where projects will be small in any case, similar to the "scattered-site" projects in larger communities.

TABLE 3.—USE OF NEW HOUSING APPROACHES

(In percent)

	Authorities with over 1,000 units				Total			
	Already in use	Plan to use	No present plans to use	No answer	Already in use	Plan to use	No present plans to use	No answer
Leasing	23	27	32	18	3	7	51	38
"Turnkey"	11	33	37	19	4	12	48	37
Rehabilitation	15	21	40	23	4	9	50	38
Mixed public-private sponsorship, mixed-income developments	5	27	43	25	3	9	50	38
"Scattered-site" construction	24	28	28	20	18	20	32	30

A more important finding emerges when commissioners were asked their opinions about new programs compared with the traditional project approach: *Should available public housing authorizations in your com-*

*munity be used for some of the new public housing programs that have been suggested (leasing or purchasing units from private owners; acquiring substandard units for rehabilitation; entering into arrangements*

Footnotes at end of article.

with private sponsors to create mixed sponsorship, mixed low- and moderate-income developments), or should they be used to increase the supply of traditional housing projects? (See Table 4.)

Nearly three out of every five commissioners—and nearly a third of the commissioners of authorities which manage more than 1,000 units—report they do not yet know enough about these new programs to make a decision. Of the remainder a substantial proportion indicate preference for traditional projects, which have been so thoroughly and justly criticized, over the newer programs. Regardless of the sources for this failure to keep commissioners up-to-date on newer developments in the housing field—whether it is the fault of HUD, professional organizations in the field, the housing authority staff, or the commissioners themselves—the extent of ignorance about current trends in the programs these commissioners operate would seem to indicate a critical defect inherent in the system of lay boards. These men and women are not professionals in the field of housing. Nor do they spend a great deal of time on their jobs: 67 percent of all respondents indicate they devote an average of two hours or less per week to housing authority business; only 5 percent report that they put in an average of ten hours or more (even among authorities operating more than 1,000 units, only 16 percent of the commissioners report putting in this much time, and 64 percent report devoting four hours or less each week to housing authority affairs.)<sup>23</sup> Asked directly, *Do you feel a need for more information about the public housing program in general?*, nearly two-thirds (66 percent) of all commissioners replied "yes," and the proportion was only slightly lower (62 percent) among commissioners of authorities with over 1,000 units. One can well question whether in a complex and constantly changing field like low-rent housing, the system of vesting decision-making powers in a spare-time, uncompensated lay board can produce the most effective, flexible and up-to-date housing program for the community.<sup>24</sup>

TABLE 4.—PREFERENCES FOR NEW VERSUS TRADITIONAL PROGRAMS  
[In percent]

	Author- ities with 1,000 units	Total
All or most units in projects.....	32	24
All or most units in new programs.....	37	17
Did not know enough about new pro- grams to make a decision.....	31	59

The fact that among those commissioners sufficiently informed about new programs such a high proportion express a clear preference for traditional housing projects (59 percent of those expressing a preference opted for putting all or most new units in projects, 41 percent indicated they would put all or most units in the newer programs; among commissioners of authorities with over 1,000 units the respective percentages are 45 percent and 54 percent) further indicates the difficulties in translating new Congressional programs to the local level. In view of the demonstrated evils of "institutionalization" and isolation of the poor in easily identifiable and hence stigmatized compounds, one can question whether opposition, on the part of so many housing authority commissioners, to the new techniques for housing the poor demonstrates adequate representation of the interests of the community's low-income families, and to what extent these views instead reflect simple inertia or the desire of the rest of the community to insulate it-

self from its low-income and nonwhite residents.

A related issue is how the public housing program in each community is to deal with so-called "multiproblem families"—those households and individuals so battered by the cumulative effects of poverty and discrimination that they are in need of considerable help in the form of medical, psychological, vocational, homemaking, and educational services. Our survey attempted to get commissioners' views on the place for such persons and families within the public housing program and the role of the authority in providing these needed services. Nearly two out of five commissioners (38 percent) felt that "families with severe social problems ought to be rejected for public housing altogether"; another 24 percent felt that these families "ought to be accepted by the authority but placed in separate projects or separate parts of projects"; and 37 percent felt that these families "ought to be assigned apartments on the same basis as other families." Among commissioners of authorities with more than 1,000 units, the respective figures are 31 percent, 14 percent, and 55 percent.

With regard to the issue of social services to families accepted into public housing, 35 percent of the commissioners felt that "social services are not the responsibility of the housing authority"; 57 percent felt that "the authority ought to cooperate with social service agencies by providing space in projects and referral services, but should not directly be involved in the provision of social services"; and only 8 percent felt that "the housing authority ought to be responsible for directly providing social services and social workers to tenants in need of assistance." The commissioners' dominant view of this matter was expressed by one respondent who wrote: "Less emphasis on social work for tenants. This is not housing work." Commissioners of large housing authorities tended to feel more responsibility for providing social services as part of the public housing program, mainly in the area of cooperation with social service agencies: among commissioners of authorities with over 1,000 units, 13 percent rejected the notion of any housing authority responsibility for social services, 77 percent thought that space and referrals ought to be provided, and 9 percent felt that provision of these services was the direct responsibility of the housing authority.

Clearly, then, among commissioners responding to the survey, a very substantial proportion feel that families with multiple social problems do not belong in public housing at all, and very few feel that the housing authority ought to take direct responsibility for meeting the social needs of those multiproblem families accepted. These views doubtless stem from the earlier role that the public housing program played as a temporary home for the "submerged middle class." As the program's clientele has changed and as the institution is called upon to perform a different role in society, the traditional view that public housing is only for the "worthy poor" and that the business of the housing authority is solely to provide decent shelter becomes less and less tenable. One must ask how the so-called "multiproblem families" (who may be most in need of a supportive home and environment) are going to get decent housing if the one agency in the community charged with this responsibility will not provide assistance. It may also be asked how tenant services are to be provided to those public housing residents in need of help if those who administer the program do not accept this responsibility. Obviously, questions of finance are involved—to date federal subsidies for public housing have been designed to cover only housing costs and have not been sufficient to provide social services as well—but again one must ask whether the views of the commissioners, as

expressed here, reflect the needs of the low-income families who are their responsibility.<sup>25</sup>

#### COMMISSIONERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD TENANTS

Our survey also included a series of opinion items, directly and indirectly about the public housing program and its clientele, with which commissioners were asked to express agreement or disagreement. Table 5 presents responses to the more important items on the list.

With respect to the issues of racial heterogeneity versus homogeneity, more than two out of five commissioners (42 percent) disagreed with the proposition that the authority's tenant assignment policies ought to seek to promote racial integration rather than segregation, despite the plethora of federal laws and policies to the contrary.<sup>26</sup> Commissioners of large authorities were more amenable to the ideal of racial heterogeneity, but a substantial proportion—about a third—of these also rejected the idea.

One of the principal issues in the public housing field currently has to do with tenant-management relations. Again, one may look at this problem in terms of the evolving character of the program and its clientele. As the proportion of families with social and behavioral problems increases; as the gap widens between clientele and management of public housing (in terms of central and project staff, as well as board of commissioners); and as issues of social justice and community participation and control come increasingly to the fore, it is inevitable that the relationship of public housing tenants to those who run the program will become an ever greater source of concern and conflict. A growing number of persons in the housing field have concluded that housing authority personnel are out of touch with, if not hostile to, the needs and desires of their tenants, and that one of the principal causes of dissatisfaction among public housing tenants is their inability to have a meaningful voice in the basic decisions that affect their daily lives.<sup>27</sup>

Survey results would seem to support the contention that a massive gap exists between public housing clientele and those who run the program. Although most of recent tenant protests about public housing and most surveys of public housing tenants indicate strong resentment against the excessive, picayune, and arbitrary regulations that characterize public housing operations,<sup>28</sup> nearly three out of five commissioners (59 percent) agreed and only 27 percent disagreed with the statement that even stricter regulations and enforcement mechanisms are needed. These views are rooted in frequently antagonistic overall attitudes toward public housing tenants on the part of many commissioners. Nearly two out of five commissioners (38 percent) agreed with the sweeping statement, "Most public housing tenants have no initiative," including nearly one out of three commissioners (31 percent) of the large authorities. The prevalence of such negative feelings about public housing families can lead only to conflict between tenants and management and probably serves to reduce the effectiveness of public housing as a supportive experience for poor families.

Participation of tenants in project life is now seen as an important, perhaps necessary, element of satisfactory residential and communal life for low-income families. Similar assumptions, of course, underlie the anti-poverty program and, to a lesser extent, the urban renewal program. As noted earlier, both HUD and OEO are fostering experiments with greater tenant involvement in basic decisions relating to public housing management.<sup>29</sup> Commissioners were asked: *In view of recent proposals that programs directed toward assisting the poverty sector ought to have representatives of the poor on their governing bodies, do you favor having a public housing tenant serve as a housing commissioner?* Fifty-six percent said no,

Footnotes at end of article.

only 23 percent said yes, and the remaining 21 percent said they were not sure.<sup>40</sup> Opposition to this idea was even stronger among commissioners of large authorities: 66 percent of the commissioners of authorities with over 1,000 units rejected this notion, only 15 percent said yes, and 20 percent had no opinion. The statement that elicited the strongest disagreement by the commissioners referred to the possibility of establishing tenant unions to act as bargaining agents in establishing procedures for managing

housing projects. Sixty-one percent of the commissioners disagreed with this proposition, and only 24 percent agreed. The forcefulness of these negative opinions was underscored by one commissioner who wrote next to this statement: "Let's tear them all down if we stoop to this." It seems clear that the present housing authority commissioners constitute a formidable barrier to the goal of giving public housing tenants some meaningful measure of control over their own lives.

A more promising approach—although by no means easy to effect—might be to abolish the housing authority board, and with it the notion of an independent authority, in favor of an agency directly responsible to the elected chief executive. What our cities need, if they are to mount a serious and final attack on the slum problem, is an effective agency that can plan, oversee, and where necessary directly implement on a completely new scale the various programs that seek to bring about achievement of the National Housing Goal. The housing authority, as traditionally conceived, provides neither the professionalism nor the leadership necessary for a housing program of this magnitude and quality. Instead, it inserts, at a critical level of internal decision-making, an intervening layer of part-time, lay commissioners who act as a brake on the program by failing to keep abreast of new trends and techniques and by representing a microcosm of middle class, white views about the poor, their housing, and the responsibilities of government. Better to have an agency that is true to its own interests and clientele, directly responsible to a central elected official body, where the necessary compromises and tradeoffs regarding allocation of scarce resources can eventually be made.

TABLE 5.—ATTITUDES TOWARD RACE, RULES, AND TENANTS  
(In percent)

	Authorities with over 1,000 units			Total		
	Agree <sup>1</sup>	No opinion	Disagree <sup>1</sup>	Agree <sup>1</sup>	No opinions	Disagree <sup>1</sup>
The authority ought to attempt to keep projects racially mixed through tenant assignment policies.....	62	5	34	48	10	42
At present, the authority needs stricter rules and regulations, and proper means of enforcing them, in order to promote acceptable behavior on the part of tenants.....	47	5	48	59	14	27
Management ought to recognize and negotiate with tenant unions.....	38	12	50	24	15	61
Most public housing tenants have no initiative.....	31	9	60	38	13	49
It is up to the government to make sure that everyone has the opportunity to obtain a secure job and a good standard of living.....	38	4	57	28	3	69

<sup>1</sup> In the original survey respondents were given the option of checking "strongly agree" or "agree," "strongly disagree" or "disagree." In these tabulations the categories have been collapsed.

Finally, responses to one general attitudinal statement about political philosophy, frequently used in survey research to indicate basic political orientations, served to confirm this generally conservative posture on the part of housing authority commissioners. Sixty-nine percent of all commissioners disagreed (57 percent strongly), and only 28 percent agreed with the view that "It is up to the government to make sure that everyone has the opportunity to obtain a secure job and a good standard of living." On this, as well as the above issue, commissioners of large authorities expressed only slightly more liberal views.

POSSIBILITIES FOR CHANGE

Our survey has shown that the men and women who make basic public housing policy at the local level are in no sense representative of the client group the programs are intended to serve. A substantial proportion of the commissioners do not favor adding to the stock of publicly subsidized housing, nor use of newer forms of public housing, nor many of the "liberalization" trends, including increased tenant participation. In one sense this should not be surprising. These commissioners probably reflect the sentiments of the larger community (or at least the white, middle class majority). As one of our commentators noted: "The authors properly point out that most commissioners' views are conservative and almost obstructionist. The commissioners' unwillingness to increase their programs is not peculiar to them, and cannot be solved merely by replacing them; for the fact is that on this as on other matters these people probably reflect the opinions of the world around them, rather than a set of opinions peculiar to themselves. I think it would be well to remember . . . that it is not really the commissioners who are our problem, but rather it is the American society they so well represent. . . ."<sup>41</sup>

Clearly, the billions of federal dollars along with the local resources and support required to attain the National Housing Goal will not be forthcoming until (1) better and more acceptable programs for housing low-income families are utilized and (2) both those who need and those who advocate decent housing develop the necessary political

and social pressure to achieve these ends. Yet without sufficient demonstrations of the superiority of newer techniques for subsidizing low-income families—which can be brought about only by farsighted and innovative housing agencies—it will be difficult to dispell the deep well of anti-public housing sentiment that exists in our society. The need is for dedicated, powerful agencies that can proselytize and produce on a scale large enough to break this logjam, but we must conclude from our survey that the housing authority, as presently constituted, is an inadequate vehicle. What is needed instead is an agency that can and will aggressively advocate and work for a comprehensive low-rent housing program in the community; an agency that perhaps must be metropolitan in jurisdiction and must be able to plan for and implement the entire range of urban development programs rather than treating low-income housing in a vacuum; that is sensitive to the needs and demands of the poor; that is willing to make use of the very best of the newer techniques for providing government housing subsidies; that can act in effective cooperation with local community groups; and that will work, through exhortation and example, to change the community's negative attitudes toward publicly subsidized housing rather than acquiescing and sharing in these prejudices.

One possibility, of course, is to work to replace existing housing commissioners with men and women more dedicated to the evolving goals of the program and to the true interests of the poor. Such a process would, however, be extremely difficult and time-consuming. Since normally only one appointment is made annually to each authority (commissioners operate on staggered terms), it would take several years at best to change a board's composition. Moreover, under existing practices, the political battles to get a representative of the poor, a public housing tenant,<sup>42</sup> or a person who truly represents these interests appointed to the board are laborious, particularly in the absence of strongly organized political forces to pressure the mayor or designating body into making such an appointment. Tradition, sentiment, and the conventional wisdom would probably provide strong pressures to perpetuate appointment of the present type of commissioner.

Although technical problems will have to be met (rewriting state statutes and bond agreements, revising municipal debt limit stipulations) to permit transformation of independent housing authorities into regular municipal departments, these problems are by no means insurmountable. Further, the political and legal problems of abolishing these positions are made easier by the very fact that they are part-time, honorific, usually unpaid posts. The model provided by the New York City Housing Authority, the largest in the nation, is instructive here: in 1958 that Authority switched over from the traditional board-staff agency to an authority headed by a three-man board of housing professionals, who are full-time and well-paid (the chairman receives \$35,000 annually, the two other members, \$25,000), and who act as both policymaker and administrative chief of the authority's vast operations. The NYC authority is now regarded as one of the most progressive, innovative, and aggressive in the nation in providing New York City, within the limitations imposed by inadequate federal funding and frequent community opposition, with programs to meet its vast low-income housing problems.<sup>43</sup>

Other solutions are possible as well. The notion of a housing development corporation with many of the powers of the local housing authority but with much greater freedom to engage in other programs of housing construction and rehabilitation, moving easily in both private and public sectors, and unrestrained by many of the legal, geographical, bureaucratic, and political limitations that characterize the housing authority, also has great appeal.<sup>44</sup> Still another alternative is greater federal or state direction for the low-rent housing program to insure that low-income families are obtaining maximum benefits from available federal programs. In the past year or two, greater leadership and direction appear to be coming from HUD, in the form of suggestion rather than mandate.<sup>45</sup> States can certainly influence and control the operations of local housing authorities since it is the state that has created these bodies. An example of this kind of state direction is a new Massachusetts statute which prohibits local housing authorities from constructing projects larger than 100 units for exclusive occupancy by low-income families.<sup>46</sup> More recent moves toward decentralization of government services provide one further alternative. There is no reason why local community groups could not negotiate directly with HUD and be the financial conduit and

Footnotes at end of article.

administrative agency for housing subsidization programs passed by Congress. Centralized direction and planning of the housing program as a whole, combined with highly decentralized sponsorship and administration of specific development schemes, would probably provide the most effective and satisfactory model for the future.

(AUTHORS' NOTE.—This study was undertaken with the assistance and cooperation of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. The research also received support from the Richard King Mellon II Charitable Trust, the Harvard Department of City and Regional Planning, and the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies. The authors wish to acknowledge the considerable assistance given them throughout their work by Dorothy Gazzolo, Mary Nenko, and Frank Milwee of the NAHRO staff. The views contained herein are those of the authors and are not necessarily shared by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. The authors also wish to acknowledge with gratitude the helpful comments given on an earlier draft of this article by Sol Ackerman, Phyllis Ewen, Bernard Frieden, Lawrence M. Friedman, Ann Gordon, George Schermer, Abner Silverman, and David Yentis.)

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> See United States Housing Administrator Nathan Straus' speech at the annual meeting of the National Association of Housing Officials in Cleveland, Ohio, November 18-20, 1937, where the 1937 Housing Act was termed "essentially a piece of enabling legislation, since it formulated national housing policy in broad outlines and leaves the actual work of planning and developing these projects as well as authority and responsibility to the local housing body."

See also Charles Abrams' description of the original housing authority concept: "Under the formula the central government's agency lays down general rules and checks their observance. But the most important responsibilities rest with the local government's agency. It is the local housing authority that decides where to build, how much to spend, how to select tenants, what rent to charge. . . ." Charles Abrams, *The Future of Housing* (New York: Harper Bros., 1946), p. 282.

The federal supervisory agency for the low-rent public housing program (at present the Housing Assistance Administration in the Department of Housing and Urban Development) is responsible for funding and establishment of general policies. A good deal of dispute and conflict exists over the extent and nature of federal involvement at the local level, but the long-range trend has been to allow local authorities increasing control over their programs. In 1959 the Declaration of Policy of the United States Housing Act was amended to read: "It is the policy of the United States to vest in local public housing agencies the maximum amount of responsibility in the administration of the low-rent housing program. . . ." It is to be noted, however, that the former restrictive nature of federal regulations in many areas is still embodied in the state legislation under which local housing authorities are established. Failure to relax state laws to keep abreast of the new flexibility at the federal level has meant that some local authorities cannot take advantage of newer ideas and variations. For a review of the history of the low-rent housing program through the 1950's, see, Robert Flasher, *Twenty Years of Public Housing* (New York: Harper, 1959).

<sup>2</sup> In an early book, Charles Abrams expressed the prevailing sentiment in favor of these independent bodies: "Freedom from political interference was the main reason for incorporating the local housing authority, just as it was for its forerunner, the incorporated school board. The New York law,

upon which other local housing legislation was modeled, was drawn after the city voters had displaced a corrupt Tammany administration. The local corporate authority device was molded to secure its independence from political meddling. . . . With their members receiving no compensation (other than for expenses) and with membership of city officials limited, appointments would go to men and women of independent stature rather than to political worthies. . . . Housing must be kept free of political entanglements and such freedom is better secured under the [authority] formula." Charles Abrams, *The Future of Housing*, pp. 283, 285. Chapter 21 of Abrams' book "The Local Public Housing Agencies," pp. 281-95, is an excellent summary of the original premises underlying creation of local housing authorities. For other early advocacy of the independent housing authority, see Annette Baker Fox, "The Local Housing Authority and the Municipal Government," *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*, XVII, No. 3 (August 1941), 280-90; B. J. Hovde, "The Local Housing Authority," *Public Administration Review*, I (Winter 1941), 167-75; Leonard A. Goldberg, "The Use of the 'Authority' in Public Housing," *Georgetown Law Journal*, XXVII (June 1939), 1129-32.

<sup>3</sup> The most commonly used term for the local public housing administrative body is "authority." In Michigan, Kentucky, and Iowa these bodies are called "commissions." Occasionally, the terms "agency," "board" and "committee" are used.

About nine out of ten housing authorities are municipal in jurisdiction. Slightly over 200 county (in New Jersey and Connecticut, borough; in Louisiana, parish) housing authorities exist in twenty-two states. Regional housing authorities exist in four southern states, and all housing authorities in Ohio are metropolitanwide in jurisdiction. In Alaska and Hawaii local public housing programs are administered by a state housing authority. Housing authorities in many Indian areas are reservationwide in jurisdiction. See *Housing and Urban Renewal Directory, 1964-65* (Washington: NAHRO, 1965).

<sup>4</sup> Three states (New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut) and one city (New York City) operate their own low-rent public housing programs, similar in most respects to the federal program, but with the state or city providing financial assistance and overall supervision. In these areas the same local housing authority operates both federal and state (and in the case of New York City, municipal) programs.

<sup>5</sup> Not all housing authorities have as their exclusive concern the public housing program. Of the 1,776 authorities which run public housing programs listed in the *Housing and Urban Renewal Directory, 1964-65*, Publication No. N485 (Washington: National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, 1965), 180 were combined housing and urban renewal agencies, eleven had housing, urban renewal and community renewal program functions, and one had jurisdiction over housing, urban renewal, and codes.

<sup>6</sup> In March 1959, there were 1,046 housing authorities with units under management or in the residential stage; in March 1963, the figure was 1,423; in December 1966, 2,009. Information provided by Louis Katz, Director, Statistics Branch, Housing Assistance Administration, HUD.

<sup>7</sup> The distribution of housing authorities in 1967, according to size of program, was as follows:

Authorities	
Less than 50 units	617
50-99 units	416
100-499 units	752
500 or more units	276

Twenty cities with population over 500,000 contain one-third of all federally aided pub-

lic housing while 56 percent of the places with public housing programs account for only 8 percent of all low-rent units. See *Statistical Abstract of Housing Assistance Operations* (Washington: Department of Housing and Urban Development, January 1968).

<sup>8</sup> In a few instances four-, six-, and seven-man boards are stipulated. Ten southern states provide for consolidated or regional authorities with one member appointed from each constituent jurisdiction and an additional member appointed by the board itself in case an even number of members results.

<sup>9</sup> A typical state enabling statute reads: "Every such [housing] authority shall be managed, controlled and governed by five members, appointed or elected as provided in this section or in section twenty-six L. . . ." Massachusetts General Laws, Ch. 121, Sec. 26K.

<sup>10</sup> Among the variations are: appointment of one or more members by the judiciary branch; appointment by the governor or other state officials; requirement of confirmation of all appointments by a second party (such as the municipal legislature); appointment by the municipal legislature; appointment of one member by vote of the other members. Boards of Indian reservation housing authorities are appointed in a special manner. In Massachusetts towns, four of the five members are elected by the general public.

<sup>11</sup> Several states do allow compensation for commissioners, usually a relatively small amount. For example, Kentucky law permits the local legislative body to fix compensation for municipal authority members, not to exceed \$400 annually for members, \$2,000 annually for the chairman. Massachusetts is the only state where fairly substantial compensation is permitted: \$40 per day for members, \$50 for the chairman, with annual maxima of \$10,000 and \$12,500 respectively. This system has been heavily criticized as a waste of needed public funds and a source of administrative chaos since authority members in the larger cities tend to put in almost daily appearances in order to collect the full per diem payments allowed them. The presence of such lucrative compensation for part-time work also tends to place these jobs in the category of "political plums."

<sup>12</sup> The exact distribution of functions between board and staff varies widely in different authorities, and there is little in the way of codified guidelines as to which matters fall under whose province. A guidebook published for housing authority commissioners by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials attempts in a general way to set forth the tasks and expectations of this role and to delineate responsibilities between commissioners and the executive director and his staff, but the material contained therein is perforce vague and overly general. See Louise N. Bell, *The Commissioners' Handbook* (Washington: NAHRO, 1968).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 3-4.

<sup>14</sup> See *Journal of Housing*, XXIV, No. 4 (May 1967), for reports on housing development corporations in St. Louis (by Michael Mazer and Richard Granat, 200-03) and Philadelphia (by Byron Fielding, 221-5).

<sup>15</sup> See Chester Hartman, "The Politics of Housing," in J. Lerner and I. Howe (eds.), *Poverty: Views from the Left* (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1968), pp. 149-67; and Eugene Smolensky, "Public Housing or Income Supplements—The Economics of Housing for the Poor," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXXIV, No. 2 (March 1968), 94-102.

<sup>16</sup> For a good overview of these failings, see Lawrence M. Friedman, *Government and Slum Housing: A Century of Frustration* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1968).

<sup>17</sup> Investigation of the characteristics of citizen boards and authorities and examination of the original premises which underlay their creation is not confined to the housing field. The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service undertook a similar survey of members of local draft boards in order to gain a better picture of the workings of this system. See *In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve?*, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service (February 1967).

<sup>18</sup> A few scattered studies exist of individual housing authorities with some reference to the roles and functions of the board and individual members. See, Martin Meyerson and Edward Banfield, *Politics, Planning, and the Public Interest: The Case of Public Housing in Chicago* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 35-59 and passim; May B. Hipshman, *Public Housing at the Crossroads: The Boston Housing Authority* (Boston: Citizens' Housing and Planning Association of Metropolitan Boston, 1967), pp. 10-15 and passim; Robert K. Brown, *Public Housing in Action: The Record of Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1959). It is only in individual case studies that one can get a sense of the narrower political forces that lead to appointment of particular individuals to a housing authority. Power, prestige, and in some cases emolument accompany these appointments, and, not surprisingly, individual and group obligations and allegiances, in addition to the desire to further certain policies, are factors which determine and influence appointment of housing authority commissioners.

<sup>19</sup> NAHRO is the professional organization which advocates the interests of local housing and redevelopment authorities. It publishes *Journal of Housing*, holds frequent national and regional conferences, and provides a multiplicity of services to its members, who include staff personnel as well as board members.

<sup>20</sup> Because of financial constraints, NAHRO was able to do a followup mailing to only a 20 percent sample of the list of commissioners. The other principal reason why the response rate was not higher probably has to do with the recent establishment of many authorities, which made it difficult or impossible for some commissioners to answer many of the questions.

Comparison of the distribution of respondents with the total distribution of housing authorities by geographical region and number of units managed by the authority indicates that, aside from a slight underrepresentation of commissioners from the southeastern region and a slight overrepresentation of small (in many cases, recently established) authorities, the respondents are representative of the commissioner group as a whole.

The distribution of the universe of housing authority commissioners by region and housing authorities by size of program, compared with the distribution of respondents to our survey, is as follows:

	[In percent]	
	Respondents	Universe
Region:		
New England.....	5	4
Middle Atlantic.....	11	10
Southeast.....	26	32
North-central.....	21	18
Southwest.....	29	28
Pacific Southwest.....	5	4
Pacific Northwest.....	4	3
Size of program (units under management):		
Less than 50.....	35	30
50 to 99.....	17	20
100 to 499.....	34	36
500 or more.....	14	13

<sup>21</sup> Nearly all questions were of the multiple-choice, precoded variety. Respondents were not asked to indicate their names or the names of their chief municipalities.

<sup>22</sup> Since large cities and their housing authority commissioners account for such a disproportionately large percentage of the nation's total public housing stock, response data will be presented separately for very large authorities (defined as those with more than 1,000 units under management—132 respondents in all) and for the total sample.

<sup>23</sup> Naturally, in many smaller cities and towns where there are few nonwhite residents, in public housing or otherwise, one would not expect to find nonwhite commissioners, but even in the larger cities this finding holds true. Isolating those authorities whose non-white public housing population is 50 percent or more, the proportion of nonwhite commissioners is only 13 percent.

<sup>24</sup> Information on characteristics of families living in public housing is for 1965 and is drawn from Program Planning Division, Housing Assistance Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Families in Low-Rent Projects*, Publication 225.1 (Washington: HUD, 1966).

<sup>25</sup> Similarly, the report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service indicated that 96.3 percent of all local board members were white and that 70 percent were in white-collar occupations. "Craftsmen, service workers, semiskilled workers and laborers," the Report noted, "are represented on local boards in far smaller proportions . . . than their representation in the general population." The Commission in its recommendations for changes in the organization of local boards states that "their composition should represent all elements of the public they serve."

<sup>26</sup> Relevant skills, however, as distinguished from interests, were an acceptable basis for appointing housing authority commissioners. The few states which stipulate by statute the appointment of one or more local commissioners according to their occupations designate such occupations as licensed engineers, contractors, labor representatives, and persons experienced in real estate or finance.

<sup>27</sup> In 1945 the *Journal of Housing*, using somewhat different categories from those used in the present survey, cited occupational distributions of housing and authority commissioners in 1940 and 1945 as follows:

	[In percent]	
	1940 (909 commis- sioners)	1945 (1,778 commis- sioners)
Business, banking, and finance.....	48	54
Professionals (law, medicine, minister, architecture, welfare, and so forth).....	20	20
Wage earners and labor officials.....	12	10
Farmers and farm organization officials.....	6	4
Public officials and civic leaders.....	6	5
Miscellaneous.....	8	7

It is interesting to note, however, that the current dominance of banking, business, and finance personnel is a relatively constant feature of the housing authority system. See *Journal of Housing*, VIII (August 1945), 136.

<sup>28</sup> See the incisive review of the thirty-year history of the public housing program in Lawrence M. Friedman, "Public Housing and the Poor: An Overview," *California Law Review*, LIV (1966), 642-69.

<sup>29</sup> About a dozen states require a local referendum (in some instances applicable only to certain cities or classes of cities) before public housing can be built or a contract

with the federal government entered into. This, of course, places an additional constraint on the local housing authority. See Housing Assistance Administration, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, *State Referendum Requirements for Low-Rent Housing* (Washington: HUD, September 26, 1967).

<sup>30</sup> A checklist of responses was offered to this question, with the option of writing in other reasons.

<sup>31</sup> For a good description of the political forces lined up for and against public housing, see, Jewel Bellush and Murray Hausknecht, "Public Housing: The Contexts of Failure" in Bellush and Hausknecht (eds.), *Urban Renewal: People, Politics and Planning* (New York: Anchor Books, 1967), pp. 451-61.

<sup>32</sup> The question asked (with a checklist supplied) was, *Which of the following new approaches to public housing authorized by recent federal action has your Authority used or does it plan to use?* The high proportion of "no answers" quite probably relates to lack of knowledge about these programs and can be interpreted as indicating that these programs are not currently being used or planned for.

<sup>33</sup> As indicated, this is an average; doubtless, there are peaks and troughs of activity, and at times housing authority commissioners will devote considerably more time to running the authority.

<sup>34</sup> In commenting on an earlier draft of this article, George Schermer, a long-time student of housing authorities, noted: "It is the rare authority member that puts in many hours touring the developments, observing and learning about housing conditions, or concerning himself with programs to resolve the general housing problem . . . I have the feeling that many housing authorities consider themselves, and are considered by the local political powers, as nothing more than the local managing agents for the federal low-rent housing program. This is not to say that they are enthusiastic about that function. Rather, their attitude may be paraphrased as follows: 'Uncle Sam has imposed this housing program on the localities. We do not think much of it, and we might be better off without it, but politics being what they are, we have to manage the stuff the best way we can. The less of it we have, the better.'" Letter from George Schermer to the authors, July 12, 1968.

<sup>35</sup> A recent report on tenant-management relations commissioned by NAHRO had this to say about the reluctance of many housing authorities to consider social services as part of their responsibility: "The public assertion 'this is not our responsibility' is psychologically stultifying. It has the effect of discouraging action from every quarter. The local authority and particularly the top administration will simply have to take the initiative and supply some leadership. If they can't do that, they are not fulfilling the demands of their job. To help them they should employ as large a staff of competently trained social workers and community organizers as the budget will permit. They would seek additional funds to supplement their own. . . ." See, *Public Housing Is The Tenants*, prepared by George Schermer Associates and Kenneth C. Jones for the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (Washington: NAHRO, 1967), pp. 41-2.

<sup>36</sup> Naturally, regional differences are marked in this regard. The proportion of commissioners expressing disagreement with racial integration of public housing projects ranged from 64 percent in the Southeast and 52 percent in the Southwest to 14 percent in New England and 15 percent in the Middle Atlantic states.

Of the 3,510 federally aided public housing projects occupied during FY 1965, over 2,100 (60 percent) were one-race projects. See, Pro-

gram Planning Division, Public Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Moveout Rates in Low-Rent Housing, July 1, 1965–June 30, 1965*, Publication 228.0 (Washington: HUD, 1965).

<sup>37</sup> The Schermer-Jones report cited in note 35, subtitled "Rethinking Management's Responsibility and Role in Tenant and Community Relations," was commissioned by NAHRO out of concern for the increasing gap between housing authorities and their tenants and in an effort to communicate the nature and magnitude of this problem to those who run public housing. The report concludes that: "The essence of good tenant and community relations is primarily communication and only secondarily policy and procedure. . . . Effective person to person contact depends on attitude, openness, mutual respect, concern. . . . In summary . . . it seems doubtful that there is one particular form of organization that is superior for public housing administration. The guiding principle must be that administration must be brought closer to the tenants and all functions coordinated so that the tenants can be brought into participation." George Schermer Associates and Kenneth C. Jones, *Public Housing Is the Tenants*, pp. 43, 47 (emphasis in original). The problems described in this report—considered by many housing experts to be an exceedingly important, competent, and reasonable document—are underlined by the reaction of some housing authority commissioners to the report itself. A resolution of the New England Regional Council of NAHRO, dated March 13, 1967 and addressed to the members of NAHRO Board of Governors, states in part:

"Whereas: Much of the contents of the Report is highly critical of the operations of Local Housing Authorities, many of whom are dues paying members of the Association. "Now, therefore, be it resolved. . . . It is the consensus of the Committee that its dues are being used in a manner not beneficial to the overall membership of the Association, but rather to promote dissent and disenchantment with the Public Housing Program as a whole which could lead to its ultimate demise."

The new \$125 million HUD modernization program for older projects also lays great stress on meaningful tenant involvement and implicitly acknowledges serious defects in existing management practices. The HUD circular announcing the program to local housing authorities contains the following language:

"Local authorities obtaining modernization funds will be expected to develop long and short term programs in each of the following areas: . . .

"Involvement of the tenants in the plans and programs for the modernization of the project, changes in management policies and practices, and expanded services and facilities.

"All of these lines of activity reflect the Administration's concern that all programs for low-income families should help these families rise out of their poverty into self-dependence."

See, Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Assistance, Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Subject: Program for Upgrading Low-Rent Housing Projects*, Circular 222621-P (November 14, 1967).

<sup>38</sup> See, for example, Chester W. Hartman, "The Limitations of Public Housing: Relocation Choices in a Working-Class Community," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, XXIX, No. 6 (November 1963), 283-96 and George Schermer and Kenneth C. Jones, *Public Housing Is the Tenants*.

<sup>39</sup> OEO has recently awarded a consulting contract to develop Tenant Management

Corporations in several large housing projects in different parts of the country.

<sup>40</sup> Recent protests by public housing tenants have included the demand for representation on the local public housing authority. See, for example, story on rent strike by New Rochelle (NY) public housing tenants, *New York Times* July 6, 1968, p. 22. The *New York Times*, October 3, 1968, reported that one result of the New Rochelle rent strike was to secure appointment of a housing authority tenant to the New Rochelle Housing Authority, believed to be the first public housing tenant to serve on a municipal authority in New York state. It is interesting to note that the man appointed was a resident of one of the Authority's middle-income projects.

<sup>41</sup> Comment on an earlier draft of this article, transmitted to the authors on April 2, 1968.

<sup>42</sup> Until its repeal just this year, the original Massachusetts housing statutes forbade a public housing tenant from serving on a housing authority board.

<sup>43</sup> Under Mayor John Lindsay, New York City recently attempted to merge the Housing Authority with several other housing and housing-related agencies in the city to form a single, coordinated agency to handle housing and redevelopment in that city. Although some degree of consolidation and reorganization was effected, the attempt to include the Housing Authority—the largest of these bodies—in the amalgam was unsuccessful.

<sup>44</sup> See note 14.

<sup>45</sup> For example, a circular dated 3-22-68 from Don Hummel, Assistant Secretary of HUD for Renewal and Housing Assistance, to all local housing authorities, entitled *The Social Goals for Public Housing* reads:

"A thorough and searching examination of our policies, practices, and priorities is called for to see that they are in line with our social objectives. We ask for your full support in this effort.

"As a matter of national policy, the following are among the most important of the social objectives of the [low-rent housing] program:

"A broader cross-section of low-income households in public housing neighborhoods, so as to avoid concentrations of the most economically and socially deprived households. . . . More attention to residents' dignity, privacy, and personal safety. Special attention should be given to the elimination of unnecessary rules and regulations.

"Leadership to achieve better and more coordinated social services for project tenants.

"Greatly expanded participation of tenants in project management affairs and programs designed to strengthen the self-sufficiency of tenants."

<sup>46</sup> See Ch. 705, Acts of 1966, Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Under this act, the usual public housing subsidy can be used only to construct scattered site projects or to lease, rehabilitate, or purchase units from the private sector.

#### PERFORMANCE AND PROMISE

All of these things, Mr. Speaker, constitute only a part of the rural poverty problem that has existed, does exist and will continue to exist and worsen unless the Nation, and especially the Congress, lives up to the intention of all of our housing legislation and all of our anti-poverty legislation. Congress has repeatedly said everyone should have a decent home, be free from hunger and have a job that will provide an adequate income. But it is difficult to believe that most of the Members of Congress really believe these things when performance is measured against the promise.

#### THE WEALTHY MUST PAY THEIR SHARE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the subject of tax reform has been aired, debated, belabored, and bemoaned. Many are the breasts which have been beaten in its name. Innumerable are the tears which have been shed over it. To date, there has been no tangible alteration of a situation which all acknowledge is intolerable. Most of the criticism leveled at our tax system has been legitimate. It has illuminated fiscal injustice, which is a major shame of our society, allowing the wealthy to grow richer at the expense of those who possess little. As a consequence of these unfair tax laws, the lower- and middle-income taxpayers are struggling ever harder as they fall farther behind in the race to earn a decent living. We have it in our power here to redress existing imbalances and restore the faith of our people in the tax system of the United States.

We know fully what these evils are. All have been fully exposed to public view and congressional scrutiny. Commencing with the oil depletion allowance, we have examined these loopholes all the way down to the gift deduction and capital gains method of evading taxes. One loophole, however, glares out at us, daring the hand of reform to alter its privileged existence. Even the outrage of oil depletion pales besides our knowledge that a few privileged individuals are able to earn millions and evade all income taxes. One cannot help but gasp in exasperation at such damning revelations. Millions of Americans are desperately wrestling to make ends meet on a daily basis, as those adroit few evade their responsibilities. It is long past time for Congress to slam these loopholes shut in the faces of these few parasites.

When a citizen may earn in excess of \$10 million and legally claim more than that amount in deductions, we have a disjointed tax system. If a person is allowed to degrade the principle of charity by utilizing it as a vehicle for tax evasion, charity itself is compromised. When capital gains have become a means for depriving Government of necessary revenue, redress must be granted to the public. This is particularly true when we realize that every dollar retained by these malefactors must be taken from lower- and middle-income people.

Many millions of our people are growing increasingly aware of what is actually transpiring—how their tax system is being used against them by these few. The system which mercilessly pursues the ordinary man turns into a red carpet for the rich to walk on toward full enjoyment of ill-gotten gains. Mr. George Meany has aptly named them "The Loophole Set." The public also is aware that Congress has power to immediately rectify this situation, and possesses a series of choices in order to accomplish this goal.

A minimum tax for these evaders is our answer.

Adoption of a minimum tax to allow exemption of only half the incomes of such nontaxpayers is one alternative. Another is requiring people to allocate their deductions between income from taxable and nontaxable sources. We could tax appreciable property upon the death of its owner and remove the unlimited charitable deduction over a given period. A maximum tax is another possibility, under which high-income taxpayers would pay more than half their incomes in Federal tax. Cumulatively or singly, these alternatives would put an end to the disgusting spectacle of massive income tax evasion by people earning millions.

In effect, what these few are really saying is that "What is ours is ours, and what belongs to the rest of the Nation is negotiable—in our interest." Do we wonder then why discontent mounts among people who see our system fostering injustice and rewarding larceny?

It is worth reiterating that a nation is only as strong as the belief of its people in its institutions. Today our tax system stands compromised in the eyes of many Americans. Congress is also an institution with responsibility for that tax system.

#### THE GROWING CANCER IN OUR BODY POLITIC—NAZISM, AMERICAN STYLE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with increasing revulsion and distaste a series of highly revealing exposés which deal with a new Nazi political movement within our country. Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson have joined COPE, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, Group Research, and the Institute for American Democracy in exposing Liberty Lobby and Willis Carto for what they are—American Fascists and neo-Nazis working for destruction of American democracy in the shadow of the Capitol of the United States.

Liberty Lobby, complete with its ideological baggage of a darker era, has even penetrated into the circle of this House. Worse yet, it has exercised political power within the party of which I have always been a proud member. Would that this were not so.

Willis Carto, its real power within, is a noted extremist and exponent of neo-Nazi philosophy of the most virulent and primitive sort. His major vehicles for such activity have been American Mercury Magazine, Washington Observer Newsletter, and a publishing operation in Sausalito, Calif.—Noontide Press. He has further sought to inhibit our press through creation of a so-called Press Ethics Committee, which is as fraudulent as it is unnecessary.

In such a manner, a Fascist movement embracing and advocating Hitlerian goals, complete with Hitlerian trappings seeks a significant voice in the daily lives

of all Americans. Its machinations must be frustrated before it blossoms further. Its avowed goals of militarization of our Nation and an eventual Armageddon with the Soviet Union are incompatible with our entire concept of national life.

With deep sadness, I turn my attention to statements which have been made indicating that Members of this House have accepted major financial contributions from Mr. Carto. Such liaisons have no place in our political system and are not to be countenanced within the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy.

How sad a reflection upon our times that at such a point in history we should be confronted with Hitler's heritage within America's Government and most basic institution. How tragic a denouement.

Of late there has been much oratory to the effect that our sacred ideals, symbols, and foundations are endangered by extremism and ideologies which preach the opposite of what the Republic stands for. No better example of this is to be found than the works and ideals of Willis Carto.

Fervently do I hope that those members of my own party who, mistakenly, I am sure, accepted his aid, will renounce him and his works. It is the only acceptable alternative for anyone who holds national office in the name of the Democratic Party and its ideals.

As far as Liberty Lobby itself is concerned, I feel that America, her institutions, and people are immune to its venom. My faith reposes in the strength and viability of our institutions, and the maturity and courage of our people. All they will give to Mr. Carto and his ilk is what my Irish friends so aptly call the back of my hand.

Mr. Speaker, our country has traveled a long road through history. Bedeviled by internal strife and factional bickering, we have surmounted more than one mortal challenge which sought to change the essence of our ideals and thwart our national purpose. Each time the best elements in our national life have come to the fore and prevailed. Such a challenge stares us in the face again today, presenting us with a familiar choice—democracy or abrogation of liberty.

Let us rise above pettiness and above hatred, turning our backs collectively upon such messengers of hate. Let the call of Hitler's legacy fall upon deaf ears and die the death such ideologies deserve.

If we must struggle along ideological lines, let such combats be waged without the aid of fiends from the darkest pit that a few would unloose among us. For they are never satisfied with a little blood or a small sacrifice. More is always demanded. Democracy's children are their victims. Freedom's hopes are their slaves. Liberty's dreams are their conquests. There will come a day when all Willis Cartos have been relegated to the same museums and history books where Adolf Hitler now reposes. If this day is ever to arrive, it will be because those of us here have had the courage to put them there by our acts, attitudes, and integrity.

#### CHAIRMAN GEORGE MAHON RECEIVES GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege and honor to attend the annual banquet of the American Good Government Society on April 30 when our beloved colleague and friend, GEORGE MAHON, received the coveted 1969 George Washington Award.

Mr. MAHON's response was an honor to the Congress and a credit to the entire Nation. I was never more proud of our chairman than when he delivered the following superb response:

This is a great moment for my wife Helen and me. I wish to express my deepest thanks to the American Good Government Society for the award which you have presented me. It is a great honor and I shall never cease to appreciate it.

I wish to express my special thanks to my Texas friends who have come from afar to be here this evening.

I have been to these dinners before but this one seems better than any of the rest. Of course, it could be that the honor which is being bestowed upon the Mahons could have something to do with it!

I am honored to be on the platform with my friend Senator Bennett, and to hear former Governor Cecil Underwood, of West Virginia, make the most interesting remarks about the Electoral College I have ever been privileged to hear. Despite the turbulent history of the Electoral College, I am not so sure but that it is about the most stable college we have these days!

I have looked over this list of the past 32 recipients of the award. Many have been members of the House or Senate. It is a very distinguished company.

However, I tend to look with some condescension upon prior Congressional recipients of the award! And let me explain. In view of the recent pay raise, Senator Wallace Bennett and I are the highest priced members ever to receive the award! We are in a class by ourselves. But, what with all the problems which confront us, it looks like we are going to begin to earn the pay raise.

A recent calculation shows that the average American taxpayer in order to pay his local, state and Federal taxes, in effect, works from January 1 through April 27 for the government. This is April 30. My work to pay taxes has been concluded and I'm now speaking on my own time, not the government's, and I shall not be hampered by bureaucratic limitations!

I think I'm going to feel at home with the George Washington Good Government Award. After all, my first name is George, and I was also born on the 22nd. It makes little difference that it was September 22 and not February 22! Of course, one other George received the award, George Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury, who spoke of budgets that would curl the hair! Regretfully, we have continued to have "hair curling" deficits.

The remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, my warm friend, Mr. Bow, were most complimentary and generous. Never have I seen Frank Bow more extravagant. He usually leans to the conservative and often deals in understatement. Maybe this is explained by the fact that his generous encomiums didn't cost any money!

Frank Bow is a big man. His booming and resonant voice can fill any hall. But Frank Bow's true bigness is his heart. It

has been a great experience for me to work with him through the years in matters that involve deeply the destiny of our country.

In spending matters we have long been aware that heads of government agencies insist upon ever-increasing expenditures. They love spending . . . But Frank and I feel—and upon good authority—that the love of money is the root of all evil and we try to hold them down. We believe—as I think you do—in the principle of pay-as-you-go in government spending.

Now that we have a budget surplus of sorts in prospect, I am thinking of switching to a pay-less-as-you-go philosophy!

But even though Frank is my good and always helpful friend, I have a lurking suspicion that he wants the House to go Republican so that he can take over my job as Chairman! As I see it—from my standpoint—this would be a major disaster. But I will say this: If I have to bow to anyone, I'd rather bow to Bow than any Member I know.

One further serious word about economy. It is a far cry from the days of Calvin Coolidge, but I would like to quote with approval one statement of his. He said he favored economy not because he wished to save money but because he wished to save people.

Our major problem is saving people, our country, and promoting its continued growth. In this context, the much used word "militancy" forcefully comes to mind. I am not thinking in terms of militancy by dope addicts, demonstrators, riot instigators, or small, disruptive, undisciplined groups in the colleges. I am thinking in terms of militancy by the majority.

I just cannot believe that the great majority of our people will indefinitely stand idly by and see the greatest citadel of liberty and freedom and abundance on earth go down the drain. Sometimes we seem to be hobbled by timidity and a spirit of appeasement. It is time for the great majority to call a halt. It is time to see to it that the destructive elements are denied full leeway in their efforts to erode and destroy the very foundation of our institutions.

I want to see more militancy on the part of the great rank and file of college students who are rapidly losing an opportunity to live in an atmosphere where education and growth are possible. I applaud President Nixon's statement of yesterday in which he urged college administrators to take firmer action to maintain stability.

I want to see more militancy on the part of people who believe in the old-fashioned virtues.

I want to see more militancy on the part of office holders and community leaders. Too often as candidates we are "bloody, bold, and resolute" but as officials we tend to overrationalize every situation which arises and take on the image of appeasement and timidity.

No, I am not advocating rashness or violence; I am advocating that we take steps to curb anarchy which is eating ravenously at the very heart of this great country.

A few days ago I had a letter from a minister from my home county. I want to quote a couple of sentences:

"It looks like too many of our men in high places . . . are gutless. And for that reason, small groups all over the great United States are being permitted to destroy the great principles for which we have stood so long."

Gutless may not be a very nice word, but anarchy is not a nice word either. I think it is time, high time, for law-abiding citizens—that great majority—to rise up in their might and insist upon the preservation of the best qualities in American life. That is the issue before the American people. Perhaps never before in our history have a so-called free

people been so badgered and beleaguered by small groups of outlaws and exhibitionists.

Thomas Paine said, those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigue of supporting it.

There are no pat answers to the problems but there are reasonably adequate answers. They relate to such fundamental virtues as restraint, discipline, morality, constitutional government, and patriotism.

Americans never mount a major effort until they become deeply concerned and aroused. That point has been reached and I believe we are at the beginning of the turning of the tide.

I conclude in a spirit of high hopes and optimism. I do not have to tell this audience of people who believe in constitutional government that our country, our cherished institutions, our governments at all levels will be as good, as free, and as great as a militant majority of our people are determined they shall be!

Again, let me express my deepest thanks to the American Good Government Society and wish you much success in your efforts to promote the welfare of our great country.

Thank you very much.

#### PROPOSED FTC BAN ON UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS SHOULD BE APPLIED TO BANKS THROUGH FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND FDIC ACTION

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last February I expressed my concern in a speech on the floor of the House about the apparently widespread practice by banks and business firms of mailing credit cards to consumers who have not requested them. My remarks at that time were prompted by a personal experience I had with an unsolicited credit card, and my belief that many other consumers who have received unsolicited credit cards have found the experience as irritating and unsatisfactory as my family and I did.

That belief has been confirmed since I first raised this issue in the House, and in several public appearances. I have received hundreds of letters from fellow consumers across the country giving detailed evidence of the unpleasant experiences they have had as a result of receiving an unsolicited credit card. Many of them feel, as I do, that this practice poses a threat to family budgets and potentially to the national economy.

In view of this record of concern, I was delighted to learn today that a significant step is about to be taken to help remedy this problem. The Federal Trade Commission has publicly proposed promulgation of a regulation which would stop the practice of sending out credit cards to any party without an expressed written request from the party for such a card. I am including at the close of my remarks a copy of the FTC press release announcing hearings on this proposed regulation.

The new regulation classifies the practice of sending unsolicited credit cards, quite rightly in my view, as "an unfair act or practice, and an unfair method of

competition in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act."

This proposed regulation is most commendable, as far as it goes. Unfortunately, however, because of limitations on the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission, the regulation—even if approved, as it certainly should be—would not apply to banks or air carriers. It would apply only to "retail department stores, marketers, and retail dealers of gasoline, travel and entertainment establishments, and other credit card issuers—within FTC jurisdiction."

My own study of this problem reveals that banks are certainly one of the major sources of unsolicited credit card mailings, and it is urgent that they be covered by rules similar to those proposed by the Federal Trade Commission.

The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are the two Federal agencies with jurisdiction over banks, and every effort must be made to see that these agencies act on the unsolicited credit card problem in the banking field as the FTC has done with respect to commercial enterprises under its regulatory jurisdiction. With that in mind, I am today calling the action of the FTC to the attention of officials of the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC with a request that they issue similar bans applicable to banks at the earliest possible time. In addition, the two bills I have already introduced, H.R. 6945 and H.R. 8920, would remove any remaining uncertainty over the authority of the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC to act in this area, and provide them with an unequivocal mandate to see that the practice by banks of sending out unsolicited credit cards is ended.

The Federal Trade Commission action deserves the support of the Congress and all American consumers. But its effects in resolving the unsolicited credit card problem, for the reasons I have cited, can be only partial, at best.

The FTC action reconfirms the need for broad prohibitions against the issuance of credit cards without consumer request, and suggests the need to extend prospective prohibitions to the establishments that appear to be the prime offenders—the banks. I hope that the FTC action will be imitated by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and will stimulate prompt action on the legislation which I, and other Members of the Congress, have introduced giving these agencies a clear mandate to issue and enforce prohibitions on unsolicited bank credit cards.

#### FTC INITIATES TRADE REGULATION RULE PROCEEDING REGARDING THE MAILING OF UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS

The Federal Trade Commission today announced it has initiated a proceeding for the establishment of a trade regulation rule regarding the mailing of unsolicited credit cards.

The proposed rule would affect retail department stores, marketers and retail dealers of gasoline, travel and entertainment credit card establishments and other credit card issuers. Banks, common carriers and air carriers which mail out credit cards would not be covered by the rule because the Commission lacks jurisdiction over them.

A hearing on the proposed rule will be held at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, September 10, 1969, in Room 532, FTC Building, Pennsylvania Ave. and Sixth St., N.W., Washington, D.C., and all interested parties, including the consuming public, will be given the opportunity to present data, views or argument.

Data, views or argument may be filed in writing with the Chief, Division of Trade Regulation Rules, Bureau of Industry Guidance, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C. 20580, not later than August 12, 1969.

The proposed rule would forbid those issuers covered by it to mail a credit card to anyone without first receiving in writing his request for the card, or his consent to its being mailed.

In its notice initiating the proceeding, the Commission stated that it has reason to believe that:

"(1) Marketers of products and services such as gasoline companies, department stores, and all purpose credit card issuers have attempted to increase the use of credit cards through distribution of credit cards through the mails to persons who have not requested such cards or agreed to accept the same.

(2) A credit card holder is more likely to purchase at a retail outlet honoring his credit card.

(3) Unsolicited credit cards are often lost in the mails and the intended recipient is unaware there is a card or that an account is established in his name.

(4) Such credit cards are often misappropriated and fraudulently used by unknown parties and the intended recipient of the credit card is put to the often considerable burden of demonstrating to the billing company that the goods or services were not ordered or purchased.

(5) Billings resulting from fraudulent use of cards or billing errors cause concern among consumer recipients that their credit reputations may be jeopardized.

(6) As the result of an unsolicited credit card being issued, recipients are put to the burden of returning the unwanted credit card to the sender if they wish to indicate that the card is not desired.

(7) Credit card issuers who resort to the use of unsolicited mailings of credit cards may be placed at a competitive advantage over their competitors, who do not utilize the unsolicited mailings, and therefore that:

(8) Such practices constitute unfair acts or practices, and unfair methods of competition in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act."

And the Commission pointed out that, "Where a Trade Regulation Rule is relevant to any issue involved in an adjudicative proceeding thereafter instituted, the Commission may rely upon the Rule to resolve such issue, provided that the respondent shall have been given a fair hearing on the applicability of the Rule to the particular case."

#### NIXON'S VIETNAM PROPOSALS: HARD QUESTIONS AVOIDED, BUT MODERATE IN TONE

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the most impressive thing about President Nixon's speech on Vietnam last night was its moderate tone. The President conveyed the impression that he is truly interested in negotiating a peace, and not in recriminations.

The President is also to be commended

for attempting to spell out the U.S. negotiating position for the achievement of a political settlement in Vietnam. Many of the positions he set forth have been part of U.S. thinking for a long time, but—for reasons I never could comprehend—the previous administration was not willing to state them publicly.

The Nixon speech, however, suffered grievously from the apparent fact that it was cleared in advance with the Saigon Government and left many, if not most, of the hard questions unanswered—questions that will have to be resolved before much progress can be expected in Paris.

For example, the speech did not make clear that, before any new election can take place that would give the National Liberation Front full opportunity to participate, the existing Constitution of South Vietnam would have to be drastically amended. President Thieu has insisted that any new election would have to take place within the framework of the existing Constitution, and President Nixon did not contradict him.

President Nixon also failed to discuss in any way the extremely difficult problem of providing for interim governmental arrangements in South Vietnam during the preelection period. He said that the elections themselves would take place under the supervision of an agreed upon international agency, which is a constructive suggestion so far as it goes. But he did not state or imply that such an international body would have governmental responsibilities. Thus, the implication of the proposal is that during the preelection period the present Saigon Government would remain in control of those areas it now dominates, and the NLF would remain in control of Vietcong dominated areas. It is hard to see how truly free elections could take place under such circumstances in areas dominated by either of these two sides, much less in the contested areas. Perhaps the President has in mind that some different interim governmental arrangements would have to be worked out, but his speech did not seem even to recognize the existence of the problem.

President Nixon's proposal also failed to deal with the question of reducing the level of violence on both sides as a necessary first step toward peace. As Governor Harriman pointed out in his comments following the address, the President made no reference to the stepped-up level of activity by U.S. bombers since last fall in suspected areas of Vietcong concentration in South Vietnam. He referred only to the Vietcong attacks against South Vietnamese cities.

Another big question left open by the President's speech was the size and structure of the U.S. forces that would remain in South Vietnam after the withdrawal of "most" such forces during the proposed 12-month withdrawal period. Although the President stated that we do not want to retain any "bases" in South Vietnam, he seemed to be saying that we would want to retain some U.S. forces in designated areas in South Vietnam for an indefinite period. This seems to be a pullback from the pledge of total

withdrawal made by President Johnson at Manila in 1967.

Also notably lacking in the President's statement was any reference to the need for broadening the present Saigon Government to include many non-Communist groups and individuals excluded thus far, such as General Minh, whose presence in the government would make it far more likely that a political settlement could be worked out with the NLF. The President, likewise, made no mention of the political repression that the Thieu-Ky government continues to practice, including the imprisonment of dissenters and the closing down of critical newspapers. In fairness, though, it should be noted that President Nixon simultaneously refrained from comment on the ruthless political methods of the NLF, except for his reference to the continuing attacks on populated areas in the cities of South Vietnam.

With this speech, President Nixon has no doubt put the United States in a better posture with respect to Vietnam in the eyes of the world than it has been for some years. This was particularly true because of his clear and unequivocal statement that our objective is to assure to the South Vietnamese people a free choice for their own future, and nothing more. Refreshingly, there was no mention of the claim that the maintenance of a non-Communist government in South Vietnam is a vital U.S. interest, nor was there any reference to the long-reiterated "domino" theory. Now certainly the United States will be in a far better position to continue the negotiations in Paris on a realistic basis, especially in view of the fact that the NLF has recently put forward a realistic negotiating position for the first time.

I suggest, however, that the negotiations cannot possibly succeed until the hard questions, like those I have mentioned, have been resolved. I believe, also, that a scaling down in the level and intensity of American military activity is needed. As Governor Harriman said last night, experience has shown that military pressure does not produce the desired results on NLF and North Vietnamese behavior that its advocates have stubbornly predicted. In this connection, recent press reports that the Hanoi government has had serious problems in maintaining the morale and willingness of its people to continue their sacrifices since the United States stopped the bombing of North Vietnam are interesting.

Finally, I hope that the President will make the fundamental decision that the Thieu-Ky government cannot continue to retain a veto power in the negotiations and that indeed the chances of a political settlement will remain dim so long as the Thieu-Ky regime maintains its present monopoly of power.

To achieve the desired withdrawal of "non-South Vietnamese forces"—as the President tactfully called them, avoiding the term "foreign"—I would hope that the President would proceed not only to scale down American offensive activities, but also to withdraw immediately a significant number of Ameri-

can forces, inviting comparable reciprocal action by the North Vietnamese. It may well be that much can be accomplished in this way without expecting Hanoi to make an explicit agreement about "mutual withdrawal" of forces. Any such agreement will be politically difficult for Hanoi to make both because of its official position that it has no forces in the South, and because of its insistence that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam is not in any way comparable to the presence of Vietnamese in Vietnam, whether from the South or the North.

#### TOWARD A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF WELFARE

(Mr. MINISH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for a major overhaul of our country's present welfare system by converting the aid to families with dependent children program to a wholly Federal program. Under my bill, AFDC will be administered by local agencies under federally prescribed terms and conditions including national minimum standards with the cost being fully borne by the Federal Government.

I have focused my legislation on the aid for dependent children program because this is by far the largest—and fastest-growing public assistance program. It is also the welfare program which, due to sharply increasing enrollment and cost, is contributing most to the growing fiscal crisis of urban local governments. Aid to families with dependent children now pays out more cash grants to needy families than the combined total for the other federally assisted programs for the blind, disabled, and aged, and it now accounts for more than two-thirds of all the people on public assistance in the United States. Of the approximately 9 million Americans who receive some sort of welfare, 6,146,000 of them were covered by the AFDC program during fiscal 1969.

Underlying the difficulty in preparing legislation on this subject is the fact that although the need for some form of national welfare system has been widely recognized, there are complex questions as to how a national standard could be formulated, the financing relationship between the various governmental levels, whether there should be national standards of eligibility, which programs should be included, and so forth. Hopefully, my legislation will answer some of these questions and provide a framework within which we may work toward a constructive national welfare policy.

My bill includes the provisions of H.R. 6612 introduced by me on February 7, 1969, for the promulgation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of national standards and eligibility requirements for aid to families with dependent children. In practice the Secretary will adopt existing State formulas for determining the level of assistance to prevail in each State, except that in no

case may the benefits be less than the national average payments during the calendar quarter preceding the enactment of this legislation.

Such an approach will result in a significant lessening of the disparities which currently exist in AFDC payments among the various States. According to the latest available figures, the State of Massachusetts now pays \$67.85 per month to the average aid to dependent children recipient. In New York, aid for dependent children pays \$61.90 a month per recipient. For the Nation as a whole the average is approximately \$41.35 per recipient. My own State of New Jersey now pays \$65.28. In the State of Mississippi, on the other hand, the average monthly check for a dependent child is only \$8.50. South Carolinians receiving assistance must get by on about \$18.40 each per month. Alabama pays only \$15.30 and Texas only \$18.85.

The extreme disparities in benefits are unjust, do not reflect any reasonable differences in the cost of living, and encourage migration to large metropolitan areas where the welfare situation has already reached a critical point. Under my measure, the lowest State payment levels would be increased to the national average at the time of enactment of this legislation. States with higher assistance levels would be reimbursed at these same levels for expenditures under the AFDC program. The net effect will be to maintain the reasonable benefit levels of many States, while increasing to a decent level the pitifully low payments which millions of people now receive—payments which are totally inadequate for sustaining life even on a minimum level.

The bill makes a basic change in the financing arrangements for the aid to families with dependent children program by providing one hundred percent Federal financing, thus recognizing its national character and giving the Federal Government responsibility for assuring a workable and just policy. For some time now we have accepted the need for a national highway system and the Federal Government has provided virtually all the funds to construct this system. We must now face the fact that the welfare crisis can only be handled effectively and justly by the Federal Government.

Welfare expenditures today are becoming an unbearable burden to local governments and their hard pressed taxpayers in our Nation's metropolitan centers. In my own State of New Jersey, Federal assistance covers less than 45 percent of the cost of the AFDC program. The balance must be paid for by the taxpayers of the State, particularly the taxpayers in large urban counties like Essex. The number of recipients of AFDC funds in New Jersey has risen from 36,000 to 171,000 in the past 10 years and the State cost has increased from \$2,676,000 in 1958 to \$18,876,000 in 1968. In Essex County where my congressional district is located, the increase has been proportionately greater. Thirty-five percent of the entire State welfare load is carried by this county despite the fact that only about 15 percent of New Jersey's population resides here. In 1958

welfare costs in Essex were \$2,994,000. In 1968 the county spent approximately \$20 million on AFDC assistance. Needless to say, a continuing increase at this rate will mean fiscal chaos for the county and financial ruin for its taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, under this legislation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in addition to adopting State standards and eligibility requirements, would formulate a complete plan for the administration of the program. Actual administration would be by existing county welfare agencies which would be required to report annually to the Secretary. The localities also would be charged with dispensing funds to the needy, conducting day care centers for children of recipients undergoing work training, supervising work training programs, and providing the many necessary social services which are often neglected now in the scramble for scarce local resources. Counties would be reimbursed for all expenses of the AFDC program so long as they abide by the plans outlined by the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House, and particularly the members of the Ways and Means Committee, to study this legislation carefully. Its enactment would lead to a more rational and more enlightened welfare system geared to current realities and recognizing that the plight of the urban taxpayer can no longer be ignored.

#### NATIONAL ISSUES

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of Mr. Charles H. Flynn, the erudite editor of the Ansonia, Conn., Evening Sentinel, I recently submitted a guest editorial for publication in the Evening Sentinel. Mr. Flynn, who recently was elected president of the Connecticut Circuit of Associated Press invited me to discuss some of the issues which predominate the 91st Congress with the understanding that my guest editorial would be published while Mr. Flynn vacations in Ireland.

I have submitted the following under the heading "The National Issues":

##### THE NATIONAL ISSUES

(Written for the Ansonia Sentinel by U.S. Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Fifth District, Connecticut)

The 91st Congress is faced with strong public demand for action on several legislative fronts. The letters which I receive indicate that the national issues most prominently in the minds of the people in our District other than World Peace, which predominate, are:

Coordination and regulation of poverty programs;  
Clarification and limitation of welfare programs;

Control of unsolicited mailings of pornographic and obscene materials;  
Tax reform and budget control; and  
Evaluation of Federal spending programs and the allocation of national priorities.

In a sense this last matter surpasses all the others. Since it involves taxation, appropriations, and the exercise of statesman-like judgment as to the areas of national interest

in which our expenditures should be changed, I have long maintained (my bill, H.R. 5545) that a Commission should be established to set Federal priorities. Although in a sense this is presently done in the Executive Branch by the Bureau of the Budget, nevertheless we need some legislative authority to harmonize the various goals advocated by the various goals advocated by the different Congressional committees. For example, the question of the competing claims on behalf of tax reduction, expenditures for urban areas, and spending for national defense are supported and attacked in various quarters. A balanced judgment on these matters must be reached.

One finds today a rising popular demand for control of expenditures and tax reform. The taxpaying public feels that it is paying about as much as can be expected. Wage-earning taxpayers are particularly concerned about the current tax loopholes which permit people with million dollar incomes to escape paying taxes altogether. Certainly these inequalities should be eliminated. My proposal (H.R. 7744) for a mandatory minimum tax would be a step in the right direction.

The competing demands of our deteriorating cities and the maintenance of adequate defenses provide another conflict of opinion. The current proposal to construct a modified Anti-Ballistic Missile System and various other military demands have emphasized this conflict. The alteration of the original ABM proposal by the Nixon Administration, its cost and the questions which some scientists have raised about its efficacy, require that it be given the most searching consideration. At the same time the deployment of a similar system by the Russians, the potential threat of Chinese nuclear capacity, and the judgment of the President and our military leaders all must be thoughtfully reviewed before action. It will be some time before this matter comes before the House and I have not yet made a final determination as to my position, but these are some of the considerations which are involved.

Certainly there are opportunities for reducing expenditures. In the last Congress budget proposals were reduced approximately \$6 billion and actual expenditures were cut about \$2 billion. I believe that defense spending can be further reduced and other spending, such as that involved in the farm program, cries out for review and reduction.

In a sense the battle against smut and pornography does not rank with the other matters which I have mentioned, but there are two significant aspects which are involved which make it a matter of great importance. First of all it touches on the morals of the Nation and secondly it constitutes a danger to the youth of our country. One sees the unsolicited pornography that floods the mails only to realize regretfully that the United States has the dubious distinction of matching Denmark as one of the two most permissive countries in the world. Certainly reasonable guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom of the press can be maintained while the public and especially the juvenile public are protected from those who purvey dirt for money.

The current preoccupation with poverty in this country is entirely admirable and should be pursued without flagging. At the same time there has been such a proliferation of governmental programs and activities, all with this same objective, that some review of their purposes and some coordination of their activities is required. From Social Security to OEO the Nation will be spending \$27 billion next year on the disadvantaged and yet most of these programs operate without any reference to the activities of others in the same field.

The Subcommittee which I chair is presently making an effort to determine the de-

gree to which anti-poverty programs operate efficiently and economically. The starting point for my subcommittee's investigation will be the much publicized General Accounting Office's "Review of Economic Opportunity Programs." Oversight of the entire anti-poverty effort must be increasingly exercised by the Congress.

One of the most critical problem areas in government today is that of the welfare program and its exploding cost. This is particularly true in States like Connecticut where the high level of payments has increasingly attracted welfare recipients from rural or less prosperous States. The recent astronomical rise of payments in Connecticut, where the percentage of the State budget allocated to welfare has risen from approximately 20 percent to 30 percent in three years, sufficiently underlines the seriousness of this whole matter. I have recently filed a bill in Congress (H.R. 9952) which would require uniform standards of welfare in all the States. By raising the standards elsewhere it should be possible to deter out-of-state welfare recipients from coming into more prosperous sections such as Connecticut. The problems of the metropolitan areas would be lessened and the farms and the small towns would be preserved as vital elements in our society. My purpose is to reduce, not increase, the future burden of Connecticut wage earners and taxpayers.

These are not all the issues which face the Congress, but they are those most prominent at the present time. I know that I shall have the support and the cooperation of the people of our District as I seek to move our government in the right direction in these matters. The continued advice and recommendations of all my constituents will as always be most welcome.

#### LABOR DEPARTMENT SAVINGS BOND CAMPAIGN—PERSUASION OR COERCION?

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Department of Labor, along with several other executive agencies, has recently launched an intensive campaign to promote employee purchasing of U.S. savings bonds. While it is certainly proper for the Government to encourage purchase of savings bonds by its own employees, I am disturbed that "encouragement"—at least in the Department of Labor—borders on coercion.

By way of illustration, let me outline briefly some of the features of the Department of Labor's savings bond campaign.

The instructions for the conduct of the campaign were contained in an April 15 memorandum to supervisory personnel from Under Secretary of Labor James D. Hodgson, which I include at this point in my remarks:

MEMORANDUM TO SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL BY THE UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR, WASHINGTON, APRIL 15, 1969

The 1969 Savings Bond Campaign will commence in the Department of Labor on April 21. In order to demonstrate that Department management enthusiastically endorses the campaign, it is planned to use supervisory employees as canvassers. The basic guidelines under which they will operate are:

1. There will be no pressure put upon employees, but all will be seriously urged to sign up.

2. Please emphasize that in making the Department of Labor a stimulating place to work we are building an esprit de corps and unity of purpose. We particularly want to excel in programs where we can be compared with others. Therefore, all employees are urged to respond to this appeal.

3. Payroll deduction is a convenient way of saving, helps support the Government and, of course, is a sound and valuable investment, but the paramount appeal by the Department is *widespread participation* in this joint effort, not investment.

4. The Government has set a goal of 80 percent participation in the bond payroll savings plan. However, the Department of Labor likes to excel in responding to worthy causes, to do just a little better than other agencies. Therefore, we are setting ourselves a goal of at least 90 percent employee participation. Many other organizations both in Government and private industry regularly exceed this figure so the target is not unreasonable.

5. Any person who does not sign the card after a discussion with his supervisor will be talked to by the next higher level of supervision to insure he or she is fully aware of the importance the Department places on this program. If discussion at these two levels of supervision does not result in participation, no higher referrals will be made.

6. Employees should be advised that any payroll deduction authorization effective in July will count in this year's drive. Therefore, it is appropriate to point out that there will be a substantial Government-wide pay raise effective in July.

7. It is the fact of participation, not the size of the deduction, that is important in this particular drive, a minimum deduction may be all that some will wish. No encouragement for higher amounts should be extended in such cases.

8. The payroll deduction method is reliable. Employees now receive their bonds regularly and promptly.

Please accept my thanks for your efforts in this program. Only through leadership on the part of its supervision can the Department expect to achieve the leadership position to which it aspires.

JAMES D. HODGSON,  
Under Secretary.

Several aspects of Under Secretary Hodgson's memorandum strike me as—if not overtly coercive—at least surpassing the threshold of legitimate encouragement. First and perhaps foremost is the use of "supervisory employees" as canvassers for the campaign. In effect, this means that employees are to receive initial "encouragement" to buy bonds from supervisors who may, in fact, be the same individuals supervising them in their day-to-day employment activities.

Since the supervisor must himself respond to the goals for participation outlined by the Department of Labor, an employee may feel he will incur the enmity of his supervisor if he refuses to participate in a program for which his supervisor is held accountable. This situation in itself places undue pressure on an employee to sign up for a program in which he otherwise might be reluctant to participate.

Rather than building the "esprit de corps" to which Under Secretary Hodgson refers, it seems to me that the practice of using supervisory personnel to canvass for a program which has no relevance to the overriding purposes and duties of either the supervisor or the employee may produce exactly the opposite effect;

namely, an undermining of the relationship between supervisor and employee which is essential to the performance of the duties for which both bear responsibility. If canvassing of any kind is to be permitted within a Government agency, then it surely ought not to be done by the same supervisors with whom an employee must deal on a day-to-day basis, especially since both the employee's participation in the program and the supervisor's success in promoting participation by his employees is wholly irrelevant to either's capacity to fulfill the duties and responsibilities which should be his main concern.

A second provision of the Labor Department's memorandum—the referral of persons who do not wish to sign up for savings bonds to the “next higher level of supervision”—is patently outrageous.

Point 1 of Secretary Hodgson's memorandum stipulates that “there will be no pressure put upon employees” to sign up for the program. At the same time, however, employees are to be referred to a higher level of supervision for declining to contribute to the Labor Department's savings bond campaign.

The referral of an employee to a higher supervisory personnel as a result of his declining to participate in a program endorsed and promoted by the Department of Labor can be construed only as the most overt and direct pressure on the employee to sign up. If the employee has already indicated that he does not wish to participate in the program, referral to the next highest level is plainly coercive. As such, the practice should be terminated immediately.

An employee surely ought to have the right to dispose of his wages as he sees fit, without pressure or coercion being placed on him to obligate himself to a monthly deduction which he does not wish to incur. If government agencies feel bound to promote the purchase of savings bonds, they most certainly should not utilize supervisory personnel to cajole employees—with whom they must work on a day-to-day basis—into participating in an effort which is wholly extraneous to the purposes of the Labor Department and its programmatic responsibilities.

If the Department of Labor wishes to promote an “esprit de Corps” and “unity of purpose” among its employees, I suggest the Department organize such an effort—which I would applaud—around its own programs and responsibilities and not around the purchase of savings bonds, which is an irrelevant and meaningless test of organizational unity and purpose.

As a Member of Congress, I am interested, and concerned, with how the Department of Labor fulfills the responsibilities mandated to it by Congress, not with how many of its employees purchase savings bonds. I hope that the executive leadership of the Department will, by eliminating the coercive aspects of this campaign, exhibit a similar emphasis on meeting its primary responsibilities as a Federal agency.

#### ARMY ELECTRONICS COMMAND WASTES TAXPAYERS' MONEY

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to beat a dead horse; nor do I plan to join the currently popular chorus against the much publicized military-industrial complex. But I would like to provide for the RECORD a detailed report on how the U.S. Army Electronics Command conducts public business and obligates our tax money for electronic equipment. The enormity of the waste is so incredible to me that it would seem to border on criminal action, however, most of it could be eliminated in one stroke if the Congress of the United States would hold a single military officer as personally responsible for a single case of stupidity and remove him from the service by assigning him the appropriately poor rating in his next fitness report.

In this particular case, to say that the Army wasted the money would be equal to saying the entire Pentagon wasted the money. That would dilute the responsibility and blunt any effort to seek to determine and expose the real individual source of the problem. I do know, for example, that the commanding general of the Army Electronics Command is Maj. Gen. J. B. Latta, and that his Director of Procurement and Production is Col. Jacob B. Cooperhouse.

The total sum of money wasted here was \$853,125; so this case cannot be considered really significant compared to the billions of dollars wasted elsewhere. The important thing is, however, that this waste was incurred under a procedure called negotiations through which bids are opened in secret and awarded in secret. I am told that this is the procedure through which General Latta's command awards about 85 percent of all of its contracts. This means, conversely, of course, that only about 15 percent of all the Army's Electronics Command's multibillions of dollars' worth of contracts are publicly issued, and under conditions which permit free, open, competitive bidding and resultant dollar savings to the taxpayers.

The case to which I refer concerns a transponder test set identified by the official nomenclature, AN/APM-132( ). This unit measures 11½ inches high by 13¾ inches deep by 11⅞ inches wide and weighs 45 pounds, including all the cable assemblies, covers, attenuators, and straps. The major component is the actual test set which measures 4¼ inches high by 15½ inches deep by 13 inches wide and weighs 23.5 pounds. It is used for testing aircraft transponder—radio—sets. The Army paid \$119,515 to Packard Bell Electronics Corp., Los Angeles, Calif., to develop this equipment, which began in June 1960, and was completed in 1962.

In August 1965, the Army negotiated the first in a series of noncompetitive contracts with this firm, the last of which was awarded January 22, 1969, for a total of \$1,262,809.58, making a grand

total of something in the order of \$8 million awarded to this company for this equipment, including nearly \$2 million for what, a bit cynically, is called a competitive data package to which I shall refer later.

From August 1965 through January 1969, the Army purchased approximately 1,100 production units of the AN/APM-123( ) at a price that never went below \$5,000 per unit.

In the last award, on January 22, 1969, the Army purchased 195 units and paid \$6,450 per unit, despite the fact that the Army held an unsolicited bid—dated November 11, 1968—from another supplier who offered to manufacture the 195 units for \$4,784 per unit, for a total of \$932,880—and that was \$329,929.58 lower than the high bid which, took the contract on the basis of “urgency” of delivery.

In consideration of that often-used official alibi, it must be kept in mind that this equipment was a radio test set used in the field to test airborne radio sets already in service, and that “urgency” of delivery is a tired old expression invoked on official procurement documents to supply authority to award a contract to virtually anyone whom the procurement people want to have it, outlandish price notwithstanding.

After considerable pressure was applied against the Army Electronics Command from within the electronics industry to finally permit open, competitive bidding for this then-ancient equipment, the Army, on April 28, 1969, did accept competitive bids for this equipment under invitation DAAB05-69-B-0348 covering 241 units. Multronics, Inc., Rockville, Md., bid a unit price of \$2,074. Hydrospace Systems, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, quoted a unit price of \$2,075. In a total field of 26 bidders, the average bid was \$3,700 for this equipment which the Army had been buying from Packard Bell since 1965 on a noncompetitive basis for well over \$5,000 per unit. Packard Bell, incidentally, is a subsidiary of Teledyne, recently mentioned in Senator PROXMIRE's listing of the top 100 defense contractors, together with his list of “retired” military officers who form a very active part in that same military-industrial complex against which the late President Eisenhower warned several years ago.

Yet, there is still more to even this relatively small example of dollar wasting and competition restricting: I have been informed by a highly reliable source within the electronics industry that the foreign market for this piece of equipment to which I refer in this example is at least equal to the demands of the U.S. Army. In short, then, what the Army has, in effect, done, is to pay for the initial development of a product, then provide an uncontested market for the exclusive benefit of Packard Bell—first, within the Army, and later, to a broad market overseas. And all of this has been tersely justified on the claimed basis of “urgency” of need in the interest of providing for the national defense. In all reality, it might better be classified as, shall we say, a giant hoax which has cost the U.S.

taxpayer an estimated \$3,000,000 more than necessary.

The very worst part, I would like to mention, is the fact that the Army paid Packard Bell over nearly \$2 million for a "competitive data package" and ancillary items required for use in the subsequent—and only—competitive procurement under DAAB05-69-B-0348. I would like to place into the RECORD the specific language included in this procurement document which warned all potential bidders against possible defects in the very drawings which were officially provided for bid preparation:

NOTE.—Special attention is invited to the provision herein, entitled "Production Evaluation." Under the provision, among other things, the contractor agrees to accept at no increase in contract price or delay in delivery during the life of the contract certain changes in the technical data. For example, although the drawings cited for construction cover the design of the equipment, the compatibility of drawing detail has not been proven out, and, furthermore, the drawings do not define the necessary production techniques in sufficient detail to follow successful manufacture without contractor production engineering effort. The unit price of the equipment shall reflect the distributed costs of the effort required by the production evaluation provision which includes production engineering.

In other words, the Army is saying that it does not guarantee that the unit manufactured by the drawings officially provided will result in the production of a unit which will meet the Army requirements; this, in spite of the fact that the Army already paid about \$2 million for the "package." You will note that they do not say these drawings are unsuitable. They only hint that they may be unsuitable, and urge all bidders to increase their bids accordingly, although they do not say to what degree these prices should be increased. Senator PROXMIER's list of names on the Teledyne payroll today may include those officers who were responsible for all this since 1960, but there are many more important things for us to do here in the Congress than try to make a case on that basis. It is fair, however, to apportion the blame to those officials who remain in office who were responsible for the last \$1,262,809.58 noncompetitive contract negotiated with Packard Bell in January 1969. That requirement certainly could not have been urgent unless somebody in logistics deliberately delayed the procurement requisition until that condition did prevail, in which event, that individual should be identified and removed from office, along with General Latta and Colonel Cooperhouse who, in this one stroke, cost the taxpayers \$853,125 more than necessary when they paid \$6,450 for 195 units of this AN/APM-123( ) when they could have purchased it for \$2,074 as proven in the competitive bidding 3 months later.

Unfortunately, this practice of non-competitive bidding, and its resultant dollar waste and competition restriction is not limited to just the Army Electronics Command. It is practiced in other divisions of the Department of Defense as well.

Admittedly, therefore, this is one small isolated case. But there are many such

instances, and Congress should call a halt to this practice of "negotiating" contracts or hold those in authority personally responsible for such waste.

I include the following information table at this point:

SCPHILA IFB DAAB05-69-B-0348—OPENED  
APRIL 28, 1969—AN/APM-123( )  
AN/APM-123( ) Transponder Test Set, in accordance with Military Specification Mil-

T-55605 with exception cited in procurement document and Drawing SC-DL-538301(A). Quantity: 241 units of AN/APM-123( ) (V)1 and 1 unit of AN/APM-123( ) (V)3. (Previous Procurement: Development by Packard Bell and after that sole-source with Packard Bell for a half-dozen deals which came to \$8 Million averaging like \$5,000 a unit, where on 1/22/69 an award with Packard Bell for \$1,262,810 covering 195 units for an average \$6,475.00 each.):

Name of firms bidding IFB 69-348 and terms	241 each (V)1		1 each (V)3	
	w/BCP	MIIP&P	BCP	MIIP&P
1. Multronics, Inc., Rockville, Md., 1/2 percent-20, + drawings \$320.....	\$2,074.00	\$2,078.00	\$2,295.00	\$2,299.00
2. Hydro-Space Systems, Cedar Rapids, 2 percent-20, no charge drawings.....	2,075.00	2,075.00	2,975.00	2,075.00
3. United Telecontrol Electronics, N.J., 3/4 percent-20, + \$250.....	2,377.00	2,382.00	2,377.00	2,382.00
4. Republic Electronics Industries, 1/2 percent-10, plus \$752.....	2,463.00	2,468.00	2,463.00	2,468.00
5. Radiometrics Division, Polaroid Electronics, net, plus \$398.52.....	2,767.56	2,768.14	2,767.56	2,768.14
6. Orion Electronics Corp., 1/10 percent-20, plus \$50.....	2,813.13	2,881.13	2,818.13	2,818.13
7. Sentinel Electronics, Inc., 1/10 percent-20, plus \$250.....	2,975.00	2,986.00	2,975.00	2,985.00
8. LTV Electrosystems Inc., net drawings included.....	2,993.00	2,996.00	2,993.00	2,996.00
9. Dero R. & D. Corp., 2 percent-20, plus drawings \$500.....	3,009.00	3,013.00	2,993.00	2,997.00
10. Electrospace Corp., 1/50 percent-20, plus \$2,500.....	3,165.00	3,170.00	3,198.00	3,203.00
11. Frequency Engineering Laboratories, 1/2 percent-20, plus \$380.....	3,182.00	3,184.00	3,153.00	3,155.00
12. Nuclear Corp. of America, 1/10 percent-20, no bid drawings.....	3,210.00	3,212.00	3,200.00	3,202.00
13. Honeywell, Inc., Tampa, Fla., net, plus \$1,031.....	3,217.00	3,218.00	3,284.00	3,285.00
14. Polan Industries, Huntington, W. Va., net, plus \$2,581.....	3,262.00	3,265.00	3,262.00	3,265.00
15. Admiral Systems Corp., Chicago, net, plus \$300.....	3,395.00	3,398.00	3,375.00	3,378.00
16. Henry Products Co., Inc., 2 percent-20, plus \$750.....	3,641.83	3,644.83	3,629.40	3,632.40
17. Darc, Inc., Troy, Ohio, 1/2 percent-10, no bid drawings.....	3,724.67	3,725.78	3,724.67	3,725.78
18. S. W. Electronics & Manufacturing Corp., 1/10 percent-20, no charge drawings.....	3,878.00	3,880.00	3,878.00	3,880.00
19. Allied Research Associates, Inc., Baltimore, net, + \$1,100.....	3,890.00	3,984.00	3,890.00	3,984.00
20. Texcon Corp., Indianapolis, net, plus \$6,500.....	3,900.00	3,905.00	3,900.00	3,905.00
21. Barker & Williamson, Bristol, Pa., net, plus \$95.....	3,994.46	4,006.95	4,012.43	4,024.92
22. Airborne Instrument Laboratories, net, plus \$950.....	4,349.00	4,353.00	4,349.00	4,353.00
23. Applied Devices Corp., net, plus \$240.....	4,390.00	4,392.00	4,390.00	4,392.00
24. Stewart-Warner Electronics, Chicago, net drawings included.....	4,404.00	4,410.00	4,399.00	4,405.00
25. Packard Bell, Newbury Park, Calif., net, no charge drawings.....	5,145.00	5,156.00	5,145.00	5,156.00
26. LFE Electronics, Waltham, Mass., net, plus \$2,000.....	7,154.00	7,168.00	7,154.00	7,168.00

Note: Packard Bell also quoted 241 units with waiver \$5,045 and \$5,056.

RESIGNATION OF JUSTICE FORTAS

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 9 a.m., the President accepted the resignation of Mr. Justice Fortas of the Supreme Court. As a direct result of the recent and persistent adverse publicity of certain of the personal affairs of Mr. Fortas, I believe this action was not only necessary, but proper. The integrity of and confidence in the U.S. Supreme Court, the highest judicial tribunal in the land, cannot long withstand these public attacks when the propriety of the actions of one of its members is held in question.

AN SST ALTERNATIVE

(Mr. MACGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the New York Times, in its editorial of May 13 entitled "An SST Alternative," has endorsed the approach contained in legislation introduced by Congressman FRANK BOW and by me which seeks to substitute private-investor risk money for public funds in the further financing of supersonic transport airplane development.

For more than 3 years Congressman BOW and I have advocated the creation of an entity, the SST authority, to be publicly controlled but privately financed so that individual Americans could pur-

chase an interest in this commercial venture. Our idea would provide a marketplace test for the claim that money invested in the American SST will return handsome dividends.

In May 1966 I urged the House of Representatives to cut out \$280 million in public funds for SST development and was defeated on a voice vote. On July 18, 1967, I moved to delete \$142.3 million in new public SST spending. This motion went down to defeat on an 80-to-30 teller vote. On October 18, 1967, I moved again to cut back SST appropriations by \$142.3 million, and this time lost by the narrow margin of 8 votes.

These efforts finally bore fruit last year when the Congress deleted the entire \$223 million originally recommended in the previous administration's fiscal 1969 budget for continued development of the SST. We should now phase in the alternative financing plan and substitute private-investor risk money for public funds in this program.

While America's great human needs remain shortchanged, we cannot afford vast additional Federal expenditures on the commercial supersonic transport airplane. The needs of the ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-educated, and ill-trained must receive priority attention over the convenience of the few who might enjoy faster air travel.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the New York Times editorial at this point in the RECORD:

AN SST ALTERNATIVE

President Nixon was not responsible for the erroneous decision to subsidize the development of a supersonic passenger plane

at a time when Government funds were sorely needed for programs of social welfare and private industry was capable of bearing the financial burden. But he now has an opportunity to undo a mistake and strike a blow for the more rational ordering of Federal spending priorities.

Since the Government has already advanced \$650 million for the S.S.T.—or about half of its total contribution—it cannot withdraw without running the risk of having the entire enterprise collapse. But there are viable alternatives, the most promising of which is the establishment of a public S.S.T. authority.

The Government's S.S.T. contribution should be converted to a preferred equity interest in a new public corporation with variable proportions of the total common stock being reserved for the airlines and the investing public. To the extent necessary, the S.S.T. authority would be authorized to raise development funds by selling bonds whose interest and principal were guaranteed by the Federal Government.

In addition to freeing Federal resources for higher priority programs, such an S.S.T. authority scheme offers other advantages. The equity interest feature corrects the defect of the present arrangement in which the Federal Government bears most of the risk in return for a fixed share of profits, if any. And to the extent that funds were raised by selling common stock, the S.S.T. would be subjected to a critical test in the market place.

#### RESIGNATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICE ABE FORTAS

(Mr. BROCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas is a historical event without precedent. Certainly, Mr. Fortas should have resigned—there is no question about that.

More important, however, is the fact that we are dealing here—not with an individual—but with the prestige and credibility of one of our three great constitutional institutions, the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Fortas scandal has dealt the Supreme Court a telling blow.

Because of its peculiar place and role within our constitutional structure the Court must strictly avoid even the slightest trace of impropriety, prejudice, or bias in its decisions. The indiscretions of former Justice Fortas have cast a shadow that must be dispelled—our first concern must be to restore the integrity of the Court.

Therefore, I believe it is incumbent upon Chief Justice Warren to order a full review of all decisions in which Justice Fortas cast a deciding vote. While I recognize the magnitude of such a request, nothing short of a complete review can restore that universal trust and respect which is so necessary if we are to maintain adherence to the law of our land.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON MOVES TOWARD PEACE

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, last eve-

ning President Nixon reported to the Nation on the war in Vietnam. In what I consider to be the most forthright and meaningful expression of this country's position on the war, the President said:

Nothing could have a greater effect in convincing the enemy that he should negotiate in good faith than to see the American people united behind a generous and reasonable peace offer.

I believe the President's proposals for bringing peace in Vietnam are sufficiently and forthrightly stated that meaningful negotiations can and I hope will immediately follow. I wholeheartedly support him as I am sure the majority of American people will support him in the effort for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that an America united behind the President's new and forceful initiative will be the first step toward ending the fighting in Vietnam for it will demonstrate to the enemy that they cannot hope to win the war by a breakdown of resolve here at home.

I am highly encouraged by the President's personal leadership and the spelling out of specific proposals for terminating the war in Vietnam. A firm re-statement of America's commitment to South Vietnam coupled with concrete proposals for mutual troop withdrawals followed by a freely selected government offers to date the best hope for meaningful negotiations toward an honorable and lasting peace in Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia.

Bringing an end to the tragic loss of American lives in Vietnam while at the same time insuring that those who have given their lives in defense of freedom have not done so in vain is the President's goal and the Nation's goal, I believe. This desired result can be achieved through successful negotiations along the lines of the peace formula set down by the President last night.

#### OFFSHORE SHELL MINING RIGHTS CLAIMED BY COASTAL PETROLEUM A THREAT TO BEACH AREA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the paramount public interest in the submerged lands in and around the State of Florida is being placed in jeopardy as a result of a 28-year-old oil and mineral exploration agreement entered into by the State of Florida with the Arnold Exploration Co. The agreement in question was purchased by the Coastal Petroleum Co. in 1947, and Coastal is now seeking to exercise what it claims are its rights under the agreement by requesting a permit to drill for limerock in Lake Okeechobee in central-southern Florida, by announcing its intention to drill for shell less than 100 feet off the coast of Treasure Island in my congressional district on the Gulf of Mexico and by claiming it is entitled to payment for any shell included in the dredging of sand on to Treasure Island Beach as part of a beach erosion control project.

Congress long ago recognized the vital public interest in submerged lands by requiring the applicant to apply for a permit to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers before beginning any mining or other exploratory operations which could in any way interfere with navigation or the broader public interest.

It is my opinion that the rights being asserted by Coastal Petroleum are contrary to public policy and therefore invalid. This, of course, is a matter for the courts to decide and it is my understanding that some of these questions are presently being litigated. In the meantime, however, it is my belief that no permit should be issued to mine limerock in Okeechobee and I have made my position on this matter known to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the entire Congress because the legal questions involved could have a broad effect on public works projects throughout the United States. It raises the question of the rights of the people to basic sand and fill material to accomplish public works projects and whether a company which holds a lease like the one held by Coastal Petroleum can infringe on these rights.

In the Treasure Island situation, there are other legal questions to be decided including whether the claims of Coastal Petroleum to payment for any shell included in the dredging of sand as part of the beach erosion control project are valid, whether Coastal's announced intention to dredge this material itself is contrary to the rights of upland owners, and whether shell is a mineral included in the agreement in the first place.

Following is an editorial which appeared in the May 2, 1969, issue of the St. Petersburg Independent discussing the adverse effect such mining would have on the basic economy of the west coast of Florida:

#### INDEPENDENT EDITORS SPEAK: OFFSHORE SHELL MINING A THREAT TO BEACH AREA

You've got the water. Now think hard! What is the one other thing you need to make a beach?

Even a shepherd from the Alps could answer that—sand.

How much is sand worth to an area like the Suncoast, an area which depends upon tourists who like to swim in the surf and soak up the sun?

Obviously, you can't put a price tag on such a precious commodity. To the economy of the Suncoast, each grain of sand is as valuable as gold, providing it is located where nature left it—on the beaches.

Federal, state and local governments are spending some \$750,000 to rebuild the eroded beach at Treasure Island. A related project at Indian Rocks Beach raises the total cost to \$846,000 for a little more than two miles of beach.

That gives you some idea of how valuable sand is.

Coastal Petroleum Corp., which has a monopoly on exploration rights for minerals on 4.5 million acres of submerged land off the Gulf Coast and in 11 state lakes, now has asked the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for a permit to explore a 600-acre tract about 1,000 feet off Treasure Island.

According to a company official, the object of the search would be deposits of shell material which could be mined and sold commercially to be used as a base for roadbeds and driveways.

It is a callous request. It is inconceivable that a public-minded company would seek to take material from the Gulf floor less than a quarter mile from a beach which is being renourished at a cost of \$750,000 to the taxpayers.

But Coastal is even complaining about the beach renourishment project, claiming it is using sand which is on land leased to the firm under its mineral rights contract.

Coastal Petroleum's attempt to rape Lake Okeechobee by opening a limestone mining operation there already is the subject of a controversy which has reached the White House.

No doubt this request also will touch off a lively controversy.

But Coastal Petroleum's lease cannot allow the firm to go merrily on its way, jeopardizing the public's beaches, water supply, flood control projects and recreational areas.

The public good demands that the firm's request for an exploration permit be denied.

#### RESIGNATION OF JUSTICE FORTAS

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of Justice Fortas removes the cloud of suspicion which has hung over the Supreme Court since the disclosure that he received and belatedly returned \$20,000 to the Wolfson Foundation. However, it would appear to me that a serious breach of legal ethics has occurred. If the appropriate bar associations cannot deal with the situation, perhaps congressional action will be needed.

In addition, it should be clear now that disclosure of outside income by Federal judges is necessary to maintain the integrity of our judicial system. Since the disclosure provisions affecting Congress badly need strengthening, the provisions of the Court must be stricter to be meaningful.

#### STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF INCREASING THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION FROM \$600 TO \$1,200

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation, H.R. 10841, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal exemption for the taxpayer, his spouse, and dependents from \$600 to \$1,200. I introduced similar legislation in the last Congress, but, unfortunately, it was not acted upon. The urgency of this legislation increases daily.

The evidence is unmistakable. All agree that when the Federal income tax was originally enacted in 1913, Congress sought to leave "free and untouched" enough income to permit support of a family according to a proper standard of living. The exemptions at that time were set at \$3,000 for a single individual and \$4,000 for married couples.

Since that time, of course, we have had an unhappy combination of two world wars, the cold war, the Korean war, the Vietnam conflict and inflation which has resulted in the personal ex-

emption being reduced to the point that it no longer even remotely relates to the intent of the original income tax law.

The present \$600 exemption was provided by the Revenue Act of 1948. In the 20 years that have passed since its adoption the cost of living has increased 44.6 percent. The vast majority of the States which have an income tax, and the District of Columbia, allow a personal exemption in excess of the present \$600 Federal exemption. At least 10 of the States have personal exemptions equal to \$1,200 or above. My own State, Iowa, has a tax credit of \$15 per person, which is roughly equal to a \$2,300 exemption.

It is time for the Federal Government to act. Congress cannot raise its own salaries and be blind to the needs of the rest of the population.

The often heard claim that we are presently in the longest period of uninterrupted prosperity the United States has ever known has a hollow ring to those who are barely making ends meet because of the high cost of living. I know the heavy inroads that have been made in the real purchasing power of the middle- and lower-income taxpayer. State and local taxes have been increasing at a rapid rate; the Federal tax surcharge was made effective April 1, 1968, and social security taxes just went up this January. Inflation, which has been creeping for many years, increased its tempo in 1968 when the cost of living rose 4.2 percent, the largest annual rise in 17 years. The brutal truth is that living costs for millions of our citizens are rising faster than paychecks. The real wages of those in the manufacturing industries, for example, have virtually stood still since 1965 while the cost of living increased 10.3 percent.

Prices on everything we buy from automobiles to groceries continue to spiral upward. Bad as these are, they are paled by the relentless increase in the cost of services. Medical costs continue to skyrocket. Auto and appliance repairs, mortgages and services in general are all costing more.

For parents of college students the present \$600 exemption is even more unrealistic than it is for those with children living at home. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that the average charges for tuition, fees, and room and board for a full-time resident, undergraduate student in a public 4-year institution for the 1968-69 school year will total \$1,114. In a private 4-year institution the cost for the year is estimated to be \$2,297. And who today, will argue that a college education is a luxury?

Immediate relief is needed. It is my firm conviction that an increase in the personal exemption is the best method to achieve this objective.

Those who argue most strongly against an increase in the personal exemption do so in terms of the revenue that will be lost to the Government. They should reassess their thinking to include considerations of equity, primarily and secondarily, the fact that additional revenue will be generated by the additional funds in the economy generated by the higher personal exemptions.

To reduce the impact of the initial revenue loss and also to restrict the benefit of the increased personal exemption to those who need it the most, this legislation provides that the increase in the exemption is to be limited. The increase in the exemption is to decline with the increasing income and eventually disappear at high income levels. Under my bill the increase in personal exemption for the individual will decrease \$1 for every \$10 his adjusted gross income exceeds \$20,000. For a married couple the increase in the personal exemption will begin to diminish at the same rate when their adjusted gross joint income exceeds \$40,000. The higher figure for a married couple is not a substantively higher amount but is technically necessary because of the split income provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Federal income tax system has succeeded because it has generally been based on the ability-to-pay principle and is considered to be progressive. However, we have the right to question the fairness of our tax system when it enables special interest groups to pay relatively low taxes or to avoid the payment of taxes altogether, and the bulk of the people are having difficulty making ends meet after paying taxes. If we must have inequity in our tax system, and perfection is impossible to achieve, of course such inequity should be in favor of the average worker and the family which are the backbone of our society.

It is my belief that there is no single tax reform more urgent than this proposal. Reform is, of course, needed throughout the entire Federal tax structure to remove serious inequities and abuses. I am pleased that the House Ways and Means Committee in recognition of the urgent need for reform has conducted extensive hearings which began on February 18. Overall tax reform is such a tremendous undertaking that enactment of all necessary legislation may well encompass both sessions of the 91st Congress. It is my sincere hope that an increase in the personal exemption will be given the highest priority so that its early passage will be assured.

#### A. EFFECT ON INDIVIDUALS

The increase in the personal exemption to \$1,200 will result in billions of dollars of tax savings to individuals. However, we must not look upon these savings to the taxpayer as an equivalent loss to the Government. Some of these tax savings will come back to the Government in the form of higher taxes of other taxpayers. The low to moderate income families will probably spend all or virtually all of the tax savings. Those in the middle-income brackets will spend a good portion of them and often be able to save or invest for the first time. To both groups this extra income will greatly enhance the quality of their living.

In the autumn of 1966 the Department of Labor conducted a survey of 39 metropolitan and four nonmetropolitan regions to determine how much was required for a family of four to maintain a moderate standard of living. The family of four was a hypothetical one consisting of a 38-year-old man with a steady job, a wife

who does not work, a 13-year-old son, and an 8-year-old daughter. A moderate standard of living was defined as providing "for the maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities." This generalized concept was translated into a list of commodities and services which could be priced. The content of the budget was based on the manner of living and consumer choices in the 1960's. It is neither a luxury budget nor a poverty budget. The estimated annual cost of this moderate standard of living averaged \$9,191 in urban areas of the United States, \$9,376 in metropolitan areas, and \$8,366 in smaller cities.

The study found that about 72 percent of the total cost of the budget was allocated to the family's basic needs—food, housing, transportation, clothing, personal care, and medical care. Such costs averaged \$6,610, about \$727 higher in metropolitan areas than in smaller cities. An average of \$719 was included for "other family consumption," which included reading, recreation, education, tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and miscellaneous expenses. In addition to these items of family consumption, the budget included allowances for gifts and contributions, basic life insurance, personal income and social security taxes, and occupational expenses. Personal taxes totaled 11.9 percent of the budget in the metropolitan areas and 11.1 percent in the smaller cities.

Overall budget costs were about \$800 higher for the homeowner than the renter. Homeowners constituted about 75 percent of the families surveyed. This \$800 figure included an average of about \$450 in payments on mortgage principal which was an element of "savings" not included in the budget for renter families. However, the additional income required to cover these mortgage payments also resulted in higher personal taxes for homeowner families, despite the fact that their mortgage interest payments were tax deductible. Few families of the type represented by this budget claimed contributions, interest, and other eligible deductions in excess of the standard deduction.

Total budget costs were highest for homeowner families in metropolitan areas and lowest for renter families in smaller cities, averaging \$9,599 and \$7,946, respectively.

This budget is supposed to reflect an increase in aspirations and expectations as compared to the previous budget published in 1960 reflecting a "modest but adequate" standard of living. However, my immediate reaction to these figures is that if 72 percent of this typical family's income is required for basic consumption expenses, another 12 percent for personal taxes, another 4 percent for social security taxes and occupational expenses, less than 8 percent for other family consumption—the things that give pleasure and enrichment to life—and life insurance and gifts and contributions must come from the balance, then the quality of life for this family leaves much to be desired.

Imagine what an additional \$2,400 a year would mean to this family. For the 25 percent who do not own homes it

would be more than enough to cover the \$800 estimated for the cost of annual mortgage payments and additional personal taxes required and thus enable them to experience the pleasure, pride, and improvement in the manner of living that accompany owning a home.

It will enable this family for the first time to have more than just the minimum savings represented by life insurance—averaging \$160 in premiums for a year—and social security.

Since the children in this hypothetical family were under college age, this budget contained practically nothing for higher educational expense. But for a family with similar expenditures and college-age children, \$2,400 could mean the difference between providing them higher education or their having to seek employment with only a high school education.

This additional money would enable this family group to eat out in a restaurant once in a while. The hardworking housewife will particularly appreciate this.

The budget allows for auto ownership for most of the families in these cities, but the standard only provides for the purchase of a used car every 4 years; \$2,200 could mean a new car or at the very least a better used car.

In other words, the additional money available to this family through the increased personal exemption would give it, often for the first time, a broader spectrum of choices, not based solely on necessity.

To the really low-income family this increase in personal exemption would eliminate the necessity for their paying Federal income taxes completely. A social security study of poverty in 1966 showed the "poverty line" for a nonfarm family of four was \$3,335. Anyone who falls below the poverty line will have less than a minimum diet for health or will have to choose between necessities. Michael Harrington goes a step further and believes it is probably justified to include all Americans in 1969 with family incomes—for four, in a city—of less than \$5,000 to be within "the magnetic field of poverty."

Under present tax law a family of four with an adjusted gross income of \$3,335 has to pay \$46 in Federal income taxes. With an adjusted gross income just under \$5,000 they would have to pay \$286 in income taxes. My legislation would eliminate the payment of Federal income taxes at these levels completely.

#### B. EFFECT ON THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

The importance of placing additional money into the hands of the consumer is indicated by the fact that personal expenditures represent over 60 percent of the gross national product. The additional tax savings accruing to individuals will also increase the incomes of grocery stores, appliance dealers, clothing manufacturers, and others. As these billions of dollars of increased purchasing power are spent, re-spent through the economy, they will eventually increase consumer demand by several times the original amount.

This increase in demand for both goods and services will, in turn, spur

greater productive investment to meet the greater output required to meet the expanding consumer market, as well as the development of new techniques and new products. As production increases, so will profits. These increased profits will provide more funds for expansion, and continuing expansion will enable employment to remain at high levels as, hopefully, we return to a peacetime economy.

This ongoing process of high production, high profits, and high levels of employment will result in a larger tax base for the Federal Government, so that it will have a net loss much less than the amount of tax savings to individuals as a result of increasing exemptions.

#### C. EFFECT ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

We are all aware that at the present time various measures have been undertaken to dampen a too buoyant economy. It might appear that any move to place additional money in the hands of the consumer would serve to cancel out these efforts. But efforts to slow the economy and thus halt inflation are already making significant headway. The next step may very well be the need to prevent a tendency toward recession and an increase in unemployment.

The time lag between the introduction of legislation and its final enactment is all too well known. It is my fervent hope that the timing of this legislation will coincide with the needs of the overall economy. However, its passage today would not be soon enough for those caught in the cost-of-living squeeze.

I do not share the pessimistic views of those who think that military expenditures will continue at an extremely high rate when the hostilities in Vietnam are concluded. The pressure from the military for bigger and better weapons systems will be there, of course. And I certainly want to keep our defenses at a safe level. Also it will be necessary to restore inventories, which have been depleted by the Vietnam war, to normal levels and additional troops will undoubtedly be required for some time in Vietnam.

However, my trip to Vietnam last year convinced me that the United States should never again allow itself to become involved in this kind of futile disaster. Also, I feel there is such revulsion to war as a solution to our international problems, particularly among the young people all over the world, that peace has a better chance of being achieved than ever before. We do not want to return to isolationism, and our national security must always be paramount, but any objective view of our priorities must show that solution of our domestic problems is as important to our society as the solution of our international problems. There have been many hopeful signs, such as the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, that the Soviet Union too, is interested in diverting its resources and attention from military considerations to the long neglected social needs of its citizenry.

The needs on the domestic scene in the United States are all too evident—jobs for the hard-core unemployed, educational improvement at all levels but particularly for the culturally deprived,

inadequate housing, congestion, poverty, pollution, and the exodus of rural Americans to the cities. The Federal Government has initiated numerous programs to attack these problems, and many of them have been successful. The leadership must still be provided by the Federal Government but the real thrust must come from the private sector and the single most important factor is jobs.

An increase in the personal exemption will provide the funds necessary to stimulate the economy as the amount of military spending is decreased. By placing more money in the hands of the consumers in the form of tax savings, the demand for consumer oriented goods and services will increase. Government funds can be concentrated in those areas where private industry cannot operate profitably—such as training the hard-core unemployed. Once trained there should be jobs available because of the expanding economy.

More funds will be available for saving and investment. The increase in the availability of funds for mortgages will serve to stimulate the construction of housing which is one of the most urgent needs of our society.

By being able more easily to satisfy their material needs, a greater segment of the population will be able to work toward fulfilling the needs of the community and toward healing the divisions that are causing so much unhappiness and unrest in the Nation today.

Mr. Speaker, in his inaugural address President Nixon stated that "we are approaching the limits of what Government alone can do." This legislation will enable each of us to turn away from the necessity for Government aid to our own resources. I urge my colleagues to assist me in assuring the passage of this legislation.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WAGGONER, for May 19 and 20, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, today, for 10 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLD) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, today, for 5 minutes.  
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE, today, for 10 minutes.  
Mr. QUIE, today, for 10 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MARSH, for 30 minutes, on May 19.  
Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, on May 19.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DOWDY and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GROSS and to include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. RUPPE to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS in two instances.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. MCEWEN in 10 instances.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. MESKILL in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. DENNEY.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. SCHADEBERG in two instances.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. QUILLEN.

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

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. REUSS in six instances.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. DADDARIO in three instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. STUCKEY in two instances.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. VANIK in three instances.

Mr. MILLER of California in three instances.

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. PHILBIN in four instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in three instances.

Mr. MANN in three instances.

Mr. RIVERS.

Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.

Mr. WATTS in two instances.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1287. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 to

carry out the metric system study; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H.R. 33. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8794. An act to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 19, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

773. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report that no disbursements have been made as of March 31, 1969, from the appropriation for "Contingencies, defense," in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of that act (Public Law 90-580); to the Committee on Appropriations.

774. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of the increases in cost of two construction projects being undertaken for the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

775. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 54th annual report of the Board, for 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

776. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize in the District of Columbia a program of public day care services and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

777. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a listing of the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission during fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 705(d) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 or rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4204. A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Fifth report on recreational boating safety (pt. 2) (Rept. No. 91-250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11400. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1828. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon James F. Wegener (Rept. No. 91-251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 11306. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 11307. A bill to provide for educational assistance for gifted and talented children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11308. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 11309. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 11310. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 11311. A bill to adjust the postal revenues and to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11312. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11313. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 11314. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code, relating to control of outdoor advertising along Federal-aid highways, in order to authorize one

or more pilot programs for the purpose of such section; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 11315. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter dollar pieces with a likeness of the late President Dwight David Eisenhower on one side; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 11316. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11317. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11318. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11319. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the limitation upon the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 11320. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11321. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 11322. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms to develop methods for detecting storms for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 11323. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 11324. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 11325. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to increase the amount of assistance to such academies and to provide a minimum subsistence payable per student; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11326. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11327. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11328. A bill to modernize the U.S. postal establishment, to provide for efficient and economical postal service to the public, to improve postal employee-management relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11329. A bill to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11330. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweek of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11331. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 11332. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 11333. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to certain beekeepers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11334. A bill to amend chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11335. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for employers who employ members of the hard-core unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 11337. A bill to prohibit federally insured banks from making unsolicited commitments to extend credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11338. A bill to safeguard the consumer by requiring greater standards of care in the issuance of unsolicited credit cards and by limiting the liability of consumers for the unauthorized use of credit cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 11339. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11340. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 11341. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11342. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum monthly benefits thereunder at age 72 for all uninsured individuals, without regard to the time at which such age is attained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11343. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the U.S. mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 11344. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11345. A bill to permit the Federal Government to further assist the States in the control of illegal gambling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Mr. BEVILL):

H.R. 11346. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide grants to States for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers, to make the national emergency telephone number 911 available throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 11347. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. OBEY, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. REES, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 11348. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 11349. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 11350. A bill to repeal a portion of the act of July 15, 1968, relating to entrance, admission, and recreation user fees in connection with the national parks and other Federal areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11351. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. BETTS, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 11352. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the western division of the northern judicial district of Ohio shall constitute an additional judicial district in Ohio and to authorize two district judges for such judicial district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11353. A bill, the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 11354. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11355. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ANDERSON of California, and Mr. EDMONDSON):

H.R. 11356. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for an Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 11357. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in the benefits payable thereunder, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 11358. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that any 5-year-level premium term plan policy of U.S. Government life insurance shall be deemed paid when premiums paid in, less dividends, equal the amount of the policy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11359. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 11360. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions and retired pay of judges performing full-time judicial services after mandatory retirement age be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 11361. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention and treatment of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 11362. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the acquisition of land in Maryland under the Endangered Species Preservation Act of October 15, 1966; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LENNON (for himself, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PELLY, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KARTH, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FREY, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. FEIGAN):

H.R. 11363. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 11364. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11365. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.R. 11366. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms, to develop methods for detecting storms for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUKENS (for himself and Mr. BROCK):

H.R. 11367. A bill to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCFALL (for himself and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 11368. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 11369. A bill to require quarterly disclosure to the Comptroller General of the United States of the sources and amount of all outside income received by any person serving as a Federal judge, a Member of Congress, or a policymaking official in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11370. A bill to make it a Federal crime for anyone to pay, or to offer to pay, and for any Federal judge, Member of Congress, or policymaking official in the executive branch of the Government to receive, any sum greater than \$500 for a speech, published work, professional service, personal appearance, or otherwise by way of honorarium; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 11371. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to specify the period in which a person is engaged in certain graduate study necessary to the maintenance of the national health; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11372. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in allotted lands in the Tulalip Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1956 (70 Stat. 290); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CULVER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. REES, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 11373. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 11374. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to make the program of aid to families with dependent children a wholly Federal program, to be administered by local agencies under federally prescribed terms and conditions (embodying the eligibility formulas currently in effect in the several States but designed to encourage such States to apply nationally uniform standards), with the cost being fully borne by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11375. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the assignment of a member of an armed force to combat area duty if any of certain relatives of such member dies, is captured, is missing in action, or is totally disabled as a result

of service in the Armed Forces in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11376. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 11377. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 11378. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 11379. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 11380. A bill to provide for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives, Members of the U.S. Senate, justices and judges of the U.S. courts, and policymaking officials of the executive branch as designated by the Civil Service Commission, but including the President, Vice President, and Cabinet members, and by candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency; and to give the House Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Senate Select Committee on Standards of Conduct, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and the Attorney General of the United States appropriate jurisdiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. SISK, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. REES, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. BURTON of California):

H.R. 11381. A bill to establish fee programs for entrance to, and use of, areas administered for outdoor recreation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H.R. 11382. A bill to establish fee programs for entrance to, and use of, areas administered for outdoor recreation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 11383. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases relating to the apportionment of population among districts from which Members of Congress are elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 11400. A bill making supplemental ap-

propriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 720. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the continuance in office of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 721. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.J. Res. 722. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to interstate boundary agreements delimiting lateral boundaries in the territorial sea and delimiting spheres of influence beyond the areas of absolute sovereign jurisdiction should need for such further delimitation arise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. GUDE, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. KYROS, and Mr. HORTON):

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution to improve the care of homeless children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. POWELL, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GILBERT, and Mr. RYAN):

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the President should direct an immediate unconditional withdrawal of 100,000 U.S. troops from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 408. Resolution commending Secretary Maurice Stans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 409. Resolution authorizing reprinting of "Panel on Science and Technology 10th Meeting—Science and Technology and the Cities. Proceedings before the Committee on Science and Astronautics"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 410. Resolution authorizing reprinting of "Technical Information for Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. Res. 411. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the generous and humanitarian projects undertaken by foster parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

167. By Mr. CORBETT: Memorial of the Senate of Pennsylvania urging the adoption of the proposed commemorative stamp honoring Dwight D. Eisenhower, depicting the Civil War Monument and the U.S. flag in Center Square, Easton, Pa; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

168. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to amending the Sugar Act to allow the mainland cane sugar area to fill a portion of the unused Puerto Rico quota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

169. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to restoration of funds to become available for the Fryng

Pan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

170. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska, relative to amending the Jones Act to allow the transportation of vehicles and passengers between U.S. ports on the vessel *M. V. Wickersham*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

171. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11384. A bill for the relief of Roberto Meade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11385. A bill for the relief of Mary E. O'Connor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 11386. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hui-Fang Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 11387. A bill for the relief of Constanca B. Dimaenka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11388. A bill for the relief of Dr. Felix Jarabo Martin, his wife, Maria Martin, and their minor son, Carlos Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 11389. A bill relating to the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 11390. A bill for the relief of George Bombardiere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11391. A bill relating to the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11392. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tatiana Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 11393. A bill for the relief of Constantine Foster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 11394. A bill relating to the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 11395. A bill for the relief of Rev. Father Luis Iscla Roviera, S.J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 11396. A bill for the relief of Tam Wai King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11397. A bill for the relief of Carole Ann Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11398. A bill for the relief of Faustino Murgoa-Melendrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11399. A bill for the relief of J. Jesus Vasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

111. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gordon F. Dollar, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.