

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 20, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Danny Cottrell, Church of Christ, West Memphis, Ark., offered the following prayer:

Holy God, our Father, Creator of heaven and earth, we thank Thee for this day of life and the blessings thereof. We pause to pay homage and praise to Thy holy and righteous name. We ask Thy guidance upon the deliberations of this great body of Representatives. We pray Thy blessings upon all those who lead in the affairs of our Nation. During this time of international crises and internal turmoil, may we find the solution to our problems through the guidance of Thy word. Through Thy divine direction, may this Nation return to righteousness. We pray for a rededication to the basic principles upon which this great Nation was founded. And above all, help each of us, from the smallest to the greatest, to learn to rest our faith in Thee, the true and the living God.

For this is our prayer, in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATION FROM THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

MAY 6, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with much regret that I must advise you of my necessity to resign from the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group. I understand this conference will take place in Canada from June 3 to June 8, and in checking my schedule for this time I find I have already accepted an invitation to address the graduating class of the Dunbar High School in my district.

This is an invitation which was extended and accepted last November, and it would cause serious difficulties if the date were to be altered or my presence canceled. Therefore, I thought it best that I disassociate myself from the Group in view of these circumstances.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN M. SLACK.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE U.S. DELEGATION OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the

Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from Maine, Mr. KYROS, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

GUEST CHAPLAIN, DANNY COTTRELL

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege for us to have a young minister from my home district with us today to offer our opening prayer.

Danny Cottrell is minister of the Church of Christ in West Memphis. At 29, he has already distinguished himself in several areas, having been recognized for his writing, speaking, and spiritual leadership. Just last year he was a winner of a Freedom Foundation Award for public address.

We in Congress are acutely aware that many of our problems can be solved only in the hearts and minds of our people, not by legislation. It is the dedication and leadership such as Mr. Cottrell is giving in eastern Arkansas that gives me cause for optimism as we face these troubled times.

I am proud to represent Mr. Cottrell and am proud to introduce him to my colleagues here today. It is my hope that we can have him lead us in prayer again in the future.

POLITICAL JOBS

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have here a piece from the ticker which I would like to call to the attention of that assiduous watchdog of superfluous supergrades, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). This article on the ticker just in reads as follows:

POLITICAL JOBS

(By H. L. Schwartz III)

WASHINGTON.—While the Nixon Administration talks about taking politics out of the Post Office, more and more jobs are being created in other departments that could be used for patronage.

In the past month, the Agriculture Department has gotten authority to create 20 new positions in the Farmers Home Administration.

A department official said frankly the jobs are of "political interest."

"We wanted them available but we don't have any plans right now to fill them," he said.

Most other Cabinet members have asked for and received Civil Service Commission authority to create new jobs with fat paychecks that can be filled at the Secretary's whim. . . .

The jobs in question fall under two categories known as schedule C and noncareer executive assignments or NEA.

NEA posts cover the so-called supergrades in the general schedule or GS scale and carry salaries between \$20,000 and \$30,000. . . .

Housing and Urban Development said its

NEA and schedule C positions have increased from 86 to 95 and it wants six more.

Health, Education and Welfare had 84 positions, now has 95 and is asking for more but won't say how many.

Transportation, which got authority to create five new jobs, was the only other agency queried that declined to say how many more it was seeking.

The Justice Department had 53 positions before inauguration, now has 60 and wants another.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad that the gentleman called my attention to this matter. The Johnson administration last year asked, as I remember it, for about 450 more supergrades. This administration is presently asking for 150 additional supergrades.

Mr. HAYS. That is in addition to the 450.

Mr. GROSS. No, no; 150 supergrades.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman raised a big fuss about the supergrades last year. How does he feel about them this year?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa will look very carefully at the request for even 150. He opposed the 450 request last year.

Mr. HAYS. I want to stop this 150, and then we will be even—right where we started.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND AERONAUTICS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

VIETNAM—WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN TROOPS

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

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the American people have, I believe, been generous with President Nixon. He was elected to office on a pledge to bring us peace. It was a pledge that exceeded all others in its importance and its appeal. He even promised the revelation of a secret plan for achieving peace. But, in his recent speech on Vietnam, he has offered us nothing but a modest modification of the program that failed President Johnson and the American people so grievously in the effort to extricate us from the war. It is small wonder that we are disappointed.

My purpose, however, is not to criticize the President, Mr. Speaker; that is a sterile exercise. My concern, rather, is for our country and for the men who are giving their lives every day to a cause that does not justify their blood.

Mr. Nixon says he is seeking a peace "we can be proud of." I am not sure what he means. But I am convinced that the act of which we as a people would be most proud, now and in the future, is the declaration that we will undertake no further offensive action in Vietnam and will begin withdrawing our troops at once. With that objective in mind, Mr. Speaker, I join a group of my colleagues in the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 256, which declares 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.

SOUTH FLORIDA MIGRANT LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM, INC., RECOMMENDED FOR RE-FUNDING BY OEO

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was advised that the Office of Economic Opportunity, after evaluating the work of the South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program, Inc., over the last 2 years, has recommended that this program be re-funded in fiscal year 1970.

I concur wholeheartedly with these findings and urge support of this program so that it can continue to provide desperately needed legal services to migrants in a six-county area of south Florida.

The evaluators have said:

The program has reached the people in the camps, has won their confidence and has achieved formidably in their behalf, perhaps most notably in obtaining, in settlement of a law suit against American Foods, the only migrant labor bargaining agreement within recall of Florida memory. This view is shared by a number of non-migrants interviewed, including non-project lawyers.

I can think of no higher praise than this for a program which is specifically designed to help the poor—both migrant and nonmigrant—who are perhaps the least well represented group in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some controversy over this program, primarily due to a lack of communication between dif-

ferent elements of the six-county area. However, as the evaluation report notes in its conclusion—

The abuse this program has taken publicly is remarkably disproportionate to the actual evidence of wrongdoing which can be produced against it.

The evaluation team did take note of some inadequacies in the program and made recommendations to correct them. However, its overall determination is that it is a good program which should be continued. I am delighted with these findings and join in the recommendation that the program be re-funded.

REPUBLICANS PRAISE PRESIDENT'S NUTRITION PROGRAM

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

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, 64 of our colleagues join with me today in expressing heartfelt appreciation of the leadership President Nixon has given congressional efforts to banish hunger from our land.

In the last two sessions, congressional initiative has scored gains. Yet, as it must be under our system, meaningful programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition had to await the comprehensive action available only to a President.

The national nutrition program proclaimed by Mr. Nixon in his message on May 6, 1969, is a major social breakthrough directed at a root cause of poverty in America.

Personally, and in the name of those in need, I pay tribute to the new leadership which offers realistic proposals to resolve contemporary social problems.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL NUTRITION PROGRAM

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in calling attention to and expressing support for the President's national nutrition program.

Coming from the most agricultural State of the Union, I feel I can speak on behalf of the great farmers of this country who are willing to provide the food-stuffs necessary to feed the vast number of hungry persons in this Nation.

Throughout the history of the United States, the farmers of this Nation have, without fanfare, provided food to support a vast majority of our people. And now I am confident our farmers are ready, willing, and anxious to grow the food necessary to provide a nutritious diet for all our citizens.

The problem of hunger must be approached immediately to eliminate this blight from our country.

President Nixon's proposal provides the leadership to get to the root of the problem.

The President has laid the groundwork. It is now our duty to join the campaign.

THE NATIONAL NUTRITION PROGRAM

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, last week President Nixon sent to Congress a proposal for a comprehensive program to combat the problem of hunger wherever it exists in this country.

About a year ago I sponsored legislation in the House—H.R. 17611—which would have established a bipartisan commission with the responsibility of evaluating the problem of hunger and recommend remedial action.

Unfortunately, when the executive branch failed to support this measure, the Commission was not authorized.

Now the President has provided the leadership we sought last year to get to the root of the problem of hunger. He has mobilized the resources of the Federal Government to accomplish the objectives we sought a year ago.

I am pleased to join in this statement of support for the initiatives which the President has taken in meeting the needs of several million forgotten Americans.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 56]

Adair	Gaydos	Pettis
Ashbrook	Gray	Pollock
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Powell
Baring	Hall	Pryor, Ark.
Barrett	Hastings	Pucinski
Bates	Hébert	Rallsback
Blaggi	Helstoski	Reifel
Blester	Hicks	Riegler
Blanton	Hogan	Rodino
Blatnik	Howard	Ronan
Brook	Hungate	Rooney, Pa.
Broomfield	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Buchanan	Kee	Rumsfeld
Burlison, Mo.	King	Ruppe
Bush	Kirwan	St Germain
Byrne, Pa.	Kuykendall	St. Onge
Cahill	Lowenstein	Sandman
Carey	Lujan	Scheuer
Chisholm	Lukens	Schwengel
Clark	McClory	Shipley
Coughlin	McCloskey	Skubitz
Cowger	McCulloch	Smith, N.Y.
Culver	McKneally	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Mayne	Steiger, Wis.
Dawson	Minshall	Stuckey
Delaney	Mizell	Talcott
Dent	Mollohan	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Moorhead	Tunney
Eckhardt	Morgan	Waggoner
Edwards, La.	Morse	Watkins
Ellberg	Murphy, Ill.	Welcker
Esch	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitehurst
Ford	Myers	Wilson, Bob
William D.	Nichols	Wydler
Frey	Nix	Yates
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Hara	Yatron
Gallagher	Ottinger	Zablocki
Garmatz	Pelly	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

HELEN KELLER MEMORIAL WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 99) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in June of each year as "Helen Keller Memorial Week."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 99

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of Helen Keller's outstanding contribution to the education, welfare, and rehabilitation of blind and deaf persons throughout the world, the President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in June as "Helen Keller Memorial Week", calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1, line 6, after the word "issue" strike out the word "annually".

On page 1, line 7, after the word "June" insert "of 1969".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the first week in June of 1969 as 'Helen Keller Memorial Week'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRODUCE THE TAX REFORM PACKAGE

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, almost every Member of this body has spoken of the tremendous urgency for tax reform and tax relief reported from every section of America.

I continue to be amazed that the administration feels it can defer meaningful, revenue-raising tax reform until next year. Further study is not an acceptable substitute for action.

What is the administration position on depletion, capital gains and production payments? What will the administration learn in November that is not known now?

The urgency of these times must be utilized to produce the tax reform package for which America has waited a long time.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 19, 1969.

The SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's Office at 3:05 p.m., on Monday, May 19, 1969, and said to contain a Message from the President wherein he transmits to the Congress the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries for the Calendar Year 1967.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF ACTUARIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to Section 1444(b), title 10, United States Code, transmitted herewith is the Fourteenth Annual Report of

the Board of Actuaries for the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan, covering the administration of the Plan for Calendar Year 1967.

The Plan, inaugurated in November 1953, provides that members of the uniformed services may elect reduced retired pay during their lifetime in order to provide survivor annuities for their widows and children. The basic principle underlying the Plan is that reductions in retired pay shall be computed by the actuarially-equivalent method using actuarial tables selected by the Board. Thus, the Plan is to be self-supporting, imposing no added cost to the Federal Government, beyond administrative costs.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 19, 1969.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT ON THE NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the first Annual Report on the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. This report covers the period from August 12, 1968, thru December 31, 1968.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 20, 1969.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MUTUAL BENEFIT FOUNDATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2214) for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUNT and Mr. BROWN of Ohio objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FRANK KLEINERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3377) for the relief of Frank Kleinerman.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REDDICK B. STILL, JR., AND RICHARD CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6400) for the relief of Reddick B. Still, Jr., and Richard Carpenter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6400

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$17,318.90 to Reddick B. Still, Junior, of Spartanburg, South Carolina, and Richard Carpenter of Greenville, South Carolina, in full settlement of their claims against the United States for services rendered the Post Office Department in obtaining options on land within the city of Spartanburg, South Carolina, in connection with the relocation of the main post office in that city for which they were never compensated because the Government elected to condemn the land upon which the options to purchase had been secured. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

NOEL S. MARSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6378) for the relief of Noel S. Marston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUNT and Mr. BROWN of Ohio objected, and, under the rule the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN VINCENT AMIRAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2552) for the relief of John Vincent Amiraault.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA CAMILLA GIULIANI NIRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5615) for the relief of Maria Camilla Giuliani Niro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5615

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 312(1)

of that Act shall be inapplicable in the case of Mrs. Maria Camilla Giuliani Niro.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, the provisions of section 316(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as they relate to residence and physical presence requirements for naturalization, shall be inapplicable in the case of Maria Camilla Giuliani Niro."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

REFERENCE OF H.R. 1691—JESUS J. RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 86) referring the bill (H.R. 1691) to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EAGLE LAKE TIMBER CO., A PARTNERSHIP, OF SUSANVILLE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1749) for the relief of Eagle Lake Timber Co., a partnership, of Susanville, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1749

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eagle Lake Timber Company, a partnership comprised of M. W. Crook, John B. Crook, R. H. Emmerson, and A. A. Emmerson, of Susanville, California, the sum of \$43,690, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Eagle Lake Timber Company against the United States for compensation for losses incurred in connection with the performance of a timber sale contract (dated May 25, 1964, Numbered 11-150) between the said Eagle Lake Timber Company and the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, the said Eagle Lake Timber Company having failed, under the provision of the contract for amortizing road costs, to recover a substantial portion of the road construction cost incurred before the contract was terminated by mutual consent of the parties thereto.

Sec. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

CAPT. JOHN W. BOOTH III

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1808) for the relief of Capt. John W. Booth III.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. BEATRICE JAFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1865) for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Jaffe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES PAID BY THE AIR FORCE AT TACHIKAWA AIR BASE, JAPAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2238) to provide for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2238

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person who was a civilian employee of the Air Force at Tachikawa Air Force Base, Japan, during the period beginning on April 2, 1961, and ending on April 13, 1963, and who was promoted during that period and erroneously granted an increased living quarters allowance although his actual housing expenses were substantially well covered by the living quarters allowance applicable to him before that promotion, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amounts, which were otherwise correct, received by him as a result of this erroneous increase in his living quarters allowance. Any person who has made a repayment to the United States of any amount paid to him as a result of an erroneous increase in living quarters allowance covered by this section is entitled to have refunded to him the amount repaid.

Sec. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 3. Appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force for the pay and allowances of civilian personnel are available for refunds under this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike "of the Air Force at Tachikawa Air Force Base," and insert "paid by the Air Force Accounting and Finance Officer at Tachikawa Air Base."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the relief of certain civilian employees paid by the Air Force at Tachikawa Air Base, Japan."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AILI KALLIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1999) for the relief of Mrs. Aili Kallio.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. EZRA L. CROSS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4744) for the relief of Mrs. Ezra L. Cross.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COMDR. EDWIN J. SABEC, U.S. NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5419) to provide relief for Comdr. Edwin J. Sabec, U.S. Navy.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ALFRED LORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3006) to fix date of citizenship of Alfred Lorman for purposes of War Claims Act of 1948.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMALIA P. MONTERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6375) for the relief of Amalia P. Montero.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. EARL SPOFFORD BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6377) for the relief of Lt. Col. Earl Spofford Brown, U.S. Army Reserve, retired.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BERNARD A. HEGEMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6581) for the relief of Bernard A. Hegemann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6581

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Bernard A. Hegemann, incompetent, Beatrice, Nebraska, son of the late Bernard Anthony Hegemann, Senior (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC [REDACTED]), the amount which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies to him that would have been payable for said son of the veteran as death pension for the period prior to September 11, 1967, if application therefor had been filed within one year from May 19, 1965. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

MAJ. CLYDE NICHOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6850) for the relief of Maj. Clyde Nichols, retired.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ANTHONY SMILKO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8136) for the relief of Anthony Smilko.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the annual leave account of Anthony Smilko, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, an employee of the General Services Administration, there shall be added a separate account of three hundred and twenty-one hours of annual leave, in full settlement of claims of the said Anthony Smilko against the United States for compensation for the loss of such leave which was earned by him during the period beginning April 1959, and ending December 1965, inclusive, which, through administrative error, was not credited to his leave account.

Sec. 2. Section 6304 of title 5 of the United States Code shall not apply with respect to the leave granted by this Act, and such leave shall not affect the use or accumulation, pursuant to applicable law, of other annual leave earned by the said Anthony Smilko. None of the leave granted by this Act shall be settled by means of a cash payment in the event such leave or part thereof remains unused at the time the said Anthony Smilko is separated by death or otherwise from the Federal service.

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

CLIFFORD L. PETTY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9088) for the relief of Clifford L. Petty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9088

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Clifford L. Petty of Seattle, Washington, a former member of the United States Navy, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the sum of \$588.50 representing amounts paid him as extrahazardous diving pay at the rate of \$5.50 an hour for dives performed in August, September, and October 1959, as a member of a Navy underwater demolition team in connection with a series of special dives near Wake Island. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clifford L. Petty, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid by him or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

JACK W. HERBSTREIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10149) for the relief of Jack W. Herbstreit.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10149

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of employee rights and entitlements conferred by or pursuant to subchapter IV of chapter 35, title 5 of the United States Code, the three-year limitation imposed therein or pursuant thereto shall be waived with respect to Jack W. Herbstreit, and such employee rights and entitlements shall be extended (1) until the expiration of his current term as an elected official of the International Telecommunications Union or until he ceases to serve in that capacity, whichever first occurs, and (2) for such additional periods following his separation and application for reemployment as are specified in said subchapter or regulations pursuant thereto. However, service as such an official is not creditable service for the purpose of the civil service retirement system if such service forms the basis, in whole or in part, for an annuity or pension under the retirement system for the International Telecommunications Union.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCES VON WEDEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10153) for the relief of Frances von Wedel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10153

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of the net proceeds of interest representing vested property held in the United States Treasury, the sum of \$34,625.11 to Frances von Wedel, of Staten Island, New York, in accordance with the opinion rendered in the congressional reference case, Frances von Wedel versus the United States, numbered 1-67, filed on January 6, 1969, by the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims. The amount stated in this Act is to be paid to the said Frances von Wedel in full settlement of her claims against the United States for the return of money and proceeds of securities vested in and transferred to the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to vesting order numbered 10108 dated November 13, 1947, issued under the authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 20 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike "\$34,625.11" and insert "\$35,625.11".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

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

There was no objection.

PFC. JOSEPH ANTHONY SNITKO

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Private Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1948, to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Joseph Anthony Snitko.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1948

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Private First Class Joseph Anthony Snitko, a native of Poland, who served honorably in the United States Army from September 11, 1967,

until his death on June 13, 1968, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

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

L. CPL. THEODORE DANIEL VAN STAVEREN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Private Calendar No. 90, S. 256, to confer United States citizenship posthumously upon L. Cpl. Theodore Daniel van Staveren.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lance Corporal Theodore Daniel Van Staveren, a native of the Netherlands, who served honorably in the United States Marine Corps from February 24, 1967, until his death on April 10, 1968, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

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

L. CPL. PETER M. NEE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Private Calendar No. 94, H.R. 10060, for the relief of L. Cpl. Peter M. Nee, 2465662.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10060

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lance Corporal Peter M. Nee (2465662), a native of Ireland, who served honorably in the United States Marine Corps from April 15, 1968, until his death on March 31, 1969, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

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

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

Mr. MAHON. 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. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) and, myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11400, with Mr. HOLIFIELD 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. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we come to the consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1969, the first major appropriation bill for the 91st Congress. It deals with the fiscal year 1969 insofar as the funds are concerned. And it contains an important provision—an expenditure ceiling—with respect to fiscal year 1970.

I hope the items in the bill will be explored by the Members and that the House will work its will on this bill. In the Committee on Appropriations, we think we have done the best we could, but we make no claim of infallibility. We have cut the requests by some \$581 million. If there are further reductions which are desired, Members of course, are free to offer the amendments to bring about the reductions.

SUMMARY OF THE PENDING BILL

We have reduced the budget estimates which were before us by about 13 percent. Most of the items and the bulk of the total requests before the committee were of a mandatory character and we had no practical option to recommending approval of the necessary funds. We had to provide funds, for example, for pay increases which had been provided in previous legislation.

It is an old refrain that Congress in the regular appropriation bills reduces the annual money measures and then early in the next session restores the reductions which were made, and that therefore the reductions originally made result in no reductions at all. This is not correct. For example, in this bill less than 1 percent of the new funds provided represents a restoration of funds which were reduced last year. And the restorations—some \$34 million—represent about one-third of 1 percent of the approximately \$12 billion cut last year in new funds requested for fiscal 1969. That, I think, is a rather good record.

There are many, many items in the bill before us, and there is no way to be fully familiar with the contents of the bill other than to study the bill and the report, so I would commend to all a careful reading of the report on the bill.

There are innumerable items representing, I believe, practically every department and agency of the Government.

The bill proposes new appropriations, or budget authority, in the sum of about \$3,783,000,000. It is, as I said, about \$581 million less than the budget requests, a cut of about 13 percent.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend, I include, for purposes of elaboration, excerpts from the report summarizing the main features of the bill:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill is divided into five titles: I—Military operations in Southeast Asia, II—General supplementals (various), III—Increased pay costs, IV—Ceiling on 1970 expenditures, and V—General provisions.

The grand total of new budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill is \$3,783,212,766, a reduction of about 13%, or \$580,794,190, from the revised budget requests of \$4,364,006,956 considered.

In addition, under title II there are proposed increases of \$82,500,000 in limitations on annual contract authorizations involving interest subsidies for homeownership and rental housing assistance and college housing. The budget requests for these total \$104,500,000, so there is a reduction of \$22,000,000. Also, numerous provisions in the bill would release \$82,766,000 held in reserve under the cutback provisions of Public Law 90-364.

The amounts in the bill are within the overall totals of budget authority for 1969 shown in the administration's budget review released April 15th. That is, they are well within the totals contemplated in that review. And they are also well below the supplemental provisions contemplated for fiscal 1969 in the budget last January.

The January budget projected fiscal 1969 budget authority supplementals of \$4,813,000,000, inclusive of \$198,000,000 dependent on legislation which is not yet enacted. Of the remainder (\$4,615,000,000), a total of \$4,365,000,000 in new budget authority was submitted to the House and considered in connection with the accompanying bill. An additional \$221,000,000 in new budget authority requests for 1969—finalized after House Committee hearings were closed out—was submitted to the Senate (S. Doc. 91-18) for consideration in connection with this bill. Thus the total of such budget authority requests now indicated is \$4,586,000,000, or, in round figures, \$29,000,000 below the \$4,615,000,000 mentioned above.

This is the way the total picture stands on 1969 supplementals as of this date. It is a net result; the new administration reviewed and revised many of the supplemental requests submitted by the previous administration and made a number of reductions. But as the totals now stand, increases submitted have offset all but \$29,000,000 of the decreases from the January budget that were projected on April 15 (again, not counting the \$198,000,000 that hinges on legislation).

Summary by titles

Title I, Defense military, includes \$1,234,000,000 for military operations in Southeast Asia. This compares with the revised request of \$1,496,900,000, a reduction of \$262,900,000, or about 17 percent.

Title II, for sundry general supplementals, includes \$1,365,914,312, a reduction of \$39,736,850, or just under 3% from the budget requests of \$1,405,651,162 in new budget (obligational) authority. Some releases of reserves and other non-add provisions are involved. Increases of \$82,500,000—a reduction of \$22,000,000 from the request—are also proposed in limitations on annual contract authorizations in certain interest subsidy programs in the housing field.

The details are set forth under the various chapters in the committee report, but the great bulk of title II relates to items not subject to effective discretionary control in the annual bills. Some 83% or \$1,132,000,000, of the total, for example, is involved in grants to states for public assistance; veterans compensation, medical, and other costs; unemployment compensation payments; military retired pay; and disaster relief.

Title III, for increased pay costs, includes \$1,183,298,454 in new budget (obligational) authority, an overall reduction of \$278,157,340, or about 19 percent from the revised budget requests of \$1,461,455,794. Release of \$62,277,000 of P.L. 90-364 reserves is also involved, plus numerous transfers between appropriations to enable greater absorption of pay costs.

These supplementals relate to unabsorbed portions of pay raises generally effective last July 1 that were not taken into account in the regular 1969 appropriations.

The Executive Branch had combed the estimates initially and the new administration had also reexamined them. Since the estimates are for mandatory-type costs that have been running all fiscal year, the Committee could not make drastic additional cuts all across the boards this late in the fiscal year without creating unacceptable disruption to operations.

Title IV, limitation on 1970 budget outlays, proposes an overall ceiling on expenditures of the government during the fiscal year 1970 that begins on July 1, 1969. The proposal is explained in considerable detail beginning on page 118 of the report of the committee on the bill.

Title V, general provisions, contains general provisions customarily carried.

Approximate effect on 1969 expenditures—budget outlays

It is the committee's tentative estimate that the reduction of \$580,794,190 in new budget (obligational) authority requests, plus the relatively minor changes in requested transfers between appropriations, and reserve releases, will translate into a reduction of approximately \$464,000,000 in budget outlays previously projected for fiscal year 1969, by titles of the bill roughly as follows: title I, \$165,000,000; title II, \$26,000,000; and title III, \$273,000,000. The reductions in the interest subsidy contract authorizations limitations would not affect projected 1969 outlays.

The outlay effect of the remainder of the reduction in new budget authority and interest subsidy contract authorization limitations would be of some consideration in determining the impact of congressional actions on fiscal 1970 budget outlays; perhaps to a minor extent, even on fiscal 1971 outlays.

I believe there will be a desire on the part of the House to discuss some of the military implications involved, and the war in Southeast Asia. Some may want to discuss the antiballistic missile program and other controversial or semi-controversial matters. We have agreed on the 3 hours in which to discuss these matters.

EXPENDITURE CEILING PROPOSAL—TITLE IV

Mr. Chairman, I should like to claim your attention, if I may, at this time for the purpose of discussing a portion of the bill which appears on page 61. The report deals adequately with this proposal. It proposes an expenditure limitation—a spending ceiling. I believe it is important that all Members be familiar with the expenditure ceiling.

I should like to read the ceiling which we propose to fix in this bill. Page 61 of the bill, title IV:

Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

Mr. Chairman, that is the ceiling provision, subsection (a) of it.

Subsection (b) is the reporting provision, which I insert here for reference purposes:

(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend, and before proceeding further, let me insert an excerpt from the report which briefly states the nature of the proposition:

The committee has included a provision in the bill that would place an overall ceiling on budget expenditures during the fiscal year 1970 that begins on July 1, 1969. The precise terminology is "Expenditures and net lending"—which, taken together, constitute "budget outlays".

The amount specifically stated in the provision, \$192,900,000,000, is a beginning figure, not an ending figure. It is the revised projection of 1970 budget outlays announced by the President on April 12 and summarized in the Review of the 1970 Budget released on April 15. That summary appears in the Congressional Record of April 16, 1969, at pages 9351-9354.

Coupled to the \$192.9 billion figure is language providing—" * * * That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted."

In other words, Congress would work from the President's proposed total spending estimate. It would do so through its actions, or its inactions, on requests for appropriations and other budget obligatory authority and outlay proposals in the various appropriation bills and certain other bills affecting the budget.

The language would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated expenditure effect of specific congressional actions or inactions having budgetary impact.

It is a flexible provision—but in terms of aggregate spending, flexible only on the action of the Congress, not the Executive.

It does not seek to declare something of the end from the beginning; it sets a beginning point against which Congress would work in deciding, through its various spending actions, what the ultimate total should be, and supplies a mechanism for resetting the ceiling accordingly.

Unlike last year's ceiling provision, it does not impose an arbitrary broad-axe type ceiling cutback that would leave to the Executive the allocation of any congressional ex-

penditure reduction to specific agencies and programs.

It would be the first ceiling ever to place directly in the hands of Congress the specific decision as to the maximum amount to be taken out of the Treasury for payment of the Government's bills in a given 12-month period.

Mr. Chairman, we are at a moment when for the first time in the history of this Republic, Members of Congress are being called upon to vote on an expenditure ceiling which covers the entire Federal Government. This kind of legislation has never been passed by the Congress during the history of the country.

This is an expenditure limitation which is all inclusive. It includes the Veterans' Administration. It includes the Defense Department. It includes the war in Vietnam. It includes interest on the national debt. It includes all expenditures. Nothing is exempt.

POTENTIAL REDUCTION EFFECT AND COMPARISON TO LAST YEAR'S CEILING

We have an expenditure limitation for fiscal year 1969 and we had an expenditure limitation of sorts in the prior year. But in the fiscal 1969 version we have a series of exceptions and exemptions. Indeed we exempted about \$99 billion of fiscal 1969 currently estimated expenditures.

The Congress reduced expenditures by about \$6 billion in the fiscal year ending on June 30. However, we did not reduce net expenditures of the Government significantly due to increases in exempted areas. In those areas where we had made exemptions, expenditure increases totaled approximately \$6 billion. That offsetting increase left a relatively slight net reduction in the January 1968 budget estimate of expenditures for fiscal 1969. On the other hand, except for our action last year, expenditures would no doubt have increased by several billions.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I include additional excerpts from the committee report comprising title IV of the pending bill with last year's ceiling and drawing attention to the reduction potential of the ceiling now proposed.

It is a rigid ceiling; it cannot be exceeded except upon action by the Congress. And as indicated above, the ceiling would decrease if congressional actions on the budget so provide.

It lays the basis for potentially very significant retrenchment in expenditures. If such a ceiling had been adopted—and strictly adhered to—over the last many years, billions of expenditures would have been avoided.

More specifically, taking all 14 budgets for the post-Korea fiscal years 1955 through 1968, the projected expenditure totals in the original annual budgets were cumulatively exceeded by about \$50 billion. In 11 of the 14 years, the overruns aggregated \$53.3 billion. In 3 years, there were underruns aggregating \$3.5 billion. But overall for the 14 years, the government actually expended—for a variety of reasons—about \$50 billion more than the sum total of what was projected in the original budgets. That averages to about \$3.4 billion a year. So the potential is great, if the ceiling is adopted and adhered to.

Unlike the expenditure ceiling provisions enacted in the last session applicable to fiscal 1969, nothing would be exempt from the ceiling. Last year's ceiling provisions had a very significant impact on government spending in fiscal 1969. They significantly restrained the growth of spending that undoubtedly

would have otherwise occurred. And on the latest figures, it seems beyond reasonable debate that in the absence of the ceiling provisions, a much needed budget surplus for 1969 would not now be in prospect. But even with the ceiling and the \$6 billion cutback Congress did not, by its actions, diminish the originally projected budget expenditure (outlay) total of \$186.1 billion.

It did prevent that total from being exceeded. And it did restrain growth of spending.

More specifically, Congress exempted 50%—\$92.6 billion—of the \$186.1 billion from the \$6 billion cutback, and expressly permitted overruns to the extent determined necessary in the exempted programs. Those overruns were reestimated in the April 15 budget review at \$6.1 billion. The overruns in exempted areas wiped out the \$6 billion cutback in non-exempt areas.

In its specific actions on the individual appropriation and other spending bills, Congress last year contributed roughly \$3.7 to \$3.9 billion (depending on variable calculations) to the \$6 billion overall cutback, leaving the remainder to be allocated by the Executive. The April 15 Review reflects a total cutback of \$7.3 billion from the original estimates for non-exempted areas. Offsetting this gross cutback are the \$6.1 billion overruns in exempted areas leaving a net estimated cutback, as of April 15 of \$1.2 billion from the originally projected total.

Thus the latest estimate of spending for 1969 is \$184.9 billion, \$1.2 billion less than the \$186.1 billion projected in the original 1969 budget. But it should be noted that about \$1.5 billion of the \$7.3 billion reduction now shown in non-exempted areas is not a cut in the more conventional sense, but rather financing adjustments because the Banks for Cooperatives, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, and the Federal National Mortgage Association secondary market operations, which were in the original \$186.1 billion budget total, subsequently became 100% privately owned and thus dropped from the Federal totals.

Of course, the \$7.3 billion reduction figure is a composite of the specific congressional actions, the financing adjustments, actual curtailments of outlays, and administrative reestimates of expenditures—both up and down—in many items as conditions changed. There are signs that further reestimates upward in certain programs will substantially diminish the \$7.3 billion figure and thus in turn the \$1.2 billion figure.

The ceiling proposed in this bill would afford opportunity for maximum flexibility within the overall total to meet, as fully as reasonably possible, changed and changing expenditure requirements in certain specific programs that cannot be foreseen with great precision. The new administration has variously indicated that it intends to seek, on a continuing basis, economies in operations and to look for lower-priority areas when it needs room for increases within its stated policy of strict fiscal restraint. An aggregate ceiling would be facilitating in this regard.

Of course, the President can seek supplemental relief to meet necessary but unforeseen and unavoidable outlay increases which he finds cannot be accommodated within the overall total.

Setting a beginning ceiling in this fashion should in no way discourage the Executive Branch from its continuing commitment—and responsibility—for seeking to conduct the day-to-day management of government programs at the very minimum cost consistent with the public necessities, refraining from spending every dollar that can reasonably be saved. Constructive economy in public spending is not only a matter of legislative decision. It is also a matter of administration. The new administration has attached high priority to quality of performance in administering the government.

Wasteful and needless expenditures often do not become so until funds are poorly managed. The primary burden of getting a dollar's value for every dollar justifiably appropriated to the purposes of government lies mainly with those who administer, not with those who legislate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Now, there was a good basis last year for exempting agencies, but let me say to you that there is, in my judgment, based on presently available information, no good basis for exempting agencies this year. Last year, we were cutting the estimate of expenditures by \$6 billion and therefore we did feel some exemptions were desired and these exemptions were proposed. Then, of course, there were additional exemptions which were provided later. Last year, we proposed a cut in the estimate of expenditures, but in title IV of the pending bill, we are not proposing any cut in the estimate of expenditures. So it makes no sense to exempt the Veterans' Administration, or the interest on the national debt, or any other item. It makes no sense to exempt anything in this bill, because we are proposing an expenditure limitation or ceiling at the exact and precise limitations which have been estimated in the revised budget of the administration.

The budget this year ought to be more accurate in many respects than it was in many previous years, because ordinarily a budget is put into shape to a very considerable extent in the fall of the year preceding the year for which it begins, that is, the following January 1. However, we are now operating on an expenditure budget which was refined, redesigned, and reexamined since January 20. It is more up to date and should be more trustworthy. The revised budget of the administration on which this provision is based was submitted only a month ago.

So I hope we will not at this time yield to the temptation of trying to make any exemptions whatever.

THE ARITHMETIC AND MECHANICS OF THE PROPOSED CEILING

Mr. Chairman, let me hasten to add—and I realize this is a dull subject, but it is very important and will become increasingly more important—let me add that we will change this ceiling if we appropriate more money than was estimated for appropriation in the budget. In other words, if we increase appropriations and spending through appropriations, then this will be translated to the ceiling and increase the ceiling. If this year we were to do what we did last year when we reduced the President's appropriation budget by about \$12 billion, that would be translated into an expenditure reduction amount not of \$12 billion but into the amount that would be spent in the forthcoming year, fiscal 1970. That might be half that sum or one-third of that sum or some other percentage.

This ceiling is mandatory; it is inflexible; it is the law of the land from which the executive branch cannot escape. The executive branch will of course have the

authority to make adjustments within various programs and within those programs accommodate to better management and so forth. The administration can come to Congress and say, "Our estimates which we made as to spending last April have proved to be faulty and we would ask you to make certain adjustments to the ceiling." This would then be a matter for Congress to decide upon.

So, if we increase appropriations for various programs, then the budget ceiling will go beyond \$192.9 billion by whatever figure might be mandated by the increase.

Mr. Chairman, so that the RECORD will reflect more precisely how the ceiling would work, I include additional exploratory excerpts from the committee report:

THE ARITHMETIC AND MECHANICS OF THE CEILING

The ceiling begins by legislating a net reduction of \$2,372,000,000 in budget outlays projected for 1970 in the original (January) budget—from \$195.3 billion down to the \$192.9 billion April 15 revised projection of the present administration. But the gross ceiling reduction is \$4,020,000,000; this was offset by \$1.6 billion in the recent budget review by upward "corrections" in several specific projections in the original budget.

The \$4 billion cutback in outlays includes \$1.1 billion in defense, \$1 billion for a modification of the previously proposed \$1.6 billion increase in social security benefits, and \$1.9 billion for programs affecting almost every Federal agency.

In the April 15 review in which the \$4 billion cutback in outlays was projected the administration also proposed gross cutbacks of \$5.5 billion (\$4.2 billion, net after the "correcting" adjustments of \$1.3 billion) in appropriation and other budget obligatory authority requests. \$3 billion of this is in defense and \$2.5 billion in all other areas of the budget. Budget obligatory authority (appropriations, essentially) is the traditional basis on which appropriation and authorization bills are stated and voted on regardless of the year or years in which the funds are to be actually disbursed in the form of budget outlays.

The gross total for new budget authority for 1970 in the January budget is \$210.1 billion, and in the April 15 revision, \$205.9 billion—including so-called permanent budget authority, such as interest, trust funds, etc., which does not actually appear in the annual bills.

The Committee on Appropriations and several other committees have before them for consideration these revised appropriation requests and other budgetary recommendations for fiscal 1970. What Congress does in the bills dealing with these various budget authority proposals plus a handful of other proposals involving outlays but not budget authority basically determines what happens to the \$192.9 billion beginning ceiling in the accompanying bill.

For example, net reductions made through the appropriation bills would translate into net downward adjustments to the \$192.9 billion figure. And in this general connection, some \$38 billion of the appropriation budget requests are first subject to processing through the various annual authorization bills.

In the area of proposed legislation for which the outlay budget includes specific sums, several have the effect of holding the outlay total lower than it otherwise would be. Several, of course, involve additional outlays. For example, if Congress does not enact the proposed postal rate increase, the outlay ceiling, according to the latest estimate available, would be adjusted upward by some \$600 million. This is because postal revenues are counted as offsets to expenditures, not as budget receipts.

If the budget proposal to authorize the Farmers Home Administration to make insured rather than direct operating loans is not enacted, the outlay ceiling, according to the budget, would be adjusted upward by \$292 million.

If the budget proposal for legislation to restrict public assistance medical aid for patients in mental institutions to 120 days is not enacted, the outlay ceiling, according to the budget, would be adjusted upward by \$126 million.

Several legislative proposals designed to diminish budget outlays by the Veterans Administration are priced in the outlay total to save some \$288 million in 1970. Failure of those, according to the budget figures, would be the basis for an equivalent upward adjustment in the ceiling.

These four examples aggregate \$1.3 billion. On the other hand, again for example, if the President's proposal for social security benefit increases is not enacted, the \$600 million (of the original budget amount of \$1.6 billion) in the revised budget outlay figure would not now be needed for that purpose, in which case the outlay ceiling would drop by \$600 million.

As to the mechanics for adjusting the ceiling, timeliness in accommodating government programs to congressional changes is essential to orderly administration. Congress will be processing budgetary recommendations in many different bills, passing through various legislative stages over a period of several months—virtually all after the fiscal year begins. And it seems essential in the interest of consistency and otherwise to center responsibility in one place for at least tentative determination of congressional action impact.

The Director of the Budget is probably in the best position to make such determinations. The monthly reports submitted by the Director under subsection (b) of the ceiling provision can be evaluated currently. They can be checked for consistency and reasonableness with tentative estimates frequently made through the budget "scorekeeping" reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures and with those of the Committees on Appropriations. Amendatory action can be taken if that seems to be necessary in the circumstances.

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS: THE KEYS TO SPENDING CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, for a long time, I fought along with others the so-called Bow amendment fixing a ceiling on expenditures, and I do not apologize for that. But, I have come to the conclusion that an expenditure ceiling can be meaningful, and that it will encourage greater focus of attention by Congress and the country and the press upon spending. But in embracing this idea of an expenditure ceiling as here proposed, I do not want us for any means to delude ourselves. The best means and the most appropriate and effective way to reduce Government spending is to hold the line on authorizations and appropriations. That is a lead pipe cinch method of holding down Government spending. It is the surest and the safest. In a limit on spending in a given fiscal year—and this would limit spending only for the fiscal year, 1 year, which begins on July 1—we do not rescind the money, we do not recapture the authority—we simply say that in fiscal year 1970 you cannot spend more than so much, but the funds which have been appropriated in prior years will remain available for expenditure. So by all means, the best way for us to achieve a reduction in the cost of Government and effective control of Government spending

is to quit authorizing and appropriating so generously.

But, there are reasons other than those which I have stated for supporting an expenditure limitation. Government is growing bigger and more complex.

Now, let me give this figure which may shock some of the public, but which may not shock Members of Congress who are more aware of fiscal complexities.

If we should today appropriate all of the money and grant all of the authority requested by the administration in the pending budget in fiscal 1970 on July 1 the Government would have \$431 billion available for expenditure. But it is not now projected by the administration that more than \$192.9 billion will be spent. So, in this expenditure ceiling for the first time in the history of the Nation we are undertaking to say, "Yes, we fix the annual appropriations, but we are going a step further this year and are going to fix the annual expenditures." While we have previously authorized all the carryover funds involved, we by this limitation fix the overall rate of spending for a given year, namely fiscal year 1970.

This limitation, this ceiling, has been fixed in such a way that it ought to be, it seems to me, palatable to the rank and file of the Members of the Congress. We have drawn the limitation in such a way as to get, we hope, majority support.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of the most effective means of controlling spending, I include an additional excerpt from the report of the committee. It reflects a position long held in the committee:

While there are some grounds for doubt that the outlay (bill-paying) stage of the fiscal process is the most logical or the most effective point at which the Congress should seek to control government spending, an overall ceiling on outlays in a given year has some usefulness as a short-run regulating device, especially when the economic and fiscal situations are under great stress as at present. But there is room for great doubt that such a ceiling can realistically be regarded as an effective long-run control procedure.

As today is the consequence of yesterday, so tomorrow is the consequence of today. Legislative authorizations are the seedbeds of future expenditure growth. Initial authorization of a program or project is the beginning point in the legislative spending process. If the program or project, whatever it may be, is not authorized by the Congress, then no appropriation is in order. But the facts are that virtually every year new programs and projects are authorized, and old programs are often extended and expanded. Seldom are existing programs and activities deauthorized via the basic legislative route. Fiscally, the cumulative result is increasing demands on the Federal Treasury.

In the long range sense as distinguished from any particular fiscal year, too much emphasis is attached to controlling growth of government spending by applying the control at the end of the spending process. It is more logically and effectively applicable at the authorization and appropriation stages.

Appropriations are not in order unless there is first a legislative authorization. No funds can be withdrawn from the Treasury but in consequence of valid authority granted by the Congress to first create an obligation in behalf of the Government. That is the key to the situation. The most consistently accurate barometer to future spending levels is the dimensions of budget authority en-

acted by the Congress to enter into obligations on behalf of the Government.

Authorize something new or enlarge an existing authorization and a request for new obligating authority is almost certain to follow.

Denial of authority to obligate precludes a subsequent expenditure.

Curtail the input of new appropriations (and other forms of obligating authority) and spending will come down.

Grant authority to obligate and the obligation inevitably will follow in due time.

Once the obligation is made and the bill comes due, the check to pay it (the outlay) must also inevitably follow in due time.

FLEXIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED CEILING

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I direct the gentleman's attention to the report where it says that this will be the first ceiling ever to be placed directly in the hands of the Congress. This is what the committee says in the report.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It would be the first overall ceiling placed in the hands of the Congress, and Congress can work its will, and what Congress can do today, of course, it can modify tomorrow.

Some have said that the ceiling ought to be inflexible on the Congress. If you make it a mandate on the executive, they ask, why not make it a mandate on the Congress? There is no power on earth to fix a ceiling or a limitation on expenditures on the Congress itself. What Congress can do today it can undo tomorrow.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has pointed out, and as I understand the matter, we have set a spending ceiling at \$192.9 billion, about \$193 billion, which is exactly the Nixon budget, as a level.

We have set the ceiling at this level, which means spending cannot go beyond this amount, but if Congress takes action to increase the appropriations, by being a flexible ceiling, it goes up, or if the Congress fails to take action which is recommended in the budget it may go up or down, according to what the Congress does. The committee has set the budget at the Nixon level, but what may be the ultimate result will be dependent upon what Congress does in appropriations and in authorizations.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. But this is going to be a limitation which is not aimed at the administration itself, as the gentleman will agree.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. MAHON. We have set for the last couple of years limitations of sorts, but they have not been passed this early in the year as this one would be, and they have been limitations predicated on cuts below the budget. Title IV of the pending bill is quite a different matter.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, we are here setting a flexible limitation at the very outset on the Congress, which can be revised up or down, depending upon the actions of the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

I want to say this in defense of the administration, or of any administration: It is impossible for any administration to predict in January or April precisely what may be spent. It may be that the administration will find that certain adjustments cannot be made depending on the trend of events in the war, or otherwise, which might bring about a requirement for a change.

The administration of course would have the liberty, as it always does, to come before us with a supplemental—and the bill before us today is nothing but a supplemental presented to us by the present administration, the Nixon administration. It is a supplemental, and we inevitably have to have supplementals at times though they must be avoided wherever possible.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman point out further that this is a flexible ceiling—I mean, this is a flexible thing which can be revised up or down, depending upon the actions of the Congress.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS

The gentleman further points out in his report to the unobligated and unexpended carryovers. I believe this is very significant, as found on page 122 of the report. It says:

For example, total unexpended carryover balances at the beginning of fiscal 1970 will approximate \$226 billion—

That is, \$226 billion of money unspent in carryovers from previous actions of the Congress:

Mr. MAHON. This \$226 billion figure may at first glance seem to be perfectly outrageous and a reflection upon the Congress in making available such large sums that will be carried over in the pipeline to the next fiscal year.

But much of this money is in social security funds that have not been expended.

Much of it is in military procurement programs.

Much of it relates to space and atomic energy and such things as I am about to relate in this unexpended category. It ranges over the whole Government, really.

For example, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has about \$3 billion. It is not anticipated that this will be expended, but it is available for expenditure. It is an unobligated carryover.

For example, the Congress passed a bill granting riot insurance and flood insurance, and there are \$500 million—a half billion dollars—involved in this fund. In all probability they would not be expended, but they are within the \$226 billion. I shall elaborate on that question a little further in my remarks.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman say that this is a moderate limitation? Some have thought that it is a very small limitation, and it should go further. Would the gentleman characterize his amendment as a moderate one?

Mr. MAHON. I would so characterize it, and I thank the gentleman. I would say it is a moderate one.

It may be too firm for the Director of

the Bureau of the Budget. I can see why the Director may prefer not to have to live with this amendment. But it will help the Director of the Bureau of the Budget hold the line with the Government agencies and Government departments. If he gets into difficulty that is in any manner unavoidable, he can seek relief from the Congress.

There are also those who say it is meaningless, that it has no teeth, so it must be pretty good since we have opposition from both sides.

Mr. Chairman, under leave granted, I include further exploratory material from the committee report on the matter of carryover balances. And in this connection, I am inserting supplementary statistical material:

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS

The proposed ceiling provision, being all-inclusive, covers expenditures in fiscal 1970 from budget authority to be newly granted in this session; expenditures from so-called permanent appropriations that flow automatically from earlier laws; and expenditures from unexpended carryover balances of prior years. Very substantial portions of the \$192.9 billion beginning ceiling figure spring from each of these three general sources of expenditure availability.

For example, total unexpended carryover balances at the beginning of fiscal 1970 will approximate \$226 billion—about \$100 billion in social security and other trust funds and \$126 billion in Federal funds. But some \$77 billion of the \$126 billion of Federal funds will have been obligated for programs across the government but not yet actually paid out. The remaining \$49 billion, not obligated and not expended, is in many accounts across the government; there is a comprehensive and informative special analysis of it in the January budget, Special Analysis G, pp. 78-93.

But of the \$226 billion total beginning carryover, trust and federal funds combined, roughly \$86 billion is projected for expenditure (disbursement, that is) in fiscal 1970, and roughly that amount is thus counted in the \$192.9 billion ceiling figure. The remainder—some \$138 billion after a small lapse amount—becomes part of the total unexpended carryover projected into the following year, fiscal 1971.

Roughly then, it can be seen that only about \$107 billion of the newly projected outlay total for 1970 (\$192.9 billion, less the \$86 billion from carryovers) is estimated to come from the \$205.9 billion new budget authority requested or estimated for that same year of 1970. Funds appropriated in a given year are expended partly in that year and partly in subsequent years because of long lead-times, construction time, and other factors.

To put the relationship of budget authority and outlays in some better focus by way of extreme illustration, if the whole \$205 billion of new budget authority for 1970 failed, the expenditure outlay reduction in 1970, based on the budget, would be only \$107 billion. The remainder would be an expenditure avoided in subsequent years.

But to put the picture in sharper focus, it must be noted that Congress does not annually act on anywhere near the entire new budget authority total. Some of it is in the form of requests and some of it is in the form of estimates. Roughly \$66 billion, net, of the new budget authority total is estimated to go on the books in 1970 automatically—so-called permanent appropriations—under earlier laws, mainly trust funds, interest on the debt, and several others. The other \$139 billion goes through the annual bill process—mostly the appropriation bills—but it involves projected ex-

penditures, as to 1970, of roughly only \$90 billion, more or less which means that *Congress, in the various annual bills, normally deals with new budget authority amounts that, in total, relate to less than half of the budget outlays projected for that same year.* As noted, more than half of budget outlays in a given year now derive from carryover balances and from new budget authority that goes on the books automatically under various permanent appropriation arrangements enacted over the years.

The size of the unexpended carryover pipeline, of course, depends on what is put in and what is taken out. Addition of more new budget authority than is expended in a year increases the pipeline. During fiscal 1970, based on the recent budget projections, the total unexpended pipeline would increase from \$226 billion to \$237 billion, but all of the increase is more than accounted for in trust fund accumulations of balances. In Federal funds, there is a drop of \$1 billion, from \$126 billion to \$125 billion. Depending on congressional actions, this could drop further.

CONTROLLABLE VERSUS UNCONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURES

All expenditures are, of course, controllable by the Congress. All expenditures are controlled by Congress, because they flow from laws enacted by Congress. But as a very practical matter, not all are subject to effective discretionary control through the normal annual budget and appropriations process.

Very considerable expenditures arise from so-called permanent appropriations that do not pass through the annual appropriation bills. Interest on the debt and trust funds are examples.

Several programs that do pass through the annual bill process involve mandated-type expenditures fixed in basic law, which unless changed through legislation operate as a practical limit on the discretionary power to control them annually. Veterans pensions and public assistance matching grants are examples.

Payments for prior year contracts and obligations falling due cannot effectively be avoided. These run across the whole government.

There are a number of others. The January budget classifies some \$98 billion, or about half of the 1970 outlay budget, as "relatively uncontrollable civilian outlays under present law." The figure for the April 15 budget review under this classification is \$100 billion, meaning that better than half of the outlay budget for the year is not, as a practical matter, subject to the normal discretionary powers of appropriation without changes in the basic laws that more or less ordain them.

Similarly, though the makeup in detail does not exactly correspond, in the \$6 billion cutback provision of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act last session, Congress exempted from the ceiling and from the cutback, programs involving about half of total outlays, in effect recognizing their relative uncontrollability without changes in the basic laws applicable or other compelling circumstances giving rise to them.

Looking at the matter in terms of increases rather than totals, about 75% of the outlay increase, 1970 over 1969, projected in the January budget was in these so-called relatively uncontrollable items. The proportion applicable to the \$8 billion outlay increase, 1970 over 1969, projected in the new administration's budget review is even greater.

The outlay ceiling proposed by the committee for 1970, while rigid and all-encompassing, does not and cannot of course come to grips with these fundamentals of basic laws. But by covering both controllable and

"uncontrollable" outlays, it will focus on the total, and keep it in focus. It will tend to force attention on possible

alternatives and substitutions when upward pressures are exerted on the ceiling. It will keep the hands of Congress on it.

TABLE 8.—BALANCES OF BUDGET AUTHORITY (FROM THE JANUARY 1969 BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970)
[In millions of dollars]

Department or other unit	Start 1968		End 1968		End 1969		End 1970	
	Obligated	Unobligated	Obligated	Unobligated	Obligated	Unobligated	Obligated	Unobligated
Funds appropriated to the President:								
International financial institutions.....	1,004	6,447	1,226	6,427	1,591	6,633	1,880	6,633
Military assistance.....	2,114	2,764	1,804	2,468	1,737	2,393	1,767	2,193
Economic assistance.....	3,790	860	3,685	690	3,248	391	3,364	622
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	1,140	6	982	8	1,018	5	1,207	6
Other.....	345	112	645	111	563	-87	578	-180
Agriculture.....	5,446	2,749	5,562	2,680	6,464	2,111	6,869	2,177
Commerce.....	973	225	1,086	258	1,241	209	1,254	122
Defense—Military.....	32,077	15,116	30,884	14,829	32,818	11,594	35,055	10,970
Defense—Civil.....	302	248	345	247	441	158	496	50
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	6,403	28,043	7,820	30,778	8,669	35,729	8,908	42,756
Housing and Urban Development.....	6,674	14,462	8,254	14,743	7,050	13,495	8,076	12,139
Interior.....	845	609	947	612	1,141	359	1,175	234
Labor.....	495	10,790	498	11,919	478	12,709	656	13,680
Transportation.....	7,271	3,409	7,286	4,154	8,531	4,679	9,070	5,102
Treasury.....	102	26	103	24	87	25	94	22
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1,138	320	1,115	385	1,563	56	1,486
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	1,820	313	1,616	381	1,624	118	1,552	(*)
Veterans' Administration.....	1,034	8,139	1,030	8,768	1,120	8,341	1,181	8,387
Civil Service Commission.....	642	17,690	701	18,505	834	20,522	981	21,936
Export-Import Bank.....	2,367	3,749	2,996	2,687	3,638	2,387	4,585	1,026
Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.....	248	6,340	257	6,590	281	6,870	297	7,176
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	30	3,468	61	3,697	33	4,033	17	4,447
Railroad Retirement Board.....	112	4,240	127	4,375	130	4,525	137	4,596
Other agencies.....	2,195	4,740	2,306	6,804	2,494	1,985	2,694	1,521
Allowance for contingencies.....					50		200	
Total balances.....	78,567	134,864	81,336	142,142	86,844	139,238	93,597	145,616
MEMORANDUM								
Federal funds.....	69,839	54,095	72,043	54,988	77,416	49,090	83,301	44,986
Trust funds.....	8,728	80,769	9,293	87,154	9,434	90,148	10,278	100,630

Less than \$500,000.
Note: Totals slightly revised in table that follows this table.

BUDGET REVIEW OF APRIL 15, 1969—CHANGE IN UNEXPENDED BALANCES

	[In billions]							
	January budget				Budget review estimate			
	Federal funds	Trust funds	Intragovernmental transactions	Total	Federal funds	Trust funds	Intragovernmental transactions	Total
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1968.....	\$127.0	\$96.4	\$223.5	\$127.0	\$96.4	\$223.5
1969 Budget authority.....	148.8	53.3	-\$7.5	194.6	149.9	53.3	-\$7.5	195.7
Expiring authority in 1969, etc.....	-1.2	-7.1	-8.3	-1.2	-7.1	-8.3
Less outlays.....	148.2	43.0	-7.5	183.7	149.5	42.9	-7.5	184.9
Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1969.....	126.5	99.6	226.1	126.2	99.8	226.0
1970 Budget authority.....	158.2	60.0	-7.9	210.1	154.3	59.5	-8.0	205.9
Expiring authority in 1970, etc.....	-1.7	-1.7	-1.7	-1.7
Less outlays.....	154.7	48.4	-7.9	195.3	153.8	47.1	-8.0	192.9
Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1970.....	128.3	110.9	239.2	125.0	112.2	237.2

BUDGET AUTHORITY

[Fiscal years, in billions]

Description	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Available through current action by the Congress:			
Previously enacted.....	\$134.4	\$128.9
Proposed in this budget.....	\$134.4
To be requested separately:			
For supplemental requirements under present law.....	4.5	0.1
Upon enactment of proposed legislation.....	0.2	1.2
Allowances:			
Civilian and military pay increase.....	2.8
Contingencies.....	0.4
Subtotal, available through current action by the Congress.....	134.4	133.6	138.9
Available without current action by the Congress (permanent authorizations):			
Trust funds (existing law).....	47.8	53.5	59.1
Interest on the public debt.....	14.6	16.3	17.3
Other.....	5.4	5.4	4.3
Deductions for offsetting receipts:			
Interfund and intragovernmental transactions.....	-6.9	-8.7	-9.2
Proprietary receipts from the public.....	-4.7	-4.3	-4.5
Total budget authority.....	190.6	195.8	205.9

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES (BUDGET OUTLAYS)
FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

Mr. Chairman, we have been referring to the beginning ceiling figure of \$192.9 billion representing budget outlays projected by the administration in its budget review of April 15. I include a table based on figures in that review, showing a breakdown by departments and agencies of the \$192.9 billion:

TABLE 8.—BUDGET OUTLAYS, 1969 AND 1970
(In millions of dollars)

Agency	1969 current estimate	1970 revised estimate
Agriculture.....	8,409	7,197
CCC.....	(5,492)	(4,482)
Commerce.....	872	1,079
Defense—military and military assist- ance.....	78,400	77,903
Corps of Engineers.....	1,192	1,159
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	46,259	50,551
Trust funds.....	(32,981)	(35,324)
Housing and Urban Development.....	2,017	2,823
Interior.....	889	830
Justice.....	517	730
Labor.....	3,503	3,690
Unemployment trust funds.....	(2,749)	(2,866)
Post Office.....	929	412
State.....	434	428
Transportation.....	6,211	6,753
Treasury.....	16,603	17,559
Interest on the public debt.....	(16,300)	(17,300)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	2,451	2,504
General Services Administration.....	413	407
NASA.....	4,247	3,897
Veterans' Administration.....	7,719	7,554
All other:		
Foreign economic assistance.....	1,925	1,760
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	1,880	1,870
Other agencies.....	5,136	6,538
Allowances for:		
Civilian and military pay increases.....		2,800
Contingencies.....		200
Undistributed intragovernmental trans- actions.....	-5,105	-5,745
Total.....	184,901	192,899

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

MILITARY SPENDING PROGRAMS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman realizes that the Congress is not acting—but that we are reacting. The gentleman knows, of course, that whenever we get ready to reduce expenditures, everybody looks to the military.

Now you have the terrible situation of the people assigning the worst sort of conduct and motives to the so-called military-industrial complex. I am sure the gentleman knows that on Mr. McNamara's procurements for ships there was a cost overrun and Secretary Packard tells me that it will be an overrun of \$100 million.

This morning and on Thursday we are trying to find out what caused an inaccurate estimate—it is not all overrun—on the C-5A aircraft. There are a number of factors involved. The gentleman knows as well as I do that this Congress has not got the courage to stand up here and stop some of these crazy programs that we have, for instance, the Job Corps and the OEO and a lot of these things we are spending money on all over hell's half acre. But they will go to the military and cut them to smithereens. This is what it is coming to.

We have inaccurate estimates all over the lot in the military and when you superimpose that on the escalation caused by the increased cost of living, our military is going to come up short and we are going to have half a defense.

It would be far better to abolish certain items for the military and come clean with the American people and say, "We do not want you to have the Polaris program—we do not want you to have new bombers—even though the B-52's are 15 years old. We do not want you to modernize your navy yards. We do not want you to have a good merchant marine program. We do not want you to go on with the new fighter needs that were denied us under the McNamara programs. We do not want you to have a moon shot."

This is where these things are coming to. That is the weakness of provisions such as the one to which the gentleman referred. Why do we not cross each bridge at the time we come to it?

Mr. MAHON. That is what we propose to do. We will cross each bridge at the time we come to it as each appropriation bill is before us, or each bill from a legislative committee which mandates certain expenditures is before us. Action on these bills will in effect maintain, or lower, or raise the expenditure ceiling.

Mr. RIVERS. We probably hold longer hearings in our committee than any committee of the Congress. We have a number of subcommittees going now. They are trying their best to save money. The distinguished chairman's committee, in its wisdom, has acted, and I would like to say that if there is anyone for whom I have a higher regard than the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have not found him. But let me say this: We cannot approach it in the manner proposed with any degree of accuracy. We cannot have all the programs. I have enumerated unless we have sufficient funds. I am afraid we are going to come up short in our commitments to our own people, and to the security of America and our commitments with whatever other friends we have, if we have any.

I want the gentleman to know that I do not agree with this approach. We should act on each program instead of reacting to the entire budget. The Constitution specifically provides that the one arm of our Government that has the direct responsibility of the Congress is the military. Yet we are neglecting this responsibility by provisions of the sort proposed, and I am afraid it is a mistake.

Mr. MAHON. According to the estimates—and we are, for the time being, accepting the expenditure estimates of the administration—the military will expend about \$78 billion this fiscal year and a similar amount for next year. The full amount so estimated for next year—fiscal 1970—is provided for in the proposed spending ceiling in the bill before us.

If our military people, those with stars on their shoulders and those in civilian capacities, will run the Defense Department in a businesslike and efficient way,

I would think that sums available and in prospect would be adequate. I would hope that the sums are more than adequate.

One of the things that disturbs me is that there have been so many mistakes made by the military. This has tended to generate a lack of confidence. I grant that the problems have been of great magnitude and complexity.

Let me say that I have confidence in the military. I do not have unlimited confidence in their managerial ability.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know anybody who does.

Mr. MAHON. Let me give an example. I joined in cutting the military budget \$5 billion plus, last year. I am not beholden to any department of this Government. I want to make that clear. I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina shares this attitude completely.

With respect to management, just think of the humiliation we suffered a few days ago when the Navy, through neglect, let a submarine in a Navy shipyard go to the bottom. And what is that going to cost us? \$25 million. Of course, if we are going to let the defense dollar go down the drain in any such irresponsible manner as that, it would not be possible to supply the military with adequate funds.

I would say this: I have confidence in the administration and feel that expenditures in the military area will not be cut without any regard to the welfare of the country. I am aware that the Secretary of Defense served on the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Defense Subcommittee for many years.

I cannot think of him in a role of an appeaser or a nonspender when it comes to necessary defense expenditures. So I would say, let us take the Pentagon at its word as a starting point on the amount of funds needed. When our hearings on defense programs are completed we can reduce or increase the budget figure and the final figure agreed upon by Congress and enacted into law will determine what can be spent in fiscal 1970.

Now, before I yield to my good and distinguished friend, my able colleague, let me say that I believe in the ABM. I believe in a strong military program. I deplore the low estate in which the military finds itself. I want to see confidence restored in this area. We need to have respect and to have reason to have respect for all departments and branches of Government.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman gave wings to the very things I was talking about. I do not wear anybody's collar either. I am looking for encomiums, and I do not get them around Washington, as the gentleman knows.

I want to say this, that the military now has reached deplorable conditions. We have 60 percent of our fleet which is not fit to live on or in because someone budgeted too low. The chairman has not heard the last of the results of McNamara's systems analysis crowd. We have not heard the last of that. They are bringing disrespect and derision on military men who have not made a decision

over there since McNamara darkened the doors of the Pentagon. We have deficits coming up day in and day out, day in and day out, over which the military men had no control.

We cannot think we can just put a hard, hidebound ceiling on any kind of restrictions and think we can let each tub sit on its bottom. That is, in my opinion, a mistake.

Mr. MAHON. There are some leaks in Government tubs and we are trying to close some of them.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not deprecate the efforts of the chairman, but I am sure an enlisted man did not pull the seacock on that submarine. It could have been sabotaged.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know who is responsible, but the Navy should find out who is responsible and see that he is adequately disciplined. If they want to gain higher respect, this kind of action must be taken.

Mr. RIVERS. I agree. We must restore responsibility in the military—and then hold them responsible. And let me tell the chairman, our committee is going to investigate that incident and, for whatever it is worth, we are going to report to the Chairman on this.

THE SO-CALLED PEACE DIVIDEND IN FEDERAL FUNDS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has made a statement which makes it appropriate at this time for me to discuss a further situation.

Many of the programs and ships and weapons of the military are obsolete or are becoming obsolescent. There is no doubt of that. Large programs are going to be necessary to outfit the Navy and the other services with modern ships, aircraft, and other weapons. Defense spending is not going to toboggan downward when the war ends in Vietnam. There will be reductions but the costs will remain high.

Military spending is going to have to remain high because survival is the first law of nations. It is inescapable that the military programs are going to remain high and we are going to have to support them. That is one of the reasons we want a better job done by the military—by civilians and those in uniform—in order that we may get more for the dollar.

But those who are writing in the papers and saying in their speeches, "Wait until the war is over, and then we will have unlimited resources for all the social programs," are too optimistic. Some seem to think that Secretary Finch will have all the money he wants for education, for health, and the poor, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will have all the money he wants to for housing and related needs.

That is incorrect. They are not going to have all the money they want. There is not enough money in the Nation to meet all these demands.

Besides that, money is not the only answer in defense, and it is not the only answer in our social programs. I think it is a little bit cruel for us to make statements which would lead the cities and

the mayors and the poor and others to believe that when the war is over we will have unlimited funds for all purposes which may be desired. We just will not have that kind of money, and let us tell the people that now.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

SUPPLEMENTALS FOR INTEREST SUBSIDY PROGRAMS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said he does not want any exceptions to his limitations provision but, in fact, by not including some of the practices or programs under the limitation, there are exceptions. For example, there is no limit on the amount that they can obligate for interest subsidies. And now it is proposed, instead of having current expenditures within the fiscal year for a direct loan program and grants for college facilities, they will have a program to pay only \$11 million this year and obligate us for \$440 million, which does not show up in this year's budget. So in effect the limitation is no limitation so long as that is permitted, is it?

Mr. MAHON. I wish the gentleman would let his own statement stand as he made it. I am not quite sure of the import of the statement.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But it does not limit them from obligating us to pay for the next 35 years under these programs.

Mr. MAHON. Oh, I see what the gentleman means and his point is well taken.

I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) to this matter. Under the housing programs there is a provision in the bill providing authority for \$80 million for subsidies for 1 year. We provide a certain amount for 1 year, but when we do this we obligate ourselves for 40 years.

I believe the gentleman from North Carolina has tabulated the total amount of money in these housing programs that will be mandated as a result of this bill if we pass it. Will the gentleman give that figure?

Mr. JONAS. If the gentlemen will yield, it will be 40 times 80, and that is \$3.2 billion we will be obligating the taxpayers to pay over the 40-year period.

I remind the chairman that already in this fiscal year, we have provided \$50 million for those two programs, so we have to add that to the \$3.2 billion. You will find in these two programs, sections 235 and 236 of the housing law as amended, we will be obligating the taxpayers of this country to the amount of \$5.2 billion over the 40-year period.

Mr. MAHON. About \$5.2 billion. It looks very minimal when one looks at the bill, but when one looks at the costs which we are obligated to pay over 40 years it is about \$5.2 billion.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. This has been said, but needs to be emphasized. This spending limitation does not purport to remain in effect beyond next year. It is only for 1 year; is that not true?

Mr. MAHON. It is only for 1 year. It

might be for only 30 days, if we change it, but this is not proposed for more than 1 year. Next year we can do something similar with respect to fiscal 1971 if we so determine.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. If I might make a further point with respect to the institutions of higher learning and their construction needs, there is \$3.9 million in this bill for interest subsidy, which will construct \$145 million worth of college facilities. If you do not want that, then just wipe out the interest subsidy. It all depends on how much we appropriate in this bill for the interest subsidy, as to where that ceiling goes.

As the gentleman from North Carolina says, this is an expenditure ceiling for just the 1 year, not for 30 or 40 years.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This illustrates my point very well. If they get the \$3.9 million interest subsidy, they will withhold the \$150 million already appropriated for direct loans. That \$150 million would be under the limitation, whereas the \$3.9 million is all of the \$145 million that shows up in the fiscal year. This is a big loophole.

Mr. MICHEL. It is not a permanent loophole if you choose to use that word. It is effective only for this year.

What we are saying is that since we are in such a bind, instead of a direct appropriation of \$145 million for direct loans let us do it by the interest subsidy route, and finance the balance through the private sector.

SCOPE OF PROPOSED EXPENDITURE CEILING FOR 1970

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I should like to commend the gentleman from Texas for a most interesting and enlightening statement. I should like to ask a question on a problem I have dealing with appropriations.

An item in my district which was necessary was not included in the Nixon budget. Under this limitation would it preclude the Nixon administration from amending the budget and providing an item that is not in the present budget?

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing in this limitation that would preclude the Nixon administration from amending the budget and placing the item in it. There is nothing in this limitation which would preclude Congress from providing the funds for the unbudgeted items. So there is nothing inflexible insofar as the gentleman's problem is concerned in the resolution now before us.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Therefore, if I understand the gentleman correctly, the limitation goes only to the amount and the Congress can act independently or the executive can revise its budget. Is that what the gentleman stated?

Mr. MAHON. I think the point is clear.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not think this is such a novel approach. The Congress considered it before and in effect we have done it before.

Mr. MAHON. I believe we have never done it before, I will say to the gentleman. Not quite.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think we have put a limitation in effect before when we put a limitation, for instance, on the national debt. In effect, we said that there was a limitation on the borrowing budget.

The gentleman will recall that the Hoover Commission recommended and this Congress debated the proposal that limitations on spending be placed upon each governmental department. In other words, taking the overall limitation which you are now proposing and breaking it down. The reason for the spending limitation was that the Congress could then control the expenditure budget, which we do not now control. All we can do here is appropriate the money, and the executive controls the rate of expenditure. The Hoover Commission's proposal, which you are proposing to carry out now, was to put a limitation on what the Congress itself might control. It does not mean that you cannot vary that figure if conditions change which call for it. Congress can vary it. But it is a restraint on additional spending. It also advises the Congress, the way it was originally proposed, and if there were slippages, we could find out why there were, and if there were overages proposed, we could find out why. So it is not so novel.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman in effect is in favor of the limitation?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I certainly am. And I think it should be done even more. We should do it on each department. I wish the chairman had agreed some years ago, along with some other members of the Committee on Appropriations, to place expenditure limitations on Government departments because we could have been doing it all these years and prevented a great deal of the wild spending that we have had.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MAHON. My friend is entitled to his views. The ceiling should help but holding down authorizations and appropriations is the surest way to cut spending. No one can predict just what Congress will do, but I hope that the proposal here will be well supported by the House and by the other body.

COMPARISON OF TITLE IV OF PENDING BILL WITH THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET PROPOSAL IN THE 1946 REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. Chairman, in elaboration, may I add that the discussion recalls the efforts of the Congress, some 22 years ago, to enact a legislative budget, an important and really key feature of which was to put a ceiling on Government spending. I think it might be useful to insert an analysis comparing that effort with title IV of the pending bill:

By proposing a ceiling on the aggregate of government spending for fiscal 1970, title IV of the pending bill would secure something of what the framers of the legislative budget plan in the 1946 Reorganization Act had in mind, but which Congress in fact never accomplished. It would be useful to recall briefly what that plan was about, refer to the experiences in attempting to carry it out, and make some note of the similarities and dissimilarities between the provisions of the 1946 plan and title IV of the pending bill.

THE 1946 LEGISLATIVE BUDGET PLAN

The legislative budget plan was spelled out in the 1946 law. It is now a part of Rule XLII of the Rules of the House, and reads as follows:

"(a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

"(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: 'That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$.....'

In other words, the joint committee, after study of the budget and consultations otherwise, was to bring in, early in the session, a concurrent resolution proposing an expression of the judgment of the Congress as to the probable budget revenues for the coming fiscal year and fixing a maximum budget expenditure goal for the year.

There was nothing mandatory or compelling about any ceiling so fixed upon.

It was not an enactment requiring approval of the President.

It was to be not a binding statute but only a target for the guidance of the Congress in processing the spending and revenue bills.

It was not directed to the Executive spending agencies, but only to the Congress. In its individual actions in the appropriation and the other spending bills, and on the revenue side, Congress could either hew to the disciplines implicitly suggested by the ceiling thus set, or it could ignore the ceiling.

In the first effort—in 1947—to put the plan into effect, both Houses adopted a concurrent resolution. The House proposed an overall cut of \$6 billion from projected fiscal 1948 budget expenditures. The Senate proposed a \$4.5 billion reduction. The conferees did not resolve the differences and the resolution died in conference. Thus no target ceiling was set.

The next year, Congress, on February 27, 1948, did adopt such a concurrent resolution with respect to fiscal 1949, setting—for itself—the goal of a \$2.5 billion reduction in budgeted expenditures by expressing the

judgment, "based upon presently available information", that * * * "expenditures during such fiscal year shall not exceed 37.2 billion dollars * * *".

Actual budget expenditures in fiscal 1949 were \$40 billion; they exceeded the target by \$2.8 billion, in effect wiping out the reduction goal of \$2.5 billion. They exceeded the original budget projection of \$39.7 billion by some \$300 million.

In 1949, a move was made to set the date for action on the legislative budget for fiscal 1950 back from February 15 to May 1. Nothing further happened. Nothing further has been done in direct response to the legislative budget plan.

Many post-mortems have been rendered on the experiment. It was said that the joint committee of 102 members was unwieldy.

It was said that the time limit of February 15 was too short.

It was said that to name an expenditure reduction total in advance in the manner proposed approximated a court rendering a verdict without evidence. It was said that to vote for a blanket reduction in advance of hearings and consideration of the individual budget proposals was a vote to cut without knowing what is to be cut, how much is to be cut, or where the cut is to be made.

It was said that no legislative budget, logically premised, could precede a detailed study of the estimate.

The majority report accompanying the first concurrent resolution submitted to the House in February, 1947, suggesting the goal of a \$6 billion cutback, had this acknowledgment:

"Of course, if the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reduction in specific items contained in the budget. The resolution expresses an overall objective and its realization depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon budget estimates, individually and collectively."

THE 1946 PLAN AND TITLE IV—SIMILARITIES AND DISSIMILARITIES

There are a number of basic differences between the 1946 plan and title IV. There are also some similarities.

Of course, title IV does not deal with the revenue side. The 1946 plan did. But Congress knows what the revenue estimates of the Executive Branch are—although it should be noted that an up-dating of the January figures are needed; the April 15 budget review of President Nixon dealt only with appropriations and spending, not with revenues. The budget surplus of \$5.8 billion projected by President Nixon is subject to revision on that account.

Perhaps the most basic difference between title IV and the spending ceiling in the legislative budget resolutions of 1947 and 1948 is that title IV would legislate a rigid ceiling into law, whereas the earlier resolutions merely sought to set a goal against which Congress would work in its actions on the various spending bills.

The earlier "ceiling" was not really a ceiling because it was not enacted as a law and was not binding on either Congress or the Executive. Title IV would set a binding statutory ceiling. The ceiling figure, insofar as congressional decision is concerned, is a beginning, not an ending figure. But whatever figure Congress would wind up setting, that would become a maximum on the Executive Branch, changeable only by subsequent action of Congress. That was not the case in the 1947 and 1948 efforts.

Unlike the earlier efforts which sought to declare at the beginning that the spending budget "should" be cut by not less than a pre-determined, arbitrary amount but which was cast in such a way as not to ensure it, title IV would not impose any reduction in advance—either as a "goal" for Congress or as a "ceiling" that would leave to the

Executive the allocation of an arbitrary cut to specific agencies and programs.

Unlike King Canute who commanded the tide not to come in but was powerless to ensure it, title IV, unlike the earlier efforts "commands" that expenditures shall not exceed a certain sum and carries the mechanism to ensure the result. Of course, Congress can change tomorrow what it decides today, but that power, as to expenditures, is reserved to Congress by title IV.

Unlike the earlier effort, nothing in title IV calls on Congress to vote for a reduction—either as a "goal" or a "ceiling"—below the President's announced spending budget in advance of individual item consideration. The mechanism is there to adjust the initial ceiling figure—up or down—to comport with what Congress decides on each spending bill and proposition.

Not unlike what the majority report—quoted above—said about final results under the 1947 resolution "goal", what happens under title IV (which adopts the budget figure as a starting point)—. . . "depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon budget estimates, individually and collectively".

Like the words used in both the 1947 and 1948 resolutions, title IV is "based upon presently available information". The legislative budget effort was based on the initial budget. Title IV is also based on the initial projection of the new administration.

Like the earlier efforts, title IV encompasses expenditures from unexpended carryover balances of previous appropriations as well as expenditures from appropriations to be newly enacted in this session for fiscal 1970.

And unlike the noble but ineffective and impractical plan of 1946, title IV is a proposal logically based and practical of operation. If adopted and adhered to, it will not only focus on the total of government expenditures, but will keep the hands of Congress on the total. And the potential for retrenchment in expenditures is considerable.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF MILITARY PROGRAMS AND LEADERS

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to return to a matter I mentioned earlier, which is the business of military spending.

As I said in the colloquy with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), I believe in military strength. I believe we can negotiate with the Soviet Union better if we have military strength. I believe our main opponent in the world is not Korea or North Vietnam but the Soviet Union and Red China. I think we have to keep ourselves militarily strong. I do not think we ought to permit those to succeed who are trying to destroy the image of our civilian and uniformed military personnel. It is true our military establishments have prevented woric war III, which was and is the great catastrophic threat that has confronted us since World War II. Our military have won their wars insofar as they were able to do so under all of the facts and circumstances which pertained.

They have reflected great credit upon this country and they have also shown some considerable managerial ability.

It was Admiral Raborn who headed up the Polaris program. In this Polaris program he demonstrated leadership that was incomparable.

It was Admiral Rickover who headed up the development of the atomic submarine program. He has performed a magnificent job in that field.

It was Gen. Ben Schriever who headed

up the intercontinental ballistic missiles program of the Air Force.

Many good jobs have been done. There are countless examples of success by our military and civilian leaders. We cannot look only at shortcomings. We must look at the successes also, and we have reason to be proud.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken more time than I had anticipated but I believe it has given the members of the committee an opportunity to propound certain questions about programs in which they are interested.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I alluded earlier to unexpended carryover balances. The report reflects \$226 billion. I will ask if it is not correct that this \$226 billion unexpended carryover balance, if added to the Nixon budget request for new spending authority of \$205 billion, would not make a total of \$431 billion available for expenditure if the Nixon budget were approved as submitted?

Mr. MAHON. This is right. This \$431 billion would be, technically, available for expenditure in 1970. If we adopted the appropriation or obligational budget proposed by the President, there would be about \$431 billion available in fiscal 1970. But this requires a lot of understanding and analysis before it is intelligible to the average citizen. It is a very complex matter.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, it is a very flexible budget and it is not really putting a crimp on the Bureau of the Budget the \$192.9 billion spending figure is the full amount projected by the Nixon budget review.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

(Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. JONAS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11400 is the usual supplemental appropriation bill which we have each spring for those items not provided for in our regular appropriations bills approved during the preceding calendar year.

Overall, I think this is a good bill. The committee considered appropriation requests totaling \$4.3 billion, and approved appropriations of \$3.8 billion, thus we cut almost \$600 million below the requested amount. Moreover, the \$4.3 billion request was reduced some \$250 million by the Nixon administration under the amounts requested in the Johnson budget before we considered the request.

While I shall not repeat the detail presented by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), I do want to point out that of the \$3.8 billion provided \$1.2 billion is for military operations in Southeast Asia; \$1.2 billion is for pay increases resulting from the Pay Act of last year; and the balance of \$1.4 billion is for a variety of programs throughout the Government service.

Significant among the amounts provided are the funds requested by the ad-

ministration to fight crime throughout the United States. This effort to cope with organized crime should be welcomed by all law-abiding citizens. It is my hope that substantial inroads can be made by the Department of Justice and other investigatory and regulatory agencies in coping with the criminal problems which face us.

Although each of the individual chapters in the bill will be handled by the respective ranking Republican Members, I do want to point out that this bill provides for a spending limitation in fiscal 1970 which will restrict budget expenditures to \$192.9 billion. This \$192.9 billion figure is some \$4 billion below the adjusted amounts projected by the Johnson budget.

As we all know, President Nixon had the departments and agencies conduct an extensive review of their financial needs earlier this year, and the President was able to reduce projected expenditures by the aforementioned \$4 billion. As all members of the Committee know, for more than 3½ years I have offered the so-called Bow expenditure limitation amendment on most appropriation bills, and while it was adopted on a number of occasions by the House, in some instances unanimously, it was never approved by the Senate on an individual appropriation bill. However, last year such limitation was included in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 and it has had the effect of reducing projected Federal spending in the current fiscal year by some \$6 billion.

The provision before us which would limit budget expenditures in fiscal 1970 to \$192.9 billion is much more rigid than was the expenditure limitation of last year because a number of budget expenditure items were exempted from the provisions of the limitation last year. Expenditures in the current fiscal year for the war in Vietnam, expenditures for interest on the public debt, those for veterans benefits and compensation, and so forth, were excluded from the limit and their exemption had the effect of increasing spending for exempted programs and in the so-called uncontrollable areas by approximately \$6 billion above original estimates.

For example, interest on the public debt is up \$1.1 billion above the original estimate of a year ago and farm price support outlays have risen \$1.6 billion above the original estimate of last year.

Of the \$192.9 billion of proposed spending for fiscal 1970, some \$106.3 billion is in the relatively uncontrollable category. That includes \$81.1 billion for uncontrollable civilian programs and \$25.2 billion for special Southeast Asia support. Of the \$81.1 billion for relatively uncontrollable civilian programs \$49 billion is for outlays in the social security and public assistance programs.

Thus it seems to me that the administration will have serious difficulty holding expenditures in fiscal 1970 at \$192.9 billion since there are no exemptions for the uncontrollables such as the war in Vietnam, interest on the public debt, and so forth.

While it is true that expenditures may rise above or fall below the \$192.9 bil-

lion ceiling depending upon action or inaction by Congress on requests for appropriations, the ceiling is indeed rigid and leaves little leeway for unexpected changes in budget outlays.

As the ceiling is written in the bill it provides the following:

That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendation thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

If, for example, Congress fails to approve the postal rate increase in the amount of some \$600 million, budget expenditures will rise by that amount since postal receipts are treated as offsets against spending. Similarly, the \$192.9 billion ceiling will rise by \$600 million since the postal rate proposal is accounted for in the expenditure total. But, it also follows that where other uncontrollable expenditures exceed current budget estimates, then expenditures for controllable programs would have to be cut below current estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill in terms of the reductions which we have made in obligatory authority, and I urge favorable action by the House on it. I am somewhat distressed, however, by the rigid ceiling on spending since history clearly shows a wide variation between actual expenditures and those projected in a budget document some 18 months before the close of a given fiscal year.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to 50 minutes of what I believe to be as interesting a discussion of budget problems that I have ever heard in this Chamber. The gentleman from Texas has handled this subject in a masterful way and in my opinion has covered it adequately. Actually, I see no real reason why I should extend the discussion, because I doubt if I can add anything that he has not already covered.

However, there are a few points that I would like to make primarily by way of emphasizing what the gentleman from Texas has said. Actually, this bill contains four separate titles. They will be discussed, undoubtedly, by the chairmen of the various subcommittees that handle those topics and by the ranking minority members who work with them.

In summary, it can be said that in this supplemental bill the committee considered budget requests amounting to \$4.364 billion, reduced that total request by \$580,794,190, and recommend to the House a bill providing for \$3,783,212,766, a reduction of 13 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it is not unusual to hear remarks to the effect that the House Committee on Appropriations marched up the hill last year and cut the budget by \$14 billion and now it is marching down the same hill and restoring nearly \$4 billion of that cut. But, as the chairman has pointed out, only about 1 percent of the funds contained in this bill amount to restora-

tion of funds that were eliminated in the regular bills last year.

The remaining part of the bill covers mandatory increases that have been made necessary because of action taken by the Congress subsequent to the enactment of the appropriation bills last year.

I would like to discuss briefly the title of the bill which covers independent offices, and with particular reference to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, because that subject was raised in the colloquy between the gentleman from Texas and a member of the committee.

It is customary to read in the press that Congress has been very remiss in looking after the problems of the cities; that we have neglected them and that we have spent a lot of money on farm programs and allowed the cities to grow up in slums and what-not. I believe at times such as these that it is appropriate to remind those who read the RECORD, and who report on these deliberations—because it is not necessary to remind the Members of the House, because I am sure they are all familiar with the facts—but to those who are not familiar with the facts, I believe they need to be reminded occasionally that Congress has been pretty generous in spending the taxpayers' money on urban problems.

For example, we have been hearing a lot this afternoon about unexpended balances; and the budget does reflect that there will be on hand at the end of 1969 \$226 billion in unexpended funds. But I do not believe it has been mentioned—and this is the most significant part of that figure—that \$139,238,000,000 of that total is not even obligated. The total of \$226 billion includes unspent and unobligated funds, but there is approximately \$140 billion in the hands of the executive branch of the Government in previously appropriated funds which have not even been obligated, or will not be obligated at the end of fiscal 1969.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has on hand—or will have at the end of this year—\$20 billion of previously appropriated money which has not been spent. Some of it has been obligated, but it will have \$13.5 billion of unobligated funds at the end of this year.

We have appropriated to that Department nearly \$1 billion since 1967—\$948 million, to be exact, for the new model cities program, and very little of it has been spent. They announced nine grants a few months ago, and over the last week-end three more were announced.

I do not know what causes the delay. I know it took the previous Secretary of Housing and Urban Development 7 months after he had all of the plans in to even select the first group of cities.

So I do not believe Congress can be justly charged with any lack of a sense of urgency about these problems. I believe much of the delay can be attributed to paper shuffling, foot dragging and bureaucracy in the department.

Let me tell you in brief capsule form some of the programs Congress has funded for the aid of cities.

Urban renewal is one of the important

ones. Do you know that through 1969 the Congress has provided HUD and its predecessor with \$4.6 billion for urban renewal? Through 1969 the Congress has provided nearly \$3 billion public housing subsidies? Let me show you how the cost of the subsidy for public housing is increasing as the years go by.

The total was \$208 million in 1965.

It went up to \$241 million in 1966.

It went to \$261 million in 1967.

Then to \$295 million in 1968.

It went to \$350 million, plus a \$16 million supplemental or to \$366 million in 1969.

The 1970 budget calls for \$473 million.

New public housing starts are scheduled at 130,000 in 1970.

We have the rent supplement program.

We have the homeownership program, and we have the rental subsidy program.

We have the housing for the elderly and the rehabilitation program.

We have the below-market interest program and we have the community facilities program; the open-space land programs.

You name them—there are about 70 different programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development being funded by the Congress from funds extracted from all of the taxpayers of the United States—70 different programs operated by one Department of the Government, in various aid to the cities.

Yet we are accused of doing nothing.

The truth of the matter is that we are spending about \$30 billion a year on urban problems.

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in a colloquy with the chairman earlier, I responded to the question as to what brandnew programs we are funding in this supplemental and what they will cost—and I refer now to the programs under section 235, that is the homeownership program, a program under which the Government will subsidize the interest for a homeowner who wishes to buy a house and cannot pay the interest charges.

The subsidy will amount to the interest which exceeds 1 percent. So if the current interest rate is 7½ percent, the Government will subsidize it at no more than 6½ percent.

We put in the regular bill last year \$25 million in contract authority for that program, and we are including in the supplemental an additional \$40 million in contract authority. That is \$65 million that is being voted this fiscal year for this new program which is just getting under way. That contract authority simply means that we give the department authority to commit the Government to spend \$65 million a year on homeownership interest subsidies for 40 years—or \$2.6 billion.

There is a companion program under section 236, known as the rental housing assistance program, which carried the same figure of \$25 million in the regular bill and another \$40 million in this supplemental. So under these two sections, these two new programs, in addition to public housing and in addi-

tion to urban area and in addition to community facilities and in addition to all of these other programs—here are two additional programs that are going to cost—even if we do not ever give them another dime in future years—that are going to cost the taxpayers \$5.2 billion.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is pursuing a very interesting aspect of Federal spending. I hope that he will place in the RECORD in connection with his remarks, if the figures have been assembled—and I know the gentleman's subcommittee has asked for them—the continuing costs that are mandated by previous actions on all these various housing-type programs, rent supplements, and so forth.

The reason I make this request is that there are those who feel that Congress is losing control of the purse. I think we are not losing control of the purse at all. When we appropriate money, we expect it to be spent for the programs which we have endorsed. In the past we have not tried to fix a rate of expenditure of the funds which we have provided for various programs except to a limited degree, which we discussed earlier. But if you approve a series of long-term programs and you grant the first down payment on a 40-year program, then for 40 years the Government is committed to that particular expenditure, because it is fixed by an action of the Congress. It is done by Congress. It is not a loss of control by Congress in the beginning, but we lock just that much more into the fixed and subsequently uncontrollable area of expenditure.

I would like to have the gentleman's views on that matter.

Mr. JONAS. I certainly agree with the chairman, and I believe he would agree with me that we ought to begin giving closer scrutiny to requests for contract authority. That is where the process begins. We cannot keep up with what is going on unless, as we grant contract authority, we know how long that authority is to extend and the total amount that will be involved, because when we grant contract authority, what we do is to pile up mandatory appropriations over the period of the contract. Some of those contracts go for 35 years, most of them for 40 years. What we are doing here, in funding sections 235 and 236, is a clear example of the mistake we make when we talk about appropriating \$80 million when the cost of the program is \$3.2 billion.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Between the statements of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, we are almost drowned in figures concerning this bill, and it is proper that the chairman and the gentleman from North Carolina give us the figures contained in this bill. But let me see if I can get a small-sized handle on this big spending proposal in this way: This bill provides for

a ceiling of \$192,900,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What are the total estimated expenditures for this fiscal year? In other words, this bill would fix a ceiling of \$192.9 billion for fiscal 1970. What will be the amount spent in this fiscal year which ends on June 30?

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MAHON. The expenditure for this year will be about \$185 billion. So, under the administration's expenditure projection, expenditures would go up by \$8 billion, 1970 over 1969, and appropriations would go up by about \$10 billion.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman refers to the \$192.9 billion. Does that include the expenditures that he is giving the House now for the present fiscal year? Does that include the \$3.8 billion in this supplemental?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; the \$3.8 billion is all within these figures.

Mr. GROSS. They definitely include the \$3.8 billion in this supplemental?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Iowa made that point, because I did not want to forget to remind the Committee that if we adopt the recommendations of our committee with respect to the spending limitation, that will not be the end. We are going to have to work hard on every single appropriation bill to make reductions, because otherwise any reductions that are made will have to be made by the executive branch of the Government. There are Members of this body who do not want to give him the discretion or authority to decide where cuts shall be made. So we reserve the right, if we do our duty and live up to our responsibility and do not abdicate to the President the authority to make these cuts, to make the cuts in subsequent appropriation bills for fiscal year 1970 as they come before the House for adoption.

We cannot just adopt this spending limitation and then sit back and rubberstamp all the appropriation bills, and we do not intend to do it, but we have to have some support on this floor.

I have already heard rumors that efforts are going to be made to increase the Nixon budget. While the majority leader in the other body is making statements that spending should be reduced \$10 billion below the Nixon budget. And, there are people on this side of the Capitol who are saying already that the spending cuts are too deep. I think it is true, as it has been in all but 3 of the last 14 years, that spending has been underestimated by whoever was in the White House, and I think spending this year in the 1970 budget is underestimated. I am sure it is underestimated in the interest of the national debt and in some other areas also.

I agree with the chairman that this is not going to be any sweet pill for the administration to swallow. It is something that the administration would like to avoid, I am sure. I certainly would not

want to have to live under this limitation if I were the Executive or if I were his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but they understand full well that they have the responsibility of trying their dead-level best to live up to these spending limitations, and they are going to have to live up to them unless Congress should unwisely I think exceed the budget requests on some appropriation bills.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do so merely to make the point that I agree again with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) that we cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for watching the authorization bills as they come in.

In that regard, I am not aware of a single authorization bill that has been approved so far in this session of Congress that has not carried an increase in spending. Is the gentleman aware of an authorization bill that has not been increased?

Mr. JONAS. I am aware of the fact that one adopted on the floor of this House a few days ago was substantially above the budget.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a single one that has not provided for an increased outlay of money.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from Iowa is correct. That is the first place to start. The second place to start is within the Appropriations Committee, and I think we are going to bring some substantial cuts here for the consideration of the House, and we are going to ask for the Members' cooperation as we undertake to make some substantial reductions this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB).

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the need for supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1969 has been recognized as needed and required for many months.

The Committee on Appropriations in their report dated July 19, 1968, No. 1735 on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969, discussed the budgetary effect of the war in Vietnam and the possibility of added funds. The report stated:

It is probable that the funds provided will not be entirely adequate through the end of the current fiscal year and that a supplemental request will be made in the next session of Congress. This has been the case in the past several years.

The committee in their report also informed the House that funds were not included for military or civilian pay increases which became effective July 1, 1968. The committee report when discussing other fiscal considerations stated:

In accordance with longstanding custom, this bill does not include funds for the military and civilian pay increase for fiscal year 1969, which became effective this month. There will be, as has been the case in the past, a supplemental estimate presented to the next session of Congress covering such costs government-wide.

On September 11, 1968, when the fiscal year 1969 bill was before the House of Representatives, I remarked on the need for added appropriations as follows:

It should also be noted that the Department of Defense will require additional fiscal year 1969 funds in order to meet present requirements, particularly in Southeast Asia. A supplemental request will be required. This has been the case in the past several years. Known increases already indicate consumption of certain specific ammunition items has greatly increased. Force deployments already approved are in excess of those upon which the budget was based. If the war continues at the present rate of expenditure of material, other costs will rise. The military and civilian pay increases which went into effect July 1, 1968, are not included in the budget now before the House.

The additional new obligational authority recommended in this second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969, H.R. 11400, now before the House, for the Department of Defense, in titles I, II, and III is a net total of \$2,312,068,000.

These additional funds are required to support United States and our allies military operations in Southeast Asia. Funds are included for the pay of military personnel, for operation and maintenance, and for procurement of items to replace combat losses. The total request also includes funds for military and civilian pay increases already implemented under provisions of previously enacted laws and mandatory increases in military retired pay.

The supplemental budget estimates for fiscal year 1969 for the Department of Defense as proposed and transmitted to the Congress by President Johnson, January 17, 1969 totaled \$3,011,900,000. A reassessment by President Nixon's administration was completed in April and the revised estimate to Congress totaled \$2,871,200,000 a reduction of \$140,700,000. The Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense after devoting considerable time to analyzing the request, recommended a further reduction of \$559,132,000. The \$2,312,068,000 total recommended in this bill represents a total decrease of \$699,832,000 below the January 17, 1969 estimate.

For title I the revised estimates for military operations in Southeast Asia totaled \$1,496,900,000. The committee reduced this amount by \$262,900,000 and recommends appropriations totaling \$1,234,000,000.

In title II the committee recommends appropriations totaling \$226,050,000, a reduction of \$23,632,000 below the revised request of \$249,682,000. The largest part of the funds requested in this title, \$175,000,000, is for "Retired pay, military." The requirement for additional funds results from increased benefits paid in accordance with cost of living allowances previously authorized by law.

The balance of the appropriations in title II is funding for increased per diem costs for reservists in travel status based on a new law, Public Law 90-168, premium pay and employee benefits for National Guard technicians, depot overhaul of Guard equipment and aircraft, and funds for training and other operational costs.

Under title III there is recommended

\$852,018,000 for military and civilian pay increases. This is a reduction of \$272,600,000 below the revised request. The subcommittee reduced all requests for funds to meet increased pay costs as the requests were estimated on the total annual requirements which were based on first quarter obligations. Many of the estimates have been proven to be overstated at this point in time.

The gross amount recommended for the Department of Defense in this bill for military and civilian pay increases under titles I and II is \$903,768,000. Of this amount \$678,950,000 is for military pay and \$224,818,000 is for civilian pay. The additional pay costs and added funds stem from the second phase comparability pay adjustments effective last July 1. These increases were authorized in Public Law 90-206, the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and Public Law 90-207, increasing the basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense spent considerable time in analyzing the request for the funds requested to be assured that only those additional funds actually required were recommended. We feel that the funds which are included in this bill are needed and the appropriation should be approved.

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

President Johnson's budget for fiscal year 1969 submitted in January, 1968, proposed defense expenditures for support of Vietnam operations in the amount of \$25.8 billion. It was known during 1968 that figure was a low estimate.

The present estimate for military operations in Vietnam for fiscal year 1969 is \$28.8 billion in expenditures. This amount includes the estimates submitted in connection with the pending bill.

In January of this year the supplemental requirement for fiscal year 1969 in support of military operations in Vietnam was estimated at \$1.632 billion. The reassessment which the new administration completed in April confirmed the validity of the requirement but reduced the funds requested to \$1.497 billion.

The committee, in the bill before us, recommends \$1.234 billion in funds for military operations in Southeast Asia which provides:

	Millions
For additional personnel pay costs...	\$239.5
For operational support and maintenance of equipment.....	354.4
For procurement of ammunition and ground force equipment....	640.1
Total	1,234.0

These additional requirements result directly from factors and events not contemplated when the fiscal year 1969 budget was prepared.

First, in January 1968 the Communist Tet offensive required the deployment of additional forces to Vietnam and required increased support operations, additional equipment, ammunition, and other consumables. Losses sustained were great and material had to be repaired or replaced.

Second, the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and other aggressive actions by the North

Koreans resulted in the callup of Reserve Forces to meet the possible military threat, deployment of additional air and sea forces to the area, additional equipment, and other requirements.

This request now before us does not provide for increases to our current force levels which are somewhat below the presently authorized deployment of 549,500.

The committee procurement recommendation provides equipment and consumables for American and Allied ground forces and also to upgrade our production base. More than 65 percent of the procurement funds—\$419.5 million—is for ammunition.

The operation and maintenance appropriations require supplemental appropriations for Reserve callup and additional deployment, maintenance of material, aircraft fuel and oil and increases and modernization of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam.

Included in this supplemental are additional funds for the modernization and upgrading of the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. This is a very significant part of this supplemental bill.

President Nixon on Wednesday, May 14, said that the strengthening of the South Vietnamese forces has been speeded up and the President said:

That time is approaching when South Vietnamese forces will be able to take over some of the fighting fronts now being manned by Americans.

The funds in this bill will directly aid the speed up of the strengthening of the South Vietnamese forces.

Significantly this bill as recommended by the committee includes a total of \$246.4 million in funds which are for purposes which will enable the South Vietnamese to eventually defend themselves and thus to gain the opportunity to determine their own future.

Funds are included to procure for the South Vietnamese Armed Forces ammunition and equipment such as armored cars, trucks, rifles, communications, and electronic devices. Also included are funds for South Vietnamese training, as well as general supplies, spare parts, transportation, and depot operations associated with the major end items provided the South Vietnamese.

We must welcome the effective assumption by South Vietnamese forces of a larger share of combat operations for certainly our overall national interests do dictate that we begin reductions of U.S. forces as soon as is feasible and that our forces not remain in substantial number indefinitely if a negotiated settlement proves unattainable.

It is clear the administration requires the additional defense funds to meet our commitment in Southeast Asia and other already incurred obligations as provided in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has made every effort in deleting unessential items and funds not related to Southeast Asia military operations as well as correcting estimates which were overstated.

The funds recommended are necessary and should be appropriated.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10

minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, there is a portion of this bill to which I would like to address myself, and it is that having to do with the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. This involves \$700 million of the bill, broken down as follows: \$35.9 million for the Department of Labor and \$677 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The first item having to do with the Department of Labor is a \$20 million item for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.

The members of the committee will recall that earlier in the year we passed a supplemental in the amount of \$36 million. This will be in addition to that in order to rectify those faulty estimates that were submitted to us at the beginning of fiscal year 1969.

Then, too, there is also an item of \$15.9 million for employees' compensation, claims and expenses. Now, both of these items are mandatory payments required by law. Both were set up by the Nixon administration, because the previous estimates, as I said, were too low.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be borne in mind that compensation benefits paid to surviving children are involved in this particular item. Back in 1966 when we amended the law we provided that full-time students could receive payments until the age of 23; whereas, before they were cut off at the age of 18. We were told in our testimony that these payments to these children average \$110 a month or \$1,320 per year per child. This is one of the factors which goes into this increase.

Then, too, there is an item for the cost-of-living increase, and an increase in the maximum monthly allowance from \$525 to better than three times that amount, \$1,600. That amount has led to many of our Federal employees choosing workmen's compensation instead of sick leave. An injured employee has the choice or option to use sick leave or receive compensation. Twelve years ago only about 37 percent of our injured employees chose to use the compensation route rather than choosing sick leave. But today that figure is practically reversed to 57 percent of the employees using compensation rather than sick leave.

In the area of higher education the first item of interest is that of interest subsidy grants in the amount of \$3,920,000. This will initiate a new program of debt service grants authorized in the higher education amendments that we passed last year.

That was Public Law 90-575, signed into law October 16, 1968. It replaces the same amount of direct Federal loans permitting a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, as we pointed out earlier in our colloquy on the subject with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH). The Federal Government in this program pays the difference between the 3-percent interest rate and the going rate—and incidentally, in the fiscal year 1970 budget there is an item for interest

subsidy in the amount of \$10,670,000, which will provide for an increase then of \$6,750,000 for fiscal year 1970. Obviously this manifests itself in a greater construction of facilities at our institutions of higher learning in the years to come.

Incidentally, they told us in our hearings that there are applications on file for in excess of \$200 million worth of construction. As I said, this \$3.9 million will give us \$145 million of construction this first year.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. I believe the gentleman is approximately correct. We have the same problem in our bill in our subcommittee in funding HUD's requests. It is a lot better, I believe, to provide assistance with interest payments than for the Federal Government to go into the money market and compete with business enterprises and individuals for the available credit, and thus put our fiscal house more in disorder than is already the case.

Mr. MICHEL. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina makes a good point. Of course, Congress so expressed itself when we passed this law in October of 1968 providing for this.

I might say that this year we have about 6 million college students, and the projection is that in 1970 we will have 10 million students at our institutions of higher learning, so the need for the construction of facilities is paramount.

There is also an item in here of \$7,241,000. This is for the Federal City College, a direct payment, or a one-lump-sum payment to the Federal City College in the District of Columbia. This was the amount authorized in Public Law 90-354 as a one-time lump-sum appropriation in lieu of a land grant for the Federal City College in the District of Columbia. We were told that this sum will at the moment be invested in Government bonds to realize a return of some \$360,000 for the Federal City College of the District of Columbia to be used for salaries and other expenses of the university.

I might say, too, that over and above this the Federal City College will also receive a share of the annual appropriation for land-grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and that allotment in fiscal year 1970 will be approximately \$168,000, out of a total figure of something like \$12 million for the entire country. So here we are for fiscal year 1970 giving the District of Columbia a proportionate cut of the shares that normally go to the other 50 States.

Then too under the second Morrill Act the Federal City College would come in for another share of \$50,000 out of the total allotment of \$2,600,000 for the country.

In the item of the public health service, comprehensive health planning and services, there is an item of \$128,000 for increased pay under Public Law 90-206 and 207. \$9,600,000, the biggest item here, is for a program to combat German measles, better known as Rubella, the 3-day type of measles. We have now been

told that an effective vaccine has been developed and is expected to be licensed within the very near future.

What we are doing here is actually a forward funding so that we will not have to wait to get this program underway until the normal appropriation bill can be passed later in the year.

Incidentally, to give you some idea of the proportions of the problem here, there is expected to be another epidemic either this year or next year. If we look back to the last Rubella epidemic that we had in 1964, there were some 20,000 children born with defects. The testimony before our committee states that this will cost us in the end some \$2.8 million in medical costs without even considering the rehabilitation costs for these poor children, the 20,000 or more who were born with deformities of one kind or another as a result of that Rubella epidemic in 1964.

So it is a very worthwhile project and one which should go forward immediately.

Then for District of Columbia medical facilities there is an item here of some \$15 million. This is a portion of the amount authorized under Public Law 90-457 for grants and loans to construct hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia.

The item was included in the 1970 appropriation bill but we moved it forward here in this supplemental to enable hospitals in the District of Columbia to move ahead with their construction which is already underway.

We have been told there are some very serious financial troubles among the various hospitals here in the District of Columbia.

This is a very worthwhile item.

The biggest item in this supplemental consists of HEW and has to do with grants to States for public assistance. This is a total of \$651,546,000. This figure merges together three appropriation requests—maintenance payments to States in the amount of \$343,524,900 and this is \$30 million under their request. Although we were told in the testimony that this is a legitimate figure now that adjustments have been made in the States and that is a bona fide figure.

If you add this supplemental to what we have appropriated in the 1969 regular bill of \$3,051,900,000, you have a total amount of payments to States for public assistance for maintenance alone an aggregate of \$3,395,424,000.

The second item is for medical assistance in this supplemental for \$278,022,000.

If you add that to the original appropriation in 1969 of \$2,118,300,000—we have a total in this item for the fiscal year of 1969 of \$2,396,322,000 or a grand total in this fiscal year 1969 in grants to the States of \$5,791,746,000. For the fiscal year 1970—and hold on to your hats—it is going up again—the projections are that it will be \$6,600,000,000.

The reasons they gave us for the increased payments are—and these are all required by law—the deferral of the AFDC—that was pushed back as you will recall; the increased average payments; the increases in the number of recipients; the increased use of inter-

mediate care facilities; then finally the rising medical costs.

So this is an astronomical figure that we are talking about here in these grants to the States for public assistance and something certainly has to be done to reorient this whole program or else we are going to have to shoot the moon in the future to come up with sufficient funds to cover these programs that have been authorized.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, inquiries have been made about chapter VI, the Interior and related agencies section of the supplemental bill, particularly in regard to additional funding for the increased production of timber.

There is \$610,000 provided in chapter VI to accelerate timber production in the fiscal year 1969 on national forest and Indian lands as part of the national effort to increase the timber supply and thus ameliorate the current shortage which has contributed materially to the increased price of lumber. Of that amount, \$150,000 is provided for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and \$460,000 is for the U.S. Forest Service. It is estimated this will produce an additional 75 million board feet from the BIA forests and an additional 270 million board feet from the U.S. Forest Service lands.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am very glad that the gentlewoman from Washington made that explanation, because the timber shortage, I am told, is quite acute. It is very appropriate that we open up these lands for the scientific production of timber. I am very glad indeed that the record will show that these steps are being taken and that additional timber will be made available.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina. May I add that in the regular hearings of the committee for fiscal year 1970, volume 3, on the U.S. Forest Service, you will find an excellent discussion between the U.S. Forest Service and the committee on timber requirements and the funds that need to be spent in the national forests. You will also find similar discussions with the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs in our 1970 hearings. The funding in this supplemental bill, \$610,000, is just "a piece of adhesive tape" to meet the total problem before us. I assure you the committee in its consideration and markup of the regular 1970 bill intends to provide the maximum funds possible for the increased production of timber.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this brief time merely to call to the attention of the House the items that are in the supplemental bill relating to the Department of Agriculture. There are just

four items, each of which is demanded because of an emergency, or because of mandatory provisions which require the expenditures, which is the true purpose of the supplemental appropriation bill, in my estimation.

The first item is a matter of \$1,400,000, which is needed in order to combat a very serious outbreak of screw-worm in the Southwest part of the United States, which we were unable to forecast during the course of the regular appropriations for the fiscal year 1969. This amount of money has actually already been spent. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has the authority to authorize these expenditures in order to meet the emergency, and for that reason they have to be reimbursed at this time.

In addition, there is an item of \$218,000 which is to meet the mandatory Federal contribution to the retirement fund for the State extension personnel. These payments are related to the increased funds provided by the Congress in the regular 1969 appropriation bill to place the extension jobs on a salary basis more comparable with other agricultural personnel.

Then there is an item of \$7,500,000, which is necessary in order to meet the regular sugar beet payments, which is a mandatory payment that must be made. The increased moneys become necessary because the crop last year was greater than the estimate.

There are also increased pay costs necessary to be paid. They total more than approximately \$28 million, but there is only \$12,900,000 which is provided by supplemental appropriations. \$10 million is provided by releases from Public Law 90-364 reserves, and another \$5,182,000 is provided by transfers from funds within the Department.

Probably the most significant item within this supplemental appropriation as it relates to the Agriculture Department is the transfer of \$25 million out of unobligated funds from the FHA direct loan account to the emergency credit revolving fund. This becomes necessary in order to meet the emergency needs for credit. Some very unusual demands have been placed upon this emergency fund because of floods that have occurred throughout the Midwest, in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Illinois, Missouri, California, and several other places. The demands are such that they are necessary in order to keep farm operations going during this coming fiscal year.

In view of the fact that the Department is out of money in this category now, it becomes most essential that these moneys are provided by a transfer from the direct loan account, and requiring also that the account be repaid as the loans are repaid.

I am sure it will be provide much needed relief to a great many farmers who otherwise would find themselves in economic distress were it not for this appropriation.

In conclusion, let me say that each of these items is essential and necessary to the proper operation of the Department

of Agriculture. I can very heartily recommend them to the House for approval.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I support and the minority members support the committee's recommendation for supplemental appropriations for the Cuban refugee program. The committee recommends the appropriation of \$2,700,000 of the \$2,853,000 requested in new obligatory authority, and the release of \$35,000 of the \$38,000 in requested transfers from the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act reserves.

The requested increase for this program will fund the following activities:

There is \$1,254,000 for unanticipated welfare costs of refugees resettled outside the Miami area, due to the higher number of refugees requiring such assistance. The Federal Government has a commitment to reimburse the various States for these welfare expenditures.

There is \$755,000 for increased per-pupil rates for Cuban children in the Dade County, Fla., school system. This increase is due to increased operating costs to the Dade County system because of higher teacher salaries and other costs. These per-pupil rates will be studied again when the committee considers the fiscal 1970 budget requests.

There is \$844,000 for costs of transporting refugees from Cuba to Miami. Last year, Congress included language in the fiscal 1969 appropriation bill to fund this expense from this account, instead of the State Department account as had been the case in the past. It was hoped at the time that these costs could be absorbed by the program, but this has not occurred, thus these funds are necessary.

Although the committee is recommending the appropriation of most of this request, I think it would be well to point out the rapidly increasing cost of the Cuban refugee program. In fiscal 1968, Congress appropriated \$49 million for this program; in fiscal 1969, including this supplemental, this figure had increased to \$70.7 million; and the committee now has pending before it a request for fiscal 1970 of \$87.3 million.

This represents an increase of \$38.3 million, or 78 percent, for the Cuban refugee program in only 2 years. The American people have been very generous with this program through the years, and our country has benefited from the influx of these energetic and enthusiastic immigrants. At the same time, we should be aware of these growing costs. In an effort to insure the most efficient operation possible for this program, the committee has recommended a decrease of \$153,000 from the request for new obligatory authority. It is expected that the administrators of this program can program these cutbacks to continue the effectiveness of their operations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, first let me touch on the immediate thrust of the

military sector of this bill. It is designed to provide weapons and equipment to strengthen the South Vietnamese forces; to permit these forces to assume a greater share of the burden of battle. This is most important. The South Vietnamese forces are showing greater capability and their battle effectiveness is much more encouraging. It would appear that American forces will no longer have to carry such a great part of the conflict and significantly, the South Vietnamese will be in stronger position to enforce peace when it comes. This is a very meaningful change in the overall picture.

As we consider overall additional expenditures for defense purposes, we find ourselves buffeted by conflicting winds from many sources. There is a taxpayers' revolt against high levels of spending by Government and of course the principal offender from the standpoint of the number of dollars involved is the military. This is an inevitable part of the inflation that we in Government have helped to build; have almost permitted to get out of hand. The cost of weapons and equipment is fantastically high and the costs of development of a new weapons system is even higher because of the unknown factors which are encountered. There have been a series of blunders, some of them colossal, which have shaken the faith of the people in the military and indeed in Congress and the Government. There was the TFX—the F-111 series—which was to be Mr. McNamara's great contribution and a great money saver. In the final analysis, it cost about twice as much as had been anticipated and, in some phases, has been junked. Just a few days ago, a new submarine sank at its dock while being fitted for service. It is absolutely inconceivable that such carelessness in workmanship could have or would have been permitted.

There is the usual flap about the dangers of chemical and biological weapons which always is good for column after column of horror stories in the liberal elements of the press. What they do not print is that the Russians have seven or eight times our capability in this field, and that we could be dangerously exposed in time to a Russian attack with these weapons as an alternative to a nuclear confrontation. In the field of nuclear weapons, we can at least trade destructiveness.

The question of the ABM has been greatly overplayed. It is a simple case of survival for our nuclear weapons capability. I have felt that at least equal protection should have been provided for people in cities but apparently in an effort to negate the antivotes, the administration has cut back on the scope and purpose of the ABM. Both aspects should have been approved.

In other words, we in America find ourselves completing the cycle we have seen on so many other occasions in our country. The commentators tell us that people are getting tired of war—that they want it ended—and that they want no more involvement in foreign affairs. They are saying in effect that we want to retreat to the security of our own

continent. All of this is more than a little disconcerting. I do not believe this fallacy is reflected in the thinking of the average American. I believe that a substantial majority of the American people know why we are fighting in Vietnam. They want this war won. They do not want us walking away from Vietnam with our tail between our legs, setting the tragic stage for another war when the Communists get ready for another takeover of territory and peoples.

Our first mistake was in trying too hard to fight this war without inconveniencing anyone—to fight it so that we could have both guns and butter. It is never possible to fight a war without inconveniencing someone. The fact of 35,000 being killed in a war which is not yet resolved attests to the fallacy of this approach in the Vietnamese conflict. The people should have been told why we were fighting. They should have been shown that it is in America's best interests to fight now and win rather than to risk having all of the Pacific fall into Communist hands in the years to come. We should have been told that it is patriotic to wear the uniform, patriotic to be proud of the flag, patriotic to stand up for our country. Because this was not done, the antiwar crowd has had a field day, with the Communists happily at work stirring up anti-American sentiment at every point.

As a part of this pattern, attacks are now being leveled at our military leadership. Unfortunately, this too has always been a part of the American way of conducting its affairs. When those in uniform are winning wars for us, they are our heroes. When we no longer need them, we pick them to pieces. The fact that many people now believe it is administration policy to get out of Vietnam regardless of the cost in strengthening the efforts of every person who seeks the eventual downfall of the American system of government.

The uncertainty which is sweeping America is not confined to defense. It goes much broader. It involves the whole spectrum of national security, and in this I include all of the unrest which is reflected in the news media day after day and which in too many instances is promoted by them.

We here in the House of Representatives have our responsibility. It has not changed because there is wholesale attack upon the military, or because there is concern about the cost of spending, or because people are tired of taxes. We have a responsibility to insure that those who fight our battles in Vietnam, under whatever orders they fight, receive insofar as it is possible for us to do so, every single item that they need. We have the responsibility of demonstrating to the world that we are determined that this Nation shall not, if we can avoid it, become defenseless in the years ahead. We have a responsibility to demonstrate that there is solidarity in Government, and that we will confront communism everywhere with determination. Don't think for a moment that the Communists are not watching what is happening here on the floor of the House of Representa-

tives today. Do not think for a moment that they are not noting loud and clear what we say and what we do. I do not think I need to remind those here today that we could, by responsible action, help set the stage to throw away in Paris what the uniformed services have fought for on the battlefields of Vietnam. We could throw away whatever chance is left for success in this long, terrible and costly struggle.

Those who say that America has lost the war or cannot win it, do our country a great disservice, for neither is true. By their steadfastness on the battlefield, America's fighting forces have brought the Communists to the point where they want peace. Now they are trying to achieve at the conference table what they could not achieve on the battlefield. More than ever, there is reason for unity at home and for a show of strength for America in this body, which really speaks with the voice of the American people.

One of the items of great interest is the ABM. The question of deployment of this system should be resolved without further controversy. I hope the House will follow with me some comments from informed sources on the real function and the need for an ABM system. For instance there are those who urge continuing research and development—and not deployment. The principal purpose of ABM under the present proposal is to offer protection, as needed, to our deterrent forces.

As Secretary Laird points out:

Simply continuing research and development on the ABM without any initial deployment, would leave us with no option to provide defense to our deterrent on the schedule that might be required by the Soviet threat if we do not reach an agreement with the Soviets on limiting strategic forces.

Before and since Secretary McNamara first included defense of our strategic deterrent as an option of the Sentinel system, there has been a substantial body of testimony supporting the effectiveness of this type of deployment.

Dr. Harold Brown said in testifying before the House Armed Services Committee in 1967:

Because our missile sites are small hardened targets, they are much easier to defend than cities. The exchange ratio is favorable to us for the defense of this type of target.

Dr. Edward Teller said in a recent U.S. News & World Report interview:

Twelve years ago it seemed that a missile defense was 30 times as expensive as an offense. Today the ratio is estimated at 3 to 1, although still in favor of offense. In some respects it is even estimated at 1 to 1. The main point is we don't really know. We can't find out except by actual deployment.

In rebutting recent unfavorable comment on the feasibility of defending Minuteman sites against a heavy threat, Dr. Foster made the following comment:

Various estimates of the cost of an interceptor including its assigned fraction and the radar and other systems costs have varied between \$2.5 million and \$7 million. The present cost to the U.S. and probably the Soviet Union for an offensive R/V is in excess of \$10 million. The advances which we

expect in our forces over the next few years may reduce these to about \$3 million. . . . In other words, the cost to attack and to defend in the 1970 time frame are roughly one to one.

Moreover, those who are responsible for our national defense have said that now is the time to get on with the deployment of the Safeguard system to defend our Minuteman sites. I agree.

Secretary Laird said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 21 of this year:

We cannot delay the decision beyond this budget that we presented to this Congress, covering the program for fiscal year 1970, which begins on July 1, 1969. We must include this deployment on two sites in this particular budget.

He had earlier said:

We have sufficient strength today in the combination of our strategic forces—our missiles, our bombers, and our Polaris capability—to respond to any attack that might be launched against the United States.

As Secretary of Defense, it is my obligation and my intention to keep it that way beyond any reasonable doubt. This is what the ABM discussion is all about.

And that is why we have no alternative but to protect our options to safeguard our deterrent forces. If the Soviet threat turns out to be, as the evidence strongly indicates, an attempt to erode our deterrent capability, we must be in a position to convince them that a first strike would always involve unacceptable risks.

In addition, and again quoting Secretary Laird:

Safeguard . . . offers protection, as needed, of the entire country from a small attack, such as the kind of attack that could be possibly delivered by the Chinese Communists during the decade of the 1970's or from an accidental launch.

The estimate of our intelligence community is that the earliest the Red Chinese could have this kind of capacity would be in the 1972-73 time period, and the estimate is that in the time period of 1975 and beyond, that the Red Chinese could have the capacity and the capability to have 15 or more missiles.

Dr. Edward Teller, in U.S. News & World Report, said:

A small nuclear force such as they will have in a few years could wreak real havoc on an undefended United States. We might have to give in to Chinese demands affecting not only South Vietnam but also Taiwan and even Japan, rather than take the slightest risk of their not bluffing.

In regard to the Sentinel system as a defense against the Chinese threat, Secretary McNamara stated July 1967:

This austere defense could probably preclude damage in the 1970's almost entirely.

Dr. Foster stated more recently—on May 12, 1969:

The Safeguard system has been designed by competent people, and the best that are available. Its design has been reviewed by outside experts. Those who do, in fact, study the aspects of the system that are within their area of technical expertise are convinced it will do what it is designed to do. There are some eminent scientists who, for one reason or other, claim it won't work. On that I'd like to say . . . that they have offered no problem which we have not long since addressed and resolved."

Finally Under Secretary Packard stated on March 14, 1969:

Locating sites away from major cities should make clear to the Soviet Union that the American defense is designed to preserve our deterrent—not to change the strategic balance.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the administration has somehow misled Congress about its intentions in deploying the Safeguard system.

I think it is useful to review the letter of the law here.

The current authorizations for the ABM defense system for procurement, research and development and military construction for the Army read as follows:

Public Law 90-500, for procurement:

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows: . . . For missiles: for the Army, \$956,140,000.

Public Law 90-500, for research and development:

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows: For the Army, \$1,611,900,000.

Public Law 90-408, for military construction:

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

CONUS, various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$227,460,000.

The defense and military construction appropriation acts contain even broader language.

Clearly both the Safeguard and Sentinel systems fit under the language of the law.

In fact, there is an understanding in the Congress and in the Defense Department that funds must be spent for the purposes for which they were authorized and appropriated.

In the case of the ABM system, the purpose for which they were authorized and appropriated was to provide a defense against ballistic missiles. To accuse the officials of this administration of bad faith for deploying the best balanced ABM they can design is simply to disregard the previous actions of Congress.

Congress should not get into the business of trying to design the anti-ballistic-missile system either in its minute technical details or in its tactical deployment configuration. These decisions should be left to defense planners. I suspect that much of the agreement we hear, including many of the technical arguments, are being put forth by people who are already

over their head or who are not apprised of all the facts.

Congress has in the past given rather broad authority for the construction of the ABM system. If it wishes to change this method of operation, it can do so when the additional funds which will be required for the deployment of phase I of the Safeguard system are authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 1970.

There are other items of more than average importance which are likely to escape specific attention because they are not sensational and because there appears to be no pressing need that they receive other than casual consideration. Yet these may be of very great importance.

For instance, there is the problem of maintenance of real property facilities. The taxpayers should be very directly concerned with this problem. So should be the military officials. So it would seem would be the Congress.

Nevertheless, this subject presents an increasingly aggravated picture which I want to discuss at this point.

The Committee on Appropriations has for many years been urging that the military services properly and adequately maintain the extensive real property holdings within their jurisdictions. Some 15 years ago this interest was manifested in the appropriation of funds above the budget estimates for the then existing backlog of deferred maintenance. The committee found that much of this claimed deferred maintenance either did not rest on valid estimates or the need was subsequently ignored by the services and the practice of appropriating over the budget for real property maintenance ceased.

Indeed, during the ensuing several years it became apparent that moneys justified to Congress for the maintenance of real property facilities were being diverted to other uses in the absence of any restrictive law or legislative history. Consequently in recent years, the committee has recommended, and Congress has agreed to, language in the appropriation acts establishing floors or minimums in the amounts of money which must be devoted to real property maintenance. In the current Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1969, for example, the language reads for the Navy: "of which not less than \$155,600,000 shall be available only for maintenance of real property facilities."

In the case of the Marine Corps the language reads similarly: "of which not less than \$22,661,000 shall be available only for the maintenance of real property facilities."

House Document No. 91-50 proposed revisions reducing those amounts. Testimony in the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill indicated that reductions were made in the floors on real property maintenance based on "congressional intent." It appeared from the testimony that this interpretation of congressional intent was based on the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 and its effect on Government expenditures generally.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have here a situation of either ignoring, or violating, congressional intent by the military.

I should like to point out that the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 was enacted into law on June 28, 1968, Public Law 90-364. While its terms and conditions allowed some flexibility, some considerable flexibility in the executive branch, there was not in connection with its enactment—at least to my knowledge—any discussion of an intent to cutback on the maintenance of real property facilities of the Department of Defense. Congress does not want these cutbacks.

Now I should like to point out that the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1969 was enacted into law by virtue of the signature of the President on October 17, 1968, Public Law 90-580. The appropriation bill contains as a matter of law the phrases which I have previously quoted. I do not believe it likely that the Department can find a shred of evidence in the debate or in the committee reports on the defense appropriation bill indicating that the language of the law was intended to be set aside by any assumed or presumed interpretation of congressional intent stemming from the earlier enactment of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. On the contrary, it could be presumed that the enactment of the floors on maintenance of real properties in specific numbers and at a later date indicates the precise opposite, namely, that it is the intent that such an amount must in fact be expended for the purpose.

It is clear that much of the difficulty that we encounter in Congress, in the academic world, and through all facets of our society, stem from misinterpretations of honestly presented sets of facts. It is further clear that in most instances, if not in all instances, those who so misinterpret do totally and completely escape any remonstrance, much less punishment, for their willful acts.

Although I do not wish to magnify the incident out of all proportion, it is safe to say that the taxpayers of the country will at some future date have to shoulder the burden of new construction prematurely or unnecessarily because of failure to adequately maintain facilities that are now in being. Certainly, someone should be called to task for permitting such a situation to exist.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

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

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

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Florida made reference to the anti-ballistic-missile program. The gentleman is aware that in the fiscal year 1970

budget which is before Congress, but which is not under consideration in this bill, there is about \$860 million for a continuation of the ABM program.

In my opening remarks, I took the position that we should go forward with the ABM program. I would like to amplify that by giving, in part, some of the reasons why we have been working on this program for years. The Soviet Union, our most formidable opponent, has a somewhat limited anti-ballistic-missile system deployed. It seems to me that it would be militarily and politically unsound and indefensible for us not to undertake to have a defense against the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the Soviet Union and of Red China.

My opinion is that we must proceed now with the anti-ballistic-missile program. It is my feeling that the Members of Congress, generally, will approve of this view, and I am convinced that the American people will approve of this view. I do not believe the American people want to be completely defenseless with respect to the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the Soviet Union or of Red China. This would be illogical while the Soviet Union is providing some defense for its people. Whether or not their system is very far advanced begs the question. Therefore we should undertake to provide some defense against the possibility of attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles of either nation.

I believe the gentleman's opening remarks should be read by all Members of the Congress.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from Texas has stated the situation precisely and he has stated it very well.

We are trying to assure at this point that we can retaliate if the need should develop—we are seeking to insure for our country a capability which at least parallels the development which has been proceeding on an ABM system within Russia for a number of years. I feel that the American people demand that this be done. I feel that their voice is not really being heard in the quarters where protests are raised against the ABM system.

It is my opinion that we would be making a most serious mistake if we should not proceed with at least the small ABM program that has now been proposed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would ask the gentleman further if an article in the U.S. News & World Report, by Dr. Teller, one of the great scientists of the country, and a discussion by Dr. Wiesner, another great scientist, who are both very familiar with this problem, has been called to his attention.

We are aware that there is much discussion of the ABM in the scientific community, but as I see it this issue is one of judgment, and that is not an issue to be settled by the scientists alone. I would hope that those interested in this matter will probe deeply enough to understand what the fundamental issue is, and that is whether or not we shall let our chief opponent have a protection against our missiles and have none ourselves against his.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has stated the situation perfectly.

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

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I concur completely with the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas in the need for the Safeguard ABM. I believe that it is absolutely necessary that we go ahead on this modified program as recommended by President Nixon.

The decision of President Nixon announced on March 14, 1969, calling for the deployment of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system was made only after a searching and exhaustive analysis of the clearly emerging threat to the Nation and its people in the mid-1970's. All the available options and alternatives were thoroughly examined leading to the determination that Safeguard would provide a beginning toward the best protection against those threats.

In the judgment of the President, and of others within the Government who are charged with the direct responsibility for preserving our national security, the initial deployment of Safeguard represents the minimum action which must be taken now to preserve the credibility of our nuclear deterrent in the immediate years ahead.

The decision to deploy Safeguard is remarkable for the controversy which it has generated. Some Members of the Congress and some persons within the scientific community have taken issue with the President's decision. They have been joined in their opposition by others who find in Safeguard an excellent opportunity to give vent to their frustrations over the course of events in Vietnam, thereby injecting an emotionalism into a debate which, because of its critical importance to national security, should be governed only by rational and reasoned factual presentations.

Because the President is Commander in Chief of our military forces and, more than any other one man charged with the awesome responsibility of providing for the national defense, many Members of Congress, in the exercise of their constitutional responsibilities, have normally followed the practice of accord great weight to such momentous determinations by the President. The President has immediately at hand the most sensitive intelligence information upon which these vital decisions must be based.

For my own part, I would have to be absolutely convinced that I was right and the President was wrong before I could, in good conscience, oppose him on a national security matter of this magnitude. Moreover, in cases where the issue might be described as somewhat doubtful, my conscience would dictate that such doubts be resolved in favor of the President's determination that his recommended action is necessary for our country's protection. This has been my position with respect to all Presidents, of either political party.

It is obvious that all the people of the United States have a vital stake in the

decision we make as to whether or not we should attempt a ballistic missile defense. It is appropriate to determine the desires of the people. And I mean all the people—not just those with the resources to publish and circulate their views, nor just those who participate in organized letterwriting campaigns to Congress.

When President Nixon assumed office in January of this year, he inherited from his predecessor the beginnings of deployment of an ABM system, the Sentinel. The decision of President Johnson, announced in September 1967, to begin deployment had been endorsed by Congress in 1968 and funds had been provided for a start on the system. Production of the various components of the system had been initiated, sites acquired, and, at some sites, work had commenced.

The Nixon administration suspended work on Sentinel deployment while it conducted a broad and thorough review of the general problems of ballistic missile defense including specifically the basic possible missions of such defenses and an analysis of the actual and potential Soviet and Chinese nuclear threat capabilities to our cities and to our strategic retaliatory capability.

An important part of the review included an analysis of the many alternative ways of accomplishing the ballistic missile defense missions. The alternatives examined included:

First, not building any ballistic missile defense at this time, maintaining the research and development program, and relying on improvements in our retaliatory weapons to deter Soviet and Chinese attacks on our cities and strategic retaliatory forces;

Second, defending our strategic retaliatory forces—our second-strike capability—by hardening our missile silos and further dispersing of our bomber bases; and

Third, several alternative ABM deployments, including: a "heavy" defense against Soviet nuclear attacks on our major cities, ballistic missile defense of our strategic retaliatory forces, the Sentinel defense against the expected Chinese threat and accidental attacks, a sea-based anti-ballistic-missile intercept system—SABMIS—and various combinations of these alternatives.

Finally, the review included a careful evaluation of the technical and operational feasibility of ballistic missile defense systems based on current technology and current intelligence.

After a careful consideration of the alternatives, President Nixon reached the following conclusions: First, the concept on which the Sentinel program of the previous administration was based should be substantially modified; second, the safety of our country requires that we should proceed now with the development and construction of the new system in a carefully phased program; third, this program will be reviewed annually from the point of view of technical development, the threat, and the diplomatic context including any talks on arms limitation.

The Safeguard system has been designed so that its defensive intent is un-

mistakable. It will be implemented not according to some fixed, theoretical schedule, but in a manner clearly related to a periodic analysis of the threat.

The Safeguard system provides for the phased protection of our land-based forces and the light, overall protection of population. This deployment will permit a shift of radar and missile sites away from major cities.

Both the Nixon administration and the Johnson administration agree on the capabilities and limitations of the ABM system which technology permits us to deploy at the present time.

Both administrations agree that our ABM system at its present stage of development cannot be expected, no matter how deployed, to provide an effective defense of all our Nation's population against a heavy nuclear attack.

Both administrations agree that our ABM system does have the capability, in several types of deployment, of defending all our population against a light nuclear attack.

Both administrations agree that our ABM system does have the capability of providing a strong, although not preclusive, defense of a specific target of limited area against a heavy nuclear attack.

This evaluation, concurred in by both administrations, is extremely important. It was not made lightly, nor by any one person, or by any persons specializing in one field. This is not just a weapon, but a weapon system. It consists of a number of components, including nuclear warheads, which were and continue to be designed and tested underground by our nuclear physicists; missiles, which have been designed, constructed, tested, repeatedly improved, and tested further; data processing equipment, which has also been built and tested; missile site radar, which has been built and tested; and perimeter acquisition radar, all the components of which have been tested. In addition, the system utilizes technology dealing with such diverse areas as component hardening and command and control.

An evaluation of the ABM system is a complex matter, requiring the participation of many specialists from various and sundry science and engineering fields, who base their evaluations on the results of the tests performed. This, however, is the very type of careful evaluation which enabled the Johnson administration and, thereafter, the Nixon administration to conclude that our ABM system would work, and would do the job proposed for it.

Obviously, no one scientist, however learned, can credibly assume personally to evaluate the entirety of the system, particularly if he has not been privy to the testing accomplished with the components of the system. An impressive number of scientists, however, believe that it either will work or can be made to work.

The Johnson administration, based on an evaluation of the limitations and capabilities of the ABM system, devised a proposed deployment to provide a defense of our cities against the potential Chinese Communist capability to launch a light nuclear attack in the mid-1970's.

This is what the Sentinel system, as designed by the Johnson administration, would have done; and this Safeguard will continue to do.

The preceding administration was also very much aware of the possibility that the Soviet Union might seek to develop a capacity to overwhelm our land-based missiles and bombers. It continued to watch the missile buildup in the Soviet Union, believing, however, as Secretary McNamara said in January 1968, that the growth of the Soviet ICBM force would decelerate instead of continuing at a high rate.

The Sentinel system of the Johnson administration has three purposes, according to Secretary Clifford:

First, to "prevent a successful missile attack from China through the late 1970's."

Second, to "limit damage from an accidental launch from any source."

Third, to "provide the option for increased defense of our Minuteman force, if necessary in the future."

Safeguard will provide for the first two purposes as enumerated by Secretary Clifford, but most importantly, it also will provide for the defense of our Minuteman force which under Sentinel, had been only optional.

Neither Secretary McNamara nor Secretary Clifford believed that the relative invulnerability of the missile forces of the United States was assured for the indefinite future. Both warned that additional steps might be required if that invulnerability was to be maintained in the 1970's. Just before leaving office, Secretary Clifford expressed his "increasing concern" about "the continuing rapid expansion of Soviet strategic offensive forces." He went on to warn that—

We must continually re-examine the various ways in which the Soviets might seek to strengthen their strategic forces beyond what now seems probable, and take appropriate actions now to hedge against them.

The decision on whether or not to deploy the Safeguard system turns, it seems to me, on the answer to two questions:

First. What is the nature of the threat which there is reason to believe will confront our Nation in the mid-1970's?

Second. Is Safeguard an effective way of coping with that threat?

When I speak of a threat to our security, I am not engaging in speculation about the intentions of any foreign power. As we should have learned from the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, it is dangerous to base our policy on assumptions relating to intentions. Anyone who is not privy to deliberations in the Kremlin can hardly speak with assurance about Soviet intentions at the present time. Even certain knowledge of present intentions would be a poor basis for judging the intentions of those who may be in power in the Soviet Union 5 years or more from now.

We would be derelict in our responsibility to the people if we failed to base our policies on an estimate of the capability that the Soviet Union or Communist China will have in the future if they continue on their present course and if we failed to take timely action to thwart that capability.

Projecting into the future the current rate of construction and deployment of the SS-9, we arrive at a figure of 600 such ICBM's in operation in the Soviet Union by 1976. If each SS-9 is equipped with three independently aimed warheads—a capacity which is technically feasible and on which the Soviet Union is working—our force of 1,000 long-range Minutemen would be in danger of annihilation from the 1,800 Soviet warheads. Let me quote Dr. John S. Foster, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, on this point:

A missile system having a 20 percent failure rate and carrying 3 re-entry vehicles per missile, would require only 420 missiles to attack 1,000 silos. If the yield of each re-entry vehicle was a reasonable 5 megatons and the accuracy a reasonable $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile, about 95% of the silos could be destroyed. This would mean 50 of the 1,000 Minutemen survive.

Our present strategic offensive force includes, of course, not only land-based long-range missiles but missile-carrying manned bombers and Polaris submarines. Can we not be complacent about the future, some may ask, since two of the three elements of our deterrent force would still be in existence after an SS-9 attack on Minuteman sites thereby enabling us to inflict retaliatory devastation on an attacking nation?

There are two answers to this question. First, if prudence had not required that we keep three elements in our deterrent force, we would not have developed and maintained three in the past. Our security is assured with three. The loss of one would leave us considerably less secure. We might get by with two, but that involves risks that we have been unwilling to take in the past. Further, we should remember that our bombers, even today, are to some degree vulnerable and that our submarines may become vulnerable in the future. We must now plan for our defense through the next decade. We know that the Soviet Union is at work on a fractional orbital bombardment system and other weapons which could make both bombers and submarines vulnerable to attack in the future. To assume that both will continue to be safe from attack would be sheer folly.

I do not want to overstate the case. In order to achieve, in fact, the capability of eroding our assured destruction capability in the future, it will be necessary for the Soviets to do a number of things, but all are things which they have demonstrated a competence to accomplish. They would have to equip their SS-9 missiles with multiple, individual targeted reentry vehicles and improve their accuracy. They would have to continue to increase the number of such ICBM's deployed. They would have to continue their ambitious submarine program and possibly add a submerged launch missile utilizing a depressed trajectory. They could improve and deploy a more effective ABM system around their cities. The accomplishment of these improvements in forces, or combinations of these programs, on all of which they are now engaged, could create doubts of

the effectiveness of our assured destruction capability, provided we take no steps not already programed to prevent, or to prepare to prevent, such an erosion.

Because the Chinese ICBM development program has not progressed as rapidly as estimated a year or two ago, there has been a tendency to overlook this potential threat in the present debate on the ABM issue. Today, the intelligence community is indicating that the Chinese Communists may have an operational ICBM within 3 to 4 years. If that happens, it will be incumbent on the United States to have an adequate protective force.

There are a number of factors which point out the need for Safeguard to counter this growing Chinese threat. Most of them have to do with demographic factors. The United States has 63 percent of its population living in the 1,000 largest cities. The Chinese, on the other hand, have only 11 percent of their population living in China's 1,000 largest cities. One can conclude that the Chinese population is widely dispersed throughout her large land mass. Furthermore, as Mao Tse-tung has pointed out on numerous occasions, China, with its population of 800 million, could survive even with a loss of 200 million people from a nuclear attack. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that our ability to deter Communist China with our strategic offensive forces is considerably less certain than in the case of the Soviet Union, whose population is much more concentrated than China's.

The population concentration factor has a vital bearing on our decision to proceed with the Safeguard program. The Chinese, with only a few, relatively crude ICBM's could inflict a great deal of damage on the United States. For the United States to retaliate against such a strike might require a greater portion of our deterrent force than we could safely commit. For, by responding to a Chinese provocation, we could leave ourselves naked to a Soviet attack.

These reasons, I believe, point out that Safeguard is a good investment for protecting against a possible Chinese attack as well as insuring the credibility of our deterrent against any possible Soviet attack.

The second question which we must ask to reach the decision about deploying Safeguard has to do with its effectiveness. Of all possible courses of action which we might take to guard against the potential threat of the mid-1970's, Safeguard is the most effective, the least costly, the least provocative.

There is strong support among the most respected scientists who are familiar with all aspects of our ABM program for the conclusion that Safeguard will provide effective protection to enough of our offensive force to make an attack upon that force unprofitable for any aggressor.

Among the eminent scientists who have publicly expressed support for deployment of Safeguard are: Dr. Edward Teller, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, recognized as one of the world's foremost nuclear physicists; Dr. Eugene P.

Wigner, Princeton University nuclear physicist, elected to the National Academy of Sciences 1945, Atoms for Peace Award 1960, Nobel Prize for Physics, 1963; Dr. William G. McMillan, University of California at Los Angeles, professor of chemistry, noted specialist on strategic nuclear matters such as reentry vehicle vulnerability, penetration aids, nuclear weapons effects, and missile vulnerability.

If we could delay our decision on Safeguard until we determine whether or not the Soviet Union continues to increase its capability to threaten our security—or whether success comes of negotiations to limit arms, I would be in favor of deferring the decision. Unfortunately, we cannot wait. It will require more than 4 years to complete phase I of the Safeguard system, the deployment of protection for two missile sites in Montana and North Dakota. In the absence of authorization from Congress for fiscal year 1970, the Defense Department would be required to stop the activity in which it has been engaged under authority granted last year. It would have to close down developmental production lines, discharge skilled personnel, and cease engineering on sites. If Congress then gave authority to proceed in the next year, the program would be delayed 2 years, and the first two sites would not be in operation until 1976. Time would be lost in the search for personnel with the necessary skills and in the training of a new force to begin the work anew.

If we are not ready at the time a threat to our security comes into being, we will be no better off than we would have been if we had done nothing at all. As Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird has said:

Too little and too late has been the epitaph of more than one great nation in history. It must not be ours.

If, in fact, the decision to deploy Safeguard imposed an obstacle to fruitful negotiations toward arms limitation, this might well give us pause. But let us remember that Premier Kosygin in 1967, speaking of the embryonic ABM system which the U.S.S.R. had already begun to deploy, said:

I believe that defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people.

Let us remember, too, that President Johnson's decision to deploy the Sentinel system, instead of hampering negotiations, was followed 4 days later by a statement of the Soviet leaders that they were interested in beginning talks on arms restrictions.

Safeguard is an inducement to arms limitation and a building block toward peace. We will go forward with talks on arms control with a better chance that these talks will result in effective agreements if it is clear to all the world that the United States does not intend to stand idly by while its capacity to defend its people is undermined. Indeed, an important inducement toward agreement is missing if the U.S.S.R. is led to believe that we will unilaterally limit our defensive capacity.

Safeguard is purely defensive. It is not an escalation of the arms race. It does not increase one whit the capacity of our country to inflict damage on any other nation. It is far more moderate step than the alternative some of its opponents propose—an increase in the size of our offensive missile force, or the reckless launching of our missiles upon a warning, that may or may not be valid, that we are about to be attacked. Increasing our offensive forces would step up the arms race and might give Soviet leaders some plausible ground for fearing that we were seeking a first-strike capability.

If the threat that may confront us in the mid-1970's fails to develop, whether because of international agreement on arms control or a change in the pace or character of the Soviet buildup, or for any other reason, Safeguard can be slowed down, altered, or abandoned altogether. Deployment is divided into phases so that our defensive precautions will match the threat and not become an overreaction to it.

President Nixon clearly made these points in his announcement of his decision on Safeguard on March 14 of this year. He said:

I have directed the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board—a non-partisan group of distinguished private citizens—to make a yearly assessment of the threat which will supplement our regular intelligence assessment. Each phase of the deployment will be reviewed to insure that we are doing as much as necessary but no more than that required by the threat existing at that time.

Since our deployment is to be closely related to the threat, it is subject to modification as the threat changes, either through negotiations or through unilateral actions by the Soviet Union or Communist China.

To keep in perspective the decision which the Congress will be called on to make this year, it is important to keep in mind the phased program of deployment that is proposed. This year, we decide only whether to begin on phase I so that by 1974 we may have in being an antimissile defense of two of our missile sites. We do not commit ourselves to go beyond that, and the Congress will have ample opportunity to check on the progress of deployment and to reassess periodically the continued need for the system.

If in fact Safeguard deprived us of resources needed to deal with our pressing domestic problems, that fact might give us pause. But Safeguard is not short-changing any program designed to cure domestic ills. The decision to deploy this system involves spending in fiscal year 1970 only \$250 million more than would be spent if we limited ourselves to continuing with research and development. But a decision to defer deployment would add \$250 million to the total cost now estimated for deployment. The expenditure proposed for deployment in the next fiscal year amounts to three-tenths of 1 percent of the outlays proposed for defense. It amounts to a little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of proposed total Federal outlays. In its initial costs, it will be substantially less expensive than Sentinel would have been.

The estimated expenditure for the total Safeguard program is in the neigh-

borhood of \$8 billion, including the warheads. This expenditure would, of course, be made over the course of many years. It is unlikely that in any year Safeguard will demand spending that would equal even one-half of 1 percent of the budget.

To my mind, the basic issue which the Safeguard proposal presents is the degree of risk to which we are willing to expose the American people. I am not inclined to gamble when the stakes are the survival of our Nation and the safety of its people. I would rather be wrong by providing a measure of defense that the future might show we did not need than be wrong by failing to provide the protection required.

I hope that all Members of Congress, when they vote on Safeguard, are conscious that they may well be voting on the survival of the United States.

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

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there is the feeling on the part of many—and that includes myself—that if we move forward with our own ABM system, and we can move forward only at a certain rate of speed, that if we move forward with this program the likelihood will be enhanced that we can sit down at the conference table with the Soviet Union and arrive at some arms control agreement, not on disarmament, which I believe is unobtainable, but some agreement for a limitation on armaments. But so long as the Soviet Union goes forward with the deployment of its ABM and we take no steps at all, we are placed in a position in this particular field of defense—and this is defense, and not offense—of dealing from a position of weakness.

Mr. SIKES. It was after it was announced that we in this country were going ahead with the ABM system that the Soviets first agreed to hold a discussion on disarmament. This in itself is indicative of the validity of the statement the gentleman has just made: if we have a basis of strength from which to negotiate the Russians are much more interested in negotiating. There is no reason for them to negotiate if they have the field for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional time.

CANCELLATION OF WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the committee was advised yesterday of the cancellation of the procurement of the Cheyenne helicopter. It was canceled because it had not been possible for the contractor to solve the problems involved in developing this system. Of course, this program is subject to investigation by various appropriate committees. The Appropriation Committee intends to take a look at it.

The military from time to time, in their sincere desire to provide superior weapons programs attempt to stretch the

state of the art. They undertake to do things which are highly desirable by way of weapons development, but some of these things are not within the state of the art and cannot be accomplished.

Many years ago, we spent \$1 billion on a nuclear-powered aircraft, and finally we agreed that the state of the art had not progressed to where it was feasible to produce an acceptable plane of this type.

It is unfair and improper to condemn those who try to stretch the state of the art in order to improve our weapons. They make great efforts to add to the Nation's protection and to the budgeting capability of our servicemen.

Is it not understandable that in a stretching of the state of the art it is from time to time necessary to admit defeat? We are prone to call that "money down the drain," but if it is in the interest of trying to provide better defense it is not in the truest sense always money down the drain.

Mr. SIKES. This is of course the only way we can perfect our weapons systems. There must be trial and error. It is through this procedure that we have been able to develop the highly effective systems that we have. Fortunately most of them have not encountered problems as serious as the Cheyenne did.

In the case of the Cheyenne, unfortunately, hopes did not work out. Defense officials were seeking to develop a more effective weapons capability in a fast helicopter. The helicopter is largely a defenseless aircraft and yet it has been tremendously useful and has filled an extremely important need in Vietnam.

But it is highly vulnerable and the military were simply trying to provide a faster helicopter with an improved weapons capability that would enable it to stand off enemy attack and to provide greater support for the troops on the ground.

The thought was good. It would have been an extremely important development had it worked out—and eventually it probably will work out.

But in the effort to develop within a short time something that would be useful in the Vietnamese war, considerable moneys were expended. It has not been possible to develop the capability that is needed and rather than to continue to spend money on top of this already costly program, the military has decided to cancel the Cheyenne.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that the object of producing the Cheyenne was an effort to make our military men more effective and to save the lives of American soldiers in Vietnam?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, the purpose is to save lives—that is the primary purpose. It would have reduced the vulnerability of the helicopter, which is a very important vehicle, and made it into a gun ship.

Mr. MAHON. Pursuing the matter further, reference was made today to the so-called TFX and the Navy version, the F-111B.

Here was an effort to produce an airplane which would be suitable for all of the services. The objective was highly desirable. A great effort was made to achieve it, but as we look back with

20/20 hindsight, and I am sure the gentleman from Florida would agree, it was a mistake to undertake to make the F-111 conform to the Navy's requirements, which are in some ways quite different from the Air Force requirements.

Mr. SIKES. Yes, but we did not realize that at the time. The defense officials again felt that this was a way to save money. They made a very determined effort. The effort failed and we have to share in the blame because we financed what we thought would be a workable concept.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think all of us are indebted to the chairman of the committee and to the second ranking member of the defense subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the committee for this colloquy which is putting some of these things in the proper perspective, particularly with respect to the ABM system. I think this colloquy has made it clear that we do not, as a practical matter, have a choice between the development of the ABM system on the one hand and some agreement or other limiting arms on the other. Quite to the contrary, if we were to unilaterally make the decision and announce to the world, as some of our colleagues would have us do, that we are not going to defend ourselves against the ICBM, we would thereby destroy our capability of reaching any meaningful agreement with reference to either the ICBM or the ABM.

Certainly, if we announce beforehand that we are not in a position to defend ourselves, and that we do not intend to be in a position to defend ourselves, then we would be going to the conference table with no cards at all.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I take this additional time, first, to thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for this contribution which is sound, logical and meaningful.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. It seems to make news to be against a major defense program, at this time the ABM, but it does not make news to be in favor of providing this barrier against an attack which might come from China or from the Soviet Union.

There has been so much talk in the country and so many news columns written in opposition to our building a defense system designed to help to protect the lives of American citizens and to avoid world war III, it occurs to me that it is well for the world to know that there are many—and in my opinion the overwhelming majority of people in this country who believe that this kind of protection, as imperfect as it may be, is something we must seek to attain.

I wish to thank the gentleman and my colleagues for making reference to these

matters. No one can convince me that the people of the United States want to be second best when it comes to self-defense. I do not think that we want our country to be second best, and I predict it will not be second best. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SIKES. Let me add that the deployment of the ABM system, which is now proposed, does not mean that we will have an imperfect system. We will have a system which has the benefit of years of research and development, and as deployment progresses, it will be possible to build into it any improvements which the state of the art permits, to insure that we will have a fully workable and an effective system.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Is not one of the principal objectives of those of us who support the ABM to bring about a situation which will enable the United States and the Soviet Union—and other countries, we hope—to make some reduction in arms expenditures? That, after all, is our objective. I would hope we can join together in this effort and eventually through these procedures bring to a lower figure the vast resources we have to provide for defense.

Mr. SIKES. That is our objective. It is what we are working toward, and I believe it is a meaningful step in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) is recognized.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate and regrettable that the supplemental appropriation bill before us lumps together funds which are necessary and essential for important domestic programs with a request, as set forth in title I, for some \$1.2 billion for additional support for military operations in Southeast Asia.

Once again we are faced with a choice of either approving the entire package recommended by the Appropriations Committee, and thereby allocating still more funds to the prosecution of the war in Vietnam, or having to vote against the entire supplemental appropriation bill. I regret that the Appropriations Committee has put us in this situation again. There is strong and conscientious opposition to continuing to fund the war, and Members should have an opportunity to vote separately on the \$1.2 billion for military operations in Southeast Asia.

When the bill is open for amendment under the 5-minute rule, I intend to offer an amendment to strike title I of this bill, in order to eliminate the \$1.2 billion earmarked for Southeast Asian military operations. This would permit us to have an opportunity to vote on this question. However, of course, we know under the parliamentary procedure followed, there would be no opportunity for a rollcall

vote. If my amendment does not prevail, then I intend to offer a motion to recommend if I have the opportunity.

I believe that as long as these funds remain in this bill, it should be defeated. I have pointed out that one-third is allocated for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. We have already allocated for this fiscal year some \$27 or \$28 billion for the war in Vietnam. Now we are confronted again with another supplemental request.

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

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has been undertaken in this bill is to provide additional funds for the equipping of the South Vietnamese military forces, so that a lesser effort will be required by the U.S. forces. I believe that this portion of the plan—of transferring to the Government of South Vietnam a greater responsibility for fighting the war and maintaining the peace when the war comes to an end—probably would meet with the approval of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, would spell out exactly how much of the funds in the bill is for equipping the forces for South Vietnam. But it is clear also from the testimony, as I read it, that the supplemental provides funds for approximately 17,400 more American servicemen than were planned originally in the fiscal year 1969.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in the Army procurement portion of the bill before us, of the \$640 million, there are \$393.7 million for U.S. forces and \$246.4 million for the South Vietnamese Armed Forces modernization and improvement program. So a quarter of a billion in this bill is for the improvement and modernization of the equipment of the South Vietnamese forces. It is this quarter billion that the gentleman from Texas had in mind in propounding the inquiry of the gentleman. There are additional sums related to this procurement, such as \$50 million for the transportation of equipment, and so forth.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanation of the chairman. Nevertheless, that does leave for U.S. Southeast Asian military operations approximately \$1 billion—a little less perhaps. And it raises a further question about our overall policy in Vietnam in relation to the forces of South Vietnam.

In any event, let me point out that according to the testimony, on page 361, of General Taylor, the supplemental also provides funds for 17,400 more troops, that is U.S. troops, than had been originally intended.

It also provides funds for a 50-percent increase in bombing by B-52's in South Vietnam. I should point out that in answering a question raised by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS), General Crow said that the effect of the B-52 bombings was to make certain areas of South Vietnam look like the surface of the moon. The gentleman

from Alabama then observed that the United States has used more bombs in Vietnam than in World War II and asked:

I wonder how it is going to look when we get through over there. Will it be habitable? (Hearings, p. 296).

I think that is a good question: Will it be habitable? Will anything be left? Or will we continue to destroy the country in order to save it?

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

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, this bill does not provide funds to send additional American fighting men to South Vietnam. It provides for the payment of the men who were sent over there as a result of the Tet offensive which caused us to increase our forces. It is not the intent of this bill to increase our manpower in South Vietnam.

Mr. RYAN. I understand the gentleman's argument. The impact, nevertheless, is to provide funds for a higher level of troops there than had been budgeted for fiscal year 1969.

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

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, on the point the gentleman is making and the point the chairman of the Appropriations Committee made, the planned strength for U.S. forces in Southeast Asia has not been reached as yet, but the reason we are implementing funds in this supplemental bill is because the Tet offensive did extensive damage over there and made it necessary for us to commit more troops and more ammunition and other equipment.

Then, the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by Communist North Korea took place. It caused us to supplement our efforts in the Korean area.

It was aggressive action by North Vietnam and North Korea which made this supplemental which is before us necessary. We are just supplying additional funds for those two aggressive actions by the Communists. That is the purpose of this supplemental.

Mr. RYAN. I do not quite understand how funds for the Korean situation come under title I, which is entitled "Military Operations in Southeast Asia."

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield, I will explain it.

Mr. RYAN. I do not have sufficient time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. At the time of the *Pueblo* incident, the House of Representatives and the Senate, in the appropriation bills, had included funds for Korea with funds for Southeast Asia.

I might point out to the gentleman that there are South Korean troops who are helping the United States and the South Vietnamese effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. RYAN. This supplemental appropriation bill is before us because of an underestimation of the cost of the war in Southeast Asia. Each year for the past 5 years Congress has been asked to appropriate supplemental money for the war in Vietnam.

I have pointed out on each one of those occasions—in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, and now 1969—that the only means the House has to change the Vietnam policy is to exercise the power of the purse. This bill presents us with another opportunity to vote on the conduct of the war.

Since last May, when the Paris peace talks were started, over 12,000 American servicemen have been killed in this war. There is no end in sight. The only way that the Congress, if it feels that this war must be ended, as I do, can exercise any influence on the direction of our foreign policy in Southeast Asia, is to vote "No" to these funds.

Therefore, I will offer an amendment under the 5-minute rule to strike title I. I hope it will have wide support so that we will be able to separate out the money for Southeast Asia military operations from the very essential funds contained in this bill for domestic programs.

Almost one-third of this appropriation is for military operations in Southeast Asia. H.R. 11400 provides total appropriations of \$3,783,212,766. Of this, \$1,234,000,000 or about 31 percent is allocated for Southeast Asia. This is above and beyond an estimated \$27.6 billion which Congress has already appropriated for Vietnam for fiscal year 1969.

Although President Nixon said in his nationwide television address last Wednesday that he intends to seek a mutual withdrawal of American and North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam, testimony from officials of the Department of Defense suggests an increase in the size and scope of our military operation in Vietnam. The testimony of Gen. A. B. Taylor, director of the Army budget, reveals that approximately 17,400 more soldiers were deployed in Southeast Asia than were originally specified in the fiscal year 1969 budget. According to General Taylor, these troops were not sent as replacements but as additions to the existing force. General Taylor went on to say that additional troops would be deployed during the next fiscal year. Hearings on second supplemental appropriations bill, 1969, page 361.

For 5 years supplemental appropriations bills have been used to escalate the war and to deepen our military commitment in Southeast Asia. Although the appropriations sought in this bill may not result in the dramatic escalation that has occurred in the past, they will nonetheless be used to increase still further the killing and destruction that continues in Vietnam.

Each year the costs of the war have been underestimated in the initial budget. This happened in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, and now again in 1969. But each year the Congress has chosen to abdicate its responsibility to pass judgment on the war and has, instead, channeled more money into the quagmire in Southeast Asia.

For 5 years now, the critics of the war in Vietnam have been urging that we pursue alternative policies in Southeast Asia. In 1964, I urged a specific strategy for the neutralization of Southeast Asia to avoid broadening the conflict. But the conflict was broadened. In 1965, I argued against the Americanization of the war and against escalating our military commitment. But the war was Americanized and our commitment escalated. In 1966, I tried again to point to the policy alternatives available to us. But the choice of continued escalation was made. In 1967, I called again for renewed diplomatic efforts and an end to the bombing in the north. But diplomacy was secondary to the continued attempt to impose a military solution.

As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, the request for supplemental funds for Southeast Asian military operations has been tied in to other appropriations for some vital domestic programs which I support and, in some cases, have even proposed.

On January 30, I introduced an omnibus supplementary appropriation bill, H.R. 5562, to fully fund several important programs established under the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Later, I reintroduced this legislation with 29 cosponsors—H.R. 7760, H.R. 7761. This legislation would provide supplementary appropriations to bring the section 235 homeownership program, the section 236 rental and cooperative housing program, the rent supplement program, the urban renewal program, and the urban renewal component of the model cities program to the full amount of funding authorized by Congress.

The bill before us today includes supplemental appropriations for three programs—section 235, section 236, and low-rent public housing program. Both section 235 and section 236 would receive an additional \$40 million for fiscal year 1969—which still leaves each program \$10 million less than the amount authorized by Congress. The low-rent public housing program—which remains the only effective way to reach low-income people in our larger cities—would receive an additional \$7,168,000 for fiscal year 1968 and \$16 million for fiscal year 1969 in contract authorization.

While I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has recommended supplementary appropriations to these three programs, I am disappointed that the bill does not provide additional funds for the rent supplement program, the urban renewal program, or the urban renewal sector of the model cities program. Each year the rent supplement program has been starved for funds; the current fiscal year is no exception. While the administration recommended \$65 million for rent supplements for fiscal year 1969, Congress appropriated only \$30 million. Similarly, urban renewal in model cities, although it was authorized to receive \$500 million, has appropriated only \$312 million.

These programs must be funded to the full amount authorized by Congress if we are to mount an effective attack on the crisis in urban housing which confronts this Nation. As has been the case

so often before, the appropriations provided for Southeast Asian military operations in H.R. 11400 alone are greater than the amount which would be required to fully fund these vital housing programs.

I am also disturbed that a request from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for an additional \$2 million to carry out fair housing activities under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 was denied by the committee. As Housing and Urban Development Secretary Romney stated in his testimony in support of this appropriation:

"It is simply impossible to attain this goal (providing a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family) without a major and continuing effort in pursuit of fair housing for every person in this country." (Parenthesis added) (Hearings on Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1969, p. 570.)

At present, the fair housing program has received only \$2 million to carry on that effort from Congress. If fair housing is to be guaranteed in this country, we must allocate more resources to pursuing that goal.

No doubt the argument will be made that, since the pending bill contains funds for several agencies which require supplemental allocations for their operations, as well as for programs, such as section 235 and section 236, it should be supported despite the title I appropriation for the war. I cannot accept that argument, which ignores two basic factors.

First, if the House refused to approve this bill as long as it contained war appropriations funds earmarked for military operations in Vietnam would be removed; and the other parts of the bill would come back to the floor.

Second, and more basic, it must be recognized that vital domestic programs will not be funded adequately until the bloody and costly war in Vietnam is ended. So long as appropriations bills continue to allocate one-third of our available resources to Southeast Asian military operations—as this one does—our cities will continue to rot, and the social fabric of our Nation will continue to be ripped apart. We will never mount the concentrated attack on the multitude of domestic problems facing us—including housing, education, discrimination, and pollution—so long as these programs receive only leftover scale allocations. The solution of our domestic crisis, in other words, must be preceded by an end to the war in Vietnam.

For 5 years the Congress has acquiesced in a disastrous policy. Some 35,000 American servicemen have been killed, and many more wounded and crippled. The country which we supposedly set out to save today lies in chaos and ruin. For 5 long years the resources of this country have been poured into an ill-conceived war, only to see our policymakers return the next year with requests for still more funds.

How long will this war go on? Another year? Another 2 years? Another 3 years?

If we are truly concerned with the con-

tinuation of this war—after it was thoroughly and roundly repudiated in the elections of last year; if we are concerned that after 1 year of negotiations in Paris we have not achieved peace; if we are truly desirous of terminating the death and destruction which continue to be wreaked on a small and unhappy nation—then let us now call a halt to this war through the only power the House possesses: the power of the purse.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to state to the Members of the House that it is the purpose of the Committee to have read the first paragraph of the bill, which deals with "Military personnel, Army," lines 6 and 7 on page 2, and then I expect to move that the Committee rise. Of course, amendments will be in order, but I expect to be recognized by the Chairman to move that the Committee rise, and then the amendment period would come tomorrow.

I should like to say further that it is proposed on tomorrow before we begin further consideration of the bill, that the Rules Committee will offer a rule which will make in order the expenditure limitation, which is carried in title IV of the bill.

So, if the rule is adopted—and, of course, we hope it will be adopted—we will proceed with the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The language that you would have read this afternoon, do I understand, goes to line 7 on page 2?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It would end at the figure \$110 million in line 7 on page 2.

Mr. GROSS. That includes no language, then, that is subject to a point of order?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. GROSS. The rule is designed to waive points of order.

Mr. MAHON. The rule is designed to protect against points of order only in title IV, which relates to the expenditure limitation. It will not protect any other part of the bill than the expenditure limitation.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11400

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Army", \$110,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, 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. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill this afternoon may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain tables and excerpts relating to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR ATTEMPTING TO COVER UP FUENTES AFFAIR

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, Mr. Hilary Sandoval, Jr., the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee to discuss an SBA loan to a New York company with alleged underworld ties.

Shortly before the hearing, I received a telegram from the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, a distinguished member of the committee, concerning "an alleged shakedown" of a small business loan applicant by Mr. Albert Fuentes, special assistant to Mr. Sandoval.

The telegram follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 25, 1969.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.:

Affidavits in my possession and on file with the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that there is reason to believe that Albert Fuentes, special assistant to the Administrator, Small Business Administration, has engaged in or attempted to engage in shake-downs of SBA loan recipients. I have requested the administrator to suspend Fuentes pending full investigation and request that you join in this action. I request that the committee under your able leadership investigate all loans either made or pending in Texas offices of SBA since Fuentes entered his position and that investigation be made particularly in the San Antonio area.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

When Mr. Sandoval appeared before the committee, I asked him to look into the Fuentes situation and to report his finding to the committee. Mr. Sandoval agreed to this request. The transcript of the hearing clearly spells out what in-

formation Mr. Sandoval was to provide. The transcript states:

The CHAIRMAN. Now I will ask you to take this telegram and give me a report on Mr. Fuentes. You can do that, I assume?

Mr. SANDOVAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And also to give me all the information about the loans in the San Antonio area.

Mr. SANDOVAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And if any of them provoke your thinking along the lines as not being regular, call them to our attention.

Mr. SANDOVAL. Yes, sir.

Following Mr. Sandoval's appearance, I learned that SBA investigators had visited the San Antonio SBA office and looked into the Fuentes situation. After allowing a reasonable length of time for the investigators' report to be forwarded to Washington, I wrote to Mr. Sandoval on May 12. The letter asks Mr. Sandoval not only to provide the Fuentes report but also to furnish the committee with a document that is extremely important to the committee's investigation of the New York loan to the alleged criminal controlled company. The letter follows:

MAY 12, 1969.

Mr. HILARY SANDOVAL, Jr.,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SANDOVAL: It has come to my attention that a memo dated January 5, 1967, from Mr. William Bowling to then Small Business Administration Administrator, Bernard Boutin, contains a great deal of background information concerning SBA's involvement with A.N.R. Leasing Corporation. This memo is of vital importance to the Committee's examination of the A.N.R. loans and because of this, it is imperative that the Committee be given a copy of the complete memo immediately.

It is my understanding that there may be a problem in releasing the memo in that it contains FBI and Justice Department information. In this regard, it would be appreciated if you would take action to secure the release of the memo from the Justice Department and immediately forward it to the Committee.

In addition, you will remember that during your appearance before the Committee on April 26th, I asked you to make a complete investigation of the charges made against Mr. Albert Fuentes. While I realize you have turned the matter over to the FBI, it is my understanding that SBA investigators have been looking into Mr. Fuentes' relationship with the San Antonio office. Because of the importance of this matter, it would be appreciated if you would immediately inform the Committee as to the results of your investigation of this incident and also if any other loans involving alleged improper action on the part of Mr. Fuentes have been uncovered. Your earliest reply would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

It is quite clear from even a most casual reading of the letter that two different subjects are covered in the letter. The staff of the Banking and Currency Committee had been informed by SBA officials that the memo from Mr. Bowling to Mr. Boutin contained information from the FBI and Justice Department and that permission would have to be obtained from these departments to release the memo. Because of this, my letter specifically asked Sandoval to take

action to secure release of the memo to the committee because of its important nature to our investigation.

The last paragraph of the letter deals solely with Mr. Sandoval's promise to supply the committee with the report on the Fuentes case.

It does not suggest that the Fuentes report, promised the committee by Mr. Sandoval, should be turned over to the Justice Department, nor does the letter make any reference to the Justice Department in connection with the Fuentes case.

After the letter was sent to Mr. Sandoval, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee staff called SBA to find out when the Fuentes report would be made available. He was assured that the report would be in the committee office the following morning, along with some other material that the committee had requested. The following morning, SBA did send information concerning its lending activities in cases under study by the committee, but did not send the Fuentes report. The SBA official who brought the material to the committee stated that he did not have a copy of the Fuentes report but that he would call back to his office and make certain that the report was placed on his desk and that he would personally hand deliver the report that afternoon. Later in the day, still another SBA official reported to the committee staff that the committee would not be able to get a copy of the report that afternoon because, "I do not know where a copy of the report is and even if I did, I do not have authority to release it."

He said that Mr. Sandoval was out of town and could not be reached. The following day, several members of the Banking and Currency Committee staff attempted to obtain copies of the report but were unsuccessful. The reason given at that time for the report not being made available was that Mr. Sandoval was out of town and the report could not be released without his approval. When the committee staff attempted to locate Mr. Sandoval they were told by his office that—

He is in New York but I don't know where to get in touch with him or exactly where he is.

The following day, Mr. James Reed, congressional relations director for SBA, called the committee staff to state that the Fuentes report had been turned over to the Justice Department and would not be made available to the committee.

Following Mr. Reed's disclosure, the committee staff contacted the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice and was told that the committee could not have the document. The Justice official did state, however, that if I wrote a letter to Justice stating that the report would be kept confidential, they would consider releasing the report to the committee. The Justice Department was informed that the SBA report on Fuentes did not belong to the Justice Department since it was the committee that suggested that SBA conduct the investigation and the suggestion was agreed to by Mr. Sandoval. The Justice Department of-

ficial admitted that his Department had not asked SBA to conduct such a study but, in fact, that the direction for the study came from the committee.

On Monday, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sandoval responded, in a highly unresponsive manner, to my letter of May 12. The letter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1969.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have discussed your written request of May 12, 1969, with the Department of Justice as you suggested and have been unable to secure the release of any part of the information sought.

We understand the staff of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice has apprised your staff of the Department's attitude in this matter.

We are sorry we cannot assist you at this time, but please be assured that when the Department of Justice is willing to release the material we will be most happy to cooperate with your Committee in any area in which we may be of service.

Sincerely,

HILARY SANDOVAL, Jr.,
Administrator.

It should be noted that Mr. Sandoval has attempted to merge both of the points in my letter into one convenient alibi for his failure to live up to the promise that he made before the Banking and Currency Committee. No mention was made in my letter of consulting with Justice concerning the Fuentes case, since the matter was clearly between SBA and the Banking and Currency Committee.

I can only conclude from what transpired last week between SBA and the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee and Mr. Sandoval's letter that the Small Business Administration is attempting to cover up the Fuentes case.

Over this past weekend, Mr. Fuentes called a press conference in San Antonio in which he repeatedly referred to Congressman GONZALEZ as an "unmitigated liar." Mr. Fuentes denies the allegations against him and, in fact, indicates that he will bring a number of suits against the people involved in making the charges.

It seems strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that while Mr. Fuentes is calling press conferences to deny his guilt and calling a respected Member of this body an "unmitigated liar," the Small Business Administration refuses to release its investigative reports on the Fuentes situation. In short, if Mr. Fuentes is innocent of any wrongdoing, Mr. Sandoval would be more than willing to comply with the commitments that he made to the Banking and Currency Committee.

It certainly is convenient that just when it appears that Mr. Sandoval will have to make good on his promise and provide the committee with the Fuentes information, the Justice Department rushes in and impounds the report, a report which I repeat was requested not by the Justice Department but by the Banking and Currency Committee. At virtually the same time this is happening, Mr. Fuentes calls a press conference to deny any wrongdoing.

Despite the attempt by Mr. Sandoval to cover up the Fuentes situation, I want to assure this body that the Banking and Currency Committee will not be fooled by the literary slight of hand and devious actions of Mr. Sandoval.

To this end, the Banking and Currency Committee will hold a hearing at 10 a.m. next Saturday, May 24, in room 2128, Rayburn House Office Building, to find out why Mr. Sandoval has not complied with the promises he made to the committee. I have asked Mr. Sandoval and other officials of the Small Business Administration to appear at that time and to deliver to the committee the Fuentes report.

If Mr. Sandoval does not provide the committee with the report, then I will seriously consider asking the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee to undertake a full and complete investigation of the Fuentes incident.

Perhaps this will be the only way that we can learn the true facts of the Fuentes case.

THE NADIR IN UNNECESSARY WEAPONS AND BARBARIC WARFARE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, evidence mounts daily that our Nation has committed itself to a significant extent to preparing for the waging of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological warfare.

Research goes on apace at several facilities into the ultimate in horror—germ and chemical warfare. Nerve gas is stockpiled in several areas. Poison gas is retained and stored. Its very presence is a danger, as recent events have shown.

These are grisly facts, indeed. Destructive power of such newly developed agents approaches that of the most powerful nuclear or thermonuclear devices. Further, we know quantities are being produced and stored which pass beyond the unnecessary and enter the realm of the irrational.

Worldwide epidemics which were thought to have been buried with old wars are now a definite possibility. Such weapons are cheap to produce, compared to thermonuclear weapons systems. Their testing is infinitely less difficult than earthquake-causing proofs required of other devices. No bombers or missiles are necessary with which to deliver them. No massive defensive systems are a potential barrier to their delivery. As a result, we are producing and proliferating a poor nation's world destroyer—chemical and bacteriological devices.

We already know too that these weapons are much more susceptible to mishaps, as the Utah sheep kill proved. Damages awarded are mute proof that this is what transpired there.

It is with deep sadness that I again confess to our use of defoliants and irritating agents in Vietnam. Do we wish to edge closer to the thin, condemned ranks of those who used poison gas in war since 1925, when the Geneva pro-

ocol against use of poison gas was signed? Will we join a list headed by the Egyptians in Yemen and Japanese warlords in China? Ethiopia in the 1930's was the only other recorded instance. Do we wish to proudly stand alongside Nasser and the old warlords? How melancholy a sight we would present.

We are toying with elementary forces of nature, loosing them upon an unsuspecting world and people as well as upon a helpless, vulnerable environment. Nothing is known about tests of these horrors, because this is still another secret the people must be kept from knowing about for their own good. Where are they being tested? How? For how long? With what results? With what accidents? With what consequences to us in the future? I am not satisfied with feeble excuses and transparently false answers from gentlemen who vanish behind locked doors. If we allow this to continue, we shall fully deserve the fate which will overtake us.

There must be open hearings on this subject. We do not need this research, testing, or preparation for such methods of waging war. We must not take such chances with our Nation, world, and environment by toying with such volatile elementary forces. Even if we gain expertise and a "lead" over our potential opponents, in the process we shall compromise our ideals as a nation and our self respect as a people.

This country never appended its signature to the Geneva protocol of 1925 on use of poison gas. Would it not be an excellent step in the direction of world easing of tensions for the President to resubmit the protocol to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. Speaker, there is no rational argument in the mind of man which could possibly argue successfully for expansion or retention of our capability to wage such warfare. It is brutally against our history and daily protestations of virtue and morality. By its very nature it does violence to the spirit of man. For decades and more we have done honor and paid lip service to those who freed men from nature's scourges. Each time God laid a curse upon man, he gave another man insight with which to lift it from the brow of his children. Are we then to lift the cover caging the fiend from the pit who so many good and sublime people have sacrificed so much to place and imprison there? Are we to do so in the name of all ideals we claim to hold holy? Do they still mean anything after that?

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a major issue before Congress and the Nation is the quality and productivity of our natural environment. The variety of legislation and the number of different committees involved with these problems grows each session. I have noted on a number of occasions a call for a national

policy to guide the activities of both the private sector and governmental agencies. I believe that such a policy now exists and is well agreed upon. I come to this conclusion on the basis of two substantial efforts of policy formation.

Last July 18 a joint Senate-House colloquium on a national policy for the environment was convened by Senator HENRY JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The colloquium met for an entire day with leaders from industry, universities, and Government. Formal presentations were received from Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, Chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty; Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall; Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Robert C. Weaver; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John A. Baker; Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Director, Office of Science and Technology; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen; Dr. Philip Lee, Assistant Secretary, Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Mr. Don K. Price, dean, John Fitzgerald Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Over 100 informed and interested persons made up the participating audience, and the proceedings included written submissions from over 30 persons expert in one or another phase of environmental quality. As a result of the colloquium, the Legislative Reference Service prepared a congressional white paper on "A National Policy for the Environment," which was submitted to Congress over the signatures of Senators HENRY M. JACKSON and Thomas H. Kuchel, and Representatives GEORGE P. MILLER, JOHN A. BLATNIK, JAMES G. FULTON, CHARLES A. MOSHER, and myself. Support for this effort to set down the elements of policy is thus bipartisan and bicameral. The white paper lists the following essential elements:

It is the policy of the United States that: Environmental quality and productivity shall be considered in a worldwide context, extending in time from the present to the long-term future.

Purposeful, intelligent management to recognize and accommodate the conflicting uses of the environment shall be a national responsibility.

Information required for systematic management shall be provided in a complete and timely manner.

Education shall develop a basis of individual citizen understanding and appreciation of environmental relationships and participation in decisionmaking on these issues.

Science and technology shall provide management with increased options and capabilities for enhanced productivity and constructive use of the environment.

The second major policy delineation has come from the Committee on Environmental Quality of the Federal Council for Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President. In response to my suggestion, a group of experts from a number of executive departments and agencies was convened to examine the proposals of the white paper and provide a coordinated statement

of response. The result is most impressive because the basic principles of the congressional report are endorsed and some valuable extensions and additions are suggested. In particular I would call your attention to the executive branch policy proposal for a stipulation that: First, each person has a fundamental right to a healthful environment, and, second, each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation of the quality of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, the exact words of these policy statements are not critical. We could very likely gather yet another group of environmental specialists and public scholars and produce different languages; but the essential points would remain the same. Therefore, I propose that the national policy is now clear in terms of the executive and legislative branch statements listed above. These elements of policy should now be accepted by the various congressional committees as they consider environmental ramifications of problems in their jurisdiction. It is imperative that the widest distribution of these policy statements be made to the public and to organizations and individuals for opinion leadership. With these elements of policy the executive branch should bring the action programs of the various agencies into conformity.

The President has proposed a Cabinet-level environmental coordinating committee. Several congressional proposals have been made for a Council of Environmental Advisers or similar high-level groups. The recognition and acceptance of policy may be more important at this time than the detailed form of organization.

We are familiar with the frequent episodes and dramatic ecological disruptions which are testimony to policy inadequacies. It is easy to become engrossed in the DDT story, offshore oil slicks, ocean disposal of CBW agents, or other headline-creating alarms. But preoccupation with these incidents is like skipping a flat stone across the water. It is interesting as it hops along but it soon slows and sinks leaving nothing changed. To continue the allegory, what Congress should be concerned with is a policy which will float and support our activities in the environment over the long voyage. Policy planning is slow and unglamorous but it is the basis for a real solution to the deep problems revealed by these occasional attention-getting events.

With the discussion and development of policy accomplished we can concentrate on a reduction to practice of these national objectives. Every action of the individual citizen, local community, State and regional agencies, industry, and Federal departments can be tested against these clear and simple statements. The results should be guidelines for everyday decisions in management of technology and the economy which will bring immediate and appreciable results. Environmental quality and productivity have never been mutually exclusive, but the balance has usually been far from optimum. With the economic and technological resources at hand, these policy

statements generated from both the executive and legislative branches should equip our organizational institutions to proceed in a logical manner toward specific practical gains for our natural environment and human welfare.

I include the communication from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology, at this point in the RECORD:

APRIL 24, 1969.

DEAR MR. DADDARIO: Your letter of November 29, 1968, invited comments on the Congressional White Paper on A National Policy for the Environment.

In response to your suggestion, I invited the members of the FCST Committee on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to examine the proposals of the White Paper and to provide me with a coordinated statement of their personal views. Their comments and suggestions have been fully considered in the preparation of the enclosed document. Comments are restricted to Part III of the White Paper.

These comments are not to be taken as department or Administration views, but rather the personal views of individuals deeply involved in environmental quality matters.

We certainly appreciate the chance to comment on the White Paper and hope our reply will contribute to the formulation of a national policy for the environment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. BUCKLEY.

COMMENTS ON PART III OF THE CONGRESSIONAL WHITE PAPER

1. We endorse the basic principles implicit in the five points listed in bold face in Part III of the White Paper as vital elements of any national policy dealing with the problems of the environment, namely:

a. Recognition of the worldwide and long-range character of the problem of environmental quality;

b. Essentiality of purposeful and intelligent management of the problem as a matter of national responsibility;

c. Continuing need for fuller, up-to-date information through intensified, in-depth research on the nature of the problems, as essential to responsible and effective management;

d. Systematic use of education on all levels as a means of facilitating public understanding and, as appropriate, of laying the ground for responsible citizen participation in community action programs;

e. Application of science and technology in developing and executing policies and programs concerned with the abatement and correction as well as the improvement of present conditions.

2. We suggest that the following additional issues are of major importance and should be raised to the level of basic principles:

a. The interrelationship between deteriorating environmental quality, rapidly expanding technology and population growth which necessitates an effort to bring the needs of the population into balance with natural resources, and

b. The international spread of environmental problems which calls for positive action on an international scale.

3. We wish to give special emphasis to the following points made in the balance of Part III, without prejudice to the order of priority:

That "the policy must recognize the responsibility to future generations of those presently controlling the development of natural resources . . .

That "priorities and choices among alternatives . . . must . . . be planned and managed at the highest level of our political system (and that) all levels of government must require developments within their purview

to be in harmony with environmental quality objectives . . .

That "alteration and use of the environment must be planned and controlled rather than left to arbitrary decision . . .

That "the system of free enterprise democracy must integrate long term public interests with private economic prosperity . . .

That "decisions to make new technical applications must include consideration of unintended, unanticipated, and unwanted consequences (and that) technology should be directed to ameliorating these effects so that the benefits of applied science are retained."

4. We propose that, in addition, a national policy dealing with the environment contain the following elements:

a. A declaration pronouncing the environment as a public resource whose quality must be:

(1) Defined and assured in terms of safety, healthfulness, productivity, social amenity, cultural portent and aesthetic appeal;

(2) Protected against abuse, irreversible damage and irretrievable loss; and

(3) Managed to provide an optimum state of physical, mental and social well-being and, at the same time, to permit the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment that is possible, without risk of degradation, to satisfy the present and future needs of man;

b. A stipulation that:

(1) Each person has a fundamental right to a healthful environment; and

(2) Each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation of the quality of the environment;

c. A national commitment upholding the first line responsibility of state and local governments to manage their environment, affirming the responsibility of the Federal Government to manage environmental problems which are of nation-wide scope or exceed the competencies of state and local governments, and recognizing the authority of Federal, state and local governments, within their respective area of jurisdiction to:

(1) Set priorities in dealing with environmental problems;

(2) Make a technological assessment to determine the effects of present and new activities on the quality of the environment;

(3) Study the ecological, biological, economic and social effects of environmental changes;

(4) Develop criteria and promulgate standards defining desirable levels of environmental quality;

(5) Establish measurements, mechanisms and systems for monitoring levels of pollution;

(6) Issue regulations prescribing observance of established standards and ensure that such regulations are effectively enforced so that parties responsible for breach of regulations be held fully accountable for their action;

(7) Utilize economic incentives designed to stimulate private enterprise to act in the public interest insofar as environmental protection and management are concerned; and

(8) Coordinate, as far as practical and desirable, activities of governments on various levels in the exercise of these responsibilities;

d. A definition of the role of the science community in its broadest sense in providing policy makers and program managers with the needed data and criteria for decision-making, specifically

(1) By devising measures for immediate action aiming at the arrest, abatement and correction of the most critical problems;

(2) By developing long-range programs aiming not only at the elimination of existing but at the prevention of future hazards and the restoration and the progressive improvement of the quality of the environment in its ecological, physical, social, cultural and aesthetic aspects;

(3) By formulating alternatives that might be available to decision-makers in all major programs and actions affecting the environment;

(4) By intensifying in-depth research on the nature, causes and effects of environmental changes with a view to determining critical thresholds of deterioration requiring preventive or corrective action;

(5) By choosing a systematic interdisciplinary approach which will ensure the integrated use of resources of the natural as well as the social sciences and the cooperation of scientists dealing with the physical and biological aspects of the problem and of those dealing with social and economic, specifically behaviorist and managerial, aspects; and finally

(6) By facilitating coordination among competent non-governmental organizations and by enlisting their assistance and mobilizing their resources in support of government programs and those of inter-governmental organizations;

e. An appeal to the citizenry

(1) To alert people everywhere to the existence and the growth of present hazards caused by abuse of the environment and by technological changes;

(2) To arouse interest in the need for systematic use of information media and of educational institutions on all levels for purposes of public enlightenment; and

(3) To foster a sense of civic responsibility on the part of the private citizen for broad community action in support of programs aiming at the preservation and improvement of the environment;

f. Recognition of the international aspects of the environmental problems based on the assumptions:

That, ecosystems are not limited by national boundaries;

That, for the sake of future generations, all of mankind has a responsibility to preserve the viability of this planet and the quality of the environment;

That, with the accelerated spread and transfer of technology creating new environmental hazards, and with pollutants drifting across political frontiers, more and more peoples and their national resources will be exposed to the threat of mutual pollution and degradation;

That, in view of the pressing population problem, depletion and destruction of national resources has become a matter of international concern and conservation a matter of common responsibility;

That, even where deterioration is purely a local or national phenomenon, similarity of causes, symptoms and effects to those in other countries is creating a worldwide community of interest of peoples thus affected;

That the difficulty in coping with these problems is compounded by the disparity of resources available for research, development and demonstration and remedial action, notably of developed as against less developed countries;

That, whereas the bulk of the problem and the heavier responsibility will continue to rest with national governments and local authorities, intergovernmental agencies and international non-governmental organizations must increasingly assume a subsidiary responsibility, notable for the solution of problems which exceed national capabilities and which require the mobilization and the coordinated use of national resources in support of agreed international priorities;

g. And a pledge of support of multilateral initiatives, resolutions and programs sponsored by intergovernmental or international non-governmental organizations and aiming at:

(1) Immediate measures to arrest, abate or prevent further deterioration in critical areas of the environment threatened by serious hazards to human life and health or

with the extinction of important biotic communities and species;

(2) The development of international arrangements to coordinate existing or initiate new programs, providing on a continuing or regularized basis:

Exchange of information and transfer of technical expertise;

Training of experts;

Worldwide information and education programs;

Joint research programs to help governments establish baselines, criteria and standards;

National, regional and global monitoring systems to measure pollution hazards and levels of pollution and lay the ground for a "world pollution watch," and eventually;

The establishment of a permanent international system to act as a coordinating body for the above activities carried out under national or international auspices, with authority to recommend the adoption of specific measures to national governments.

Mr. Speaker, a letter to the President follows, and is inserted as a significant step in the development of environmental policy:

MAY 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The quality and productivity of the environment have been recognized by both the Congress and Executive agencies as a major public policy issue. Your personal long-term interest in this question together with some recent important results of Congressional programs prompts me to suggest the possibility of immediate action which would enhance the productivity and quality of our natural environment.

In discussions of matters such as pollution, pesticide practice, and major ecological disruptions the appeal for guiding policies is made. I believe that the national goals and objectives which make up these elements of policy are now clear. An immediate declaration of policy by the Administration and the Congress could provide valuable guidelines for decisions affecting the environment which are made daily by individuals, corporations and the government.

Last July 18 a joint Senate-House colloquium brought together over 100 experts and opinion leaders from the private sector, and over 20 committee chairmen, interested Senators and Representatives. As a result of this day-long meeting a Congressional White Paper on a National Policy for the Environment was submitted to the Congress over the signatures of Senator Henry M. Jackson, Representative George P. Miller, Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, and Representatives John A. Blatnik, James G. Fulton, Charles A. Mosher, and myself. The support was bipartisan and bicameral. The White Paper identified the following elements of policy:

"It is the policy of the United States that:

"Environmental quality and productivity shall be considered in a worldwide context, extending in time from the present to the long-term future.

"Purposeful, intelligent management to recognize and accommodate the conflicting uses of the environment shall be a national responsibility.

"Information required for systematic management shall be provided in a complete and timely manner.

"Education shall develop a basis of individual citizen understanding and appreciation of environmental relationships and participation in decisionmaking on these issues.

"Science and technology shall provide management with increased options and capabilities for enhanced productivity and constructive use of the environment."

On April 24, 1969 I received a communica-

tion from Executive leaders in the Committee on Environmental Quality of the Federal Council for Science and Technology which added several valuable elements to the statements developed by Congress. Taken together, it is remarkable and significant that there is no point of disagreement in these elaborations of a national policy.

Having reached this stage, I am convinced that the call for policy can now be answered. The exact language or words of the statement are not crucial. With your leadership and the cooperation of Congressional interests it should be possible to move beyond this policy discussion stage into improvement of existing action programs. The setting of priorities for future Federal efforts can do much to reconcile the conflicts of use of our environmental resources and enhance the quality of our surroundings. In addition, a declaration of policy would enable this country to proceed effectively in the international situation which is so obviously a necessary context for many urgent environmental decisions. The United States should be in a position of demonstrated accomplishment and leadership at the time of the proposed United Nations Conference in 1972.

I believe that the Administration and the Congress must act promptly to bring these policy statements to the widest possible audience of citizens and to forums of opinion everywhere. I offer my personal cooperation to pursue this matter in the Legislative Branch, and I believe that a parallel declaration of policy from your office would give the greatest impetus to this effort. Could arrangements be made to this end?

Sincerely yours,

EMILIO Q. DADDARIO,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROGRAM TO COMBAT HUNGER

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is certainly to be congratulated for his excellent, forward-looking program for dealing with hunger in America. It is a reasoned and rational program which should be a good deal more effective than the emotional and uninformed response we have so often seen in earlier programs to eliminate hunger.

It was just a short while ago that we were hearing rumors from some quarters that President Nixon had "sold out" insofar as the hunger program was concerned. Those responsible for these rumors should be very red-faced indeed, for they should now be aware that President Nixon will in due time advance reasoned responses to the problems of this country. They should now end their repeated calls for instant solutions to the problems of this country.

An excellent summary of the steps and procedures leading to the final program is contained in an article by Mr. Godfrey Sperling, Jr., carried in the *Christian Science Monitor* of May 13, 1969:

NIXON'S PLAN TO BAN HUNGER NEVER
FALTERED

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The inside story on the President's recently announced \$1 billion

hunger program is that it was never shelved—as was widely reported.

Instead, it moved along steadily over a three-month period.

In fact, at no point did the President even slightly move away from the goal he set forth in a March 17 meeting of his urban affairs council, which was to develop the program:

"This administration," he told the group, "will produce the first comprehensive, far-reaching attack on the problem in our history."

The incident provides further—and highly significant—insight into the President's approach to decisionmaking.

What stirred reports that the President had pulled away from a hunger program, and, moreover, that it was presidential domestic-affairs adviser Dr. Arthur Burns who had dissuaded him from moving ahead?

The answer, from documents made available to this reporter and from conversations with those who were in on the decision-making process; is as follows:

The false reports came from certain officials within the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare who thought they saw their hopes for a hunger program dashed by a Nixon budget that showed only \$15 million additional money for hunger-type programs.

STRONG QUESTIONS RAISED

At the same time, Dr. Burns was raising strong questions within the Urban Affairs Council about the hunger program. He asked where the money would come from, how much hunger there actually was in the United States, and he challenged the philosophical approach of providing free food stamps to the poor, without incentives.

These interested parties, at HEW and Agriculture, together with several highly interested congressmen and senators, put the small budget allocation and the Burns position together and came to the conclusion that the program was shelved.

So said a number of newsmen who reported the demise of a program that really was just moving along in the way that Mr. Nixon fully encourages—with much debate and with the pros and cons argued strongly.

Those close to the decision actually are not certain what Dr. Burns' position was. They say he is quite enigmatic in such a context. He is often the devil's advocate. But regardless of whether he was actually opposed or whether he merely was trying to encourage a full discussion, there was one outcome:

He stirred up a response of additional and better staff work on the subject. From this, the final program emerged.

At this time Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin produced a new in-depth analysis of hunger in low-income areas of Texas, Louisiana, New York, and Kentucky. Other surveys and analysis also were provided to the council.

DATA CALLED SOFT

Budget Director Robert Mayo also was involved. He and Mr. Hardin worked closely together in searching for budget areas where money could be found—and reallocated—for a hunger campaign.

They found \$1 billion, of which White House sources will only say: "It was not taken from programs that were in any way connected with aiding the poor."

In describing the slow, emerging process involved in the making of the hunger program, one White House source said:

"The trouble was that the data on hunger was relatively soft, not the sort of thing you have in mathematics or economics. It is hard to prove empirically who the poor and hungry are, where they are, how many there are."

It was Dr. Burns who pushed the group, and, particularly, Mr. Hardin, toward the gathering of ever more solid information.

What Dr. Burns wanted was some indication of how many people were suffering from malnutrition because they didn't have enough money to buy the food they should be eating.

GROUP REMINDED

He wanted to separate this group from those who are suffering from malnutrition because of ignorance or misinformation—but who, in fact, have enough money to buy the necessary food.

Finally, the information desired was gathered and it was from this data that the President's expanded food-stamp program was put together.

It is directed toward helping those who are hungry because they are poor. This was seen as No. 1 priority.

Thus, the administration's program will for the first time provide free food stamps for those in the very lowest income brackets.

What then of the pressure from the critics on Capitol Hill? Did it have no bearing on the administration coming up with a hunger program?

The role of Congress in this instance does not appear to have been controlling, despite stories to this effect.

It is true that advocates of the program, within the Urban Affairs Council, at times reminded the group of the political liabilities involved in delaying too long an announcement of a program.

But—from at least one reading of the evidence—the question was never really whether there would be a Nixon hunger program or whether the President wanted such a program.

It was merely a question of how long it would take to put the program together.

In the last analysis, congressional critics may well have helped in hastening the putting together of the hunger package.

ROGERS OF FLORIDA SAYS OVERTHROW OF CASTRO WILL MARK SECOND INDEPENDENCE OF CUBA

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with freedom-loving Cubans around the world who are celebrating the 67th anniversary of Independence Day for Cuba.

Unfortunately, the day which normally takes a very high place in any nation's holidays, will not be celebrated in Cuba. For the people now living in Cuba are not allowed to celebrate Independence Day.

I find it sadly ironic that on this Cuban Independence Day, the people of Cuba are more dependent on a foreign power than at any time in this century. Russia's annual ransom to Fidel Castro for the use of the Cuban people and the island itself is now more than \$1 million per month.

Yet last week it was necessary for Castro to initiate rationing on bread to a quarter a pound per person per day. It is obvious that Castro's asking price from Russia for the enslavement of Cuba has been adequate to support him to the extent that he has lived well, but has not been enough to even feed the Cuban people.

Castro has perpetrated himself through a dictatorship without even the pretense of free elections which he promised when he came into power. But this is not unusual. He has broken about

every promise he made to the Cuban people. Their economy continues to slide downward and they continue to be a state enslaved by communism.

I think it interesting that even Castro has noted in recent speeches that acts of economic sabotage are on the increase. Especially noteworthy is the fact that most of this comes via robberies of food and clothing stores.

Since Castro took control, more than half a million Cubans have fled their homeland rather than live as Soviet slaves.

I can only say that I hope someday all Cubans will be able to celebrate the second Cuban Independence Day. That day will mark the date when Fidel Castro has been overthrown and a Cuban Government again controls the affairs of the Cuban people.

I am sure that the free nations of the Western Hemisphere and all democracies of the world look forward to that day when we all can join in the celebration of the independence of Cuba from its present enslavement.

And I hope that day will not be long in coming.

MISUSE OF FUNDS—A CLASSIC EXAMPLE

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

Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. Speaker, I have always advocated the use of Federal funds and grants from independent organizations such as the Ford Foundation in a sincere effort to solve the many problems which exist in our cities today. I have always felt that the problems of poverty, ignorance and hunger, among others, must be attacked with all the resources at our command.

Yet today I and many other concerned Americans are disgusted with what appears to be a chronic misuse of these funds, which are supposed to be used to create jobs, provide better housing, and improve education. We are disturbed over the flagrant use of these funds to promote activities which in no conceivable way are improving the lot of America's poor. We are dismayed by the seemingly callous attitudes of community action program employees toward these funds. Finally we are concerned about the improper use of tax-exempt grants and about the apparent attitude of the Ford Foundation and the organizations which receive these grants that they do not have to be accounted for.

The instances of this misuse of money are too numerous to mention here, but I would like to relate one classic example which occurred in my district recently. The incident, which concerned the activities of a VISTA employee in New Haven, Conn., also leads me to question the propriety of recent actions by certain federally paid poverty workers.

In order to describe both the chronology of events and my complaints, I would like to include at this point the text of my letter to the Office of Economic Opportunity, which runs the VISTA program and sponsors the New Haven anti-

poverty program, Community Progress, Inc.:

MAY 9, 1969.

Mr. BERTRAND M. HARDING,
Acting Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARDING: I am greatly concerned about the actions of a worker in your VISTA program in New Haven, Connecticut. Mr. Herbert Johnston was employed by VISTA at a salary of \$220 per month at the time of his arrest on February 26, 1969, for disorderly conduct at Lee High School.

According to the Hartford Courant of February 27, Johnston was arrested: "following an unscheduled speech he made at a Lee High School assembly program last week that erupted into fighting. Five students and one teacher were injured during the melee."

"According to some present, Johnston used inflammatory language in addressing approximately 800 black and white students attending a National Brotherhood Week program at the school."

As to what was said by this supposed "Volunteer in Service to America," I quote from the Connecticut Sunday Herald of April 20:

"Students questioned by The Herald after the disturbance said that a man they described as a 'Black Panther' grabbed the microphone and began spouting off against whites. He ridiculed everything and everybody in the white society, some said, and, as one girl put it, 'knocked us constantly and unmercifully.'"

Johnston is currently awaiting his trial on the disorderly conduct charge in the Sixth Circuit Court of Connecticut.

It disturbs me that a worker who is paid with Federal funds and who is supposed to be working for the betterment of his country has become involved in such an incident.

I am also distressed by the fact that \$100 of Johnston's legal fees was advanced to him by Community Progress, Inc., the New Haven anti-poverty agency, out of funds granted to that agency by the Ford Foundation. This "loan" to Johnston was admitted last week by CPI Executive Director Milton Brown after he had received a telephone inquiry from Ford Foundation Vice President for National Affairs Mitchell Svirldoff.

While this loan was admitted by CPI only last week, I had been aware of it since early March, at which time I made inquiry to the Ford Foundation about it. In a letter dated April 4, Assistant Secretary William H. Nims replied, "Although in many cases it is within the rights of non-profit organizations to provide support for legal defense, it was not within the terms of our grant to Community Progress, Inc. We accordingly brought this to the attention of the Director, and the funds were replaced by contributions received subsequently."

I do not believe that this loan constituted proper use of tax-exempt funds, nor do I consider such action proper for a community action program under your auspices. Furthermore, there are agencies which could and would have afforded legal counsel to Mr. Johnston at no charge. This incident is another classic example of the misuse of money, and it reflects the callous attitudes of many of your community action program people towards funds which were intended to promote better jobs and housing for the poor. I want to know what steps you plan to take as the acting director of OEO to prevent this chronic mishandling of money by OEO-sponsored organizations.

I am even more interested, however, in a rumor that pending the disposition of his criminal case, Mr. Johnston has been employed recently by CPI. I hardly think that this action should have been taken at this time, but again it is so typical of the actions of community action agencies.

I would appreciate your looking into this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. GIALMO,
Member of Congress.

According to their reply of May 15, the OEO is looking into the matter.

Even though the charges against Herbert Johnston were subsequently dropped, I still question his involvement in this incident and the role of Community Progress, Inc., and the Ford Foundation in his defense.

When I first became aware of this situation I wrote to the Ford Foundation asking for an explanation. The reply I received did nothing to answer my questions about the guidelines used by the foundation to govern its tax-exempt grants. I therefore found it necessary to write a second letter to Ford Foundation, the text of which I will include at this point in the RECORD. I have not yet received any acknowledgment of this letter:

MAY 9, 1969.

Mr. MCGEORGE BUNNY,
President, the Ford Foundation,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BUNNY: On March 14, I wrote to you concerning the role your Foundation played in disbursing funds which were used to help defray legal expenses for Mr. Herbert Johnston, a VISTA worker in New Haven. I reiterate my statement that the time has come for Foundations which use tax-exempt monies to account for many of their actions. I again express interest in the guidelines, if any, which govern grants to organizations such as Community Progress, Inc.

The April 4 reply from Assistant Secretary William H. Nims did absolutely nothing to answer my questions. Mr. Nims told me that Mr. Johnston was arrested for breach of the peace in connection with an incident at Lee High School. I already knew this. He told me that CPI used \$100 to cover part of Johnston's legal expenses. This I obviously was aware of since I brought it to your attention. Finally, Mr. Nims admitted that this use of Ford Foundation funds "was not within the terms of our grant to Community Progress, Inc."

What were these terms, Mr. Bundy? That was one of the things I wanted to know and still want to know. What kind of control does your organization have over such grants? How do you determine the manner in which the grant money is to be used, and how do you insure that it will be used for those purposes?

Mr. Nims also noted that the funds used for Mr. Johnston's defense "were replaced by contributions received subsequently." Does this absolve CPI from blame? Can any organization which receives a Ford Foundation grant use the money any way it chooses as long as it replaces that money at a later date? Do you prescribe and enforce penalties for misuse of your funds?

I am greatly concerned that apparently such misuse of tax-exempt funds must be brought to your attention before it will be corrected. I wonder how many cases of this sort are never brought to your attention and are thus never corrected. How many organizations are using your funds improperly and what are you going to do about it?

It would seem that the highly sophisticated Ford Foundation could at least require a periodic audit or a statement from the grantee organizations accounting for how its grants are being used. If you do not use such a system at present, I strongly recommend that you give serious consideration to this proposal.

It is ironic that while many individuals connected with the Ford Foundation and grantee organizations decry the so-called "secrecy" of some portions of the Federal establishment, the Ford Foundation itself continues to issue large grants of tax-exempt funds in an equally secretive manner. I am pleased to note I am not the only legislator who is demanding that many of these grants be explained. In this time of increasing taxes, the people have a right to know how tax-exempt money is being spent. I will do everything in my power to see that they find out.

Please send me a complete description of the terms of your grant to CPI and an explanation of your guidelines for this and other grants. I suggest that you owe Congress and the public an explanation as to why the Ford Foundation should not be accountable for tax-exempt funds and why its funds should be tax-exempt in the first place.

In your 1968 annual report, you state, "The Ford Foundation is a private, non-profit institution dedicated to the public well-being. It seeks to identify and contribute to the solution of problems of national and international importance." I think it is high time that the Ford Foundation proves that its grants are indeed being used to solve such problems.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT N. GIALMO,
Member of Congress.

I might note here that my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has also expressed interest in this case and has received copies of both letters.

The questions I have raised remain unanswered. I and many other Americans want them answered quickly. It is time for the Ford Foundation and similar groups to explain why they should not be accountable for tax-exempt money. It is time for the Office of Economic Opportunity to stop this waste of money which is badly needed elsewhere. It is time for the local community action programs to use every cent of their money to improve the lot of the poor in this country.

For if Community Progress, Inc., and other poverty agencies can afford to defend the Herbert Johnstons, while at the same time providing better jobs, housing, and education for the millions who desperately need it, perhaps we will not have to appropriate more funds for them. If they cannot afford to do both, and I am sure they cannot, I say that it is time for them to help us complete the unfinished business of America in stead of misusing the resources which should be directed toward that goal.

MINING INDUSTRY WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Mining Industry Workmen's Compensation Improvement Act of 1969." The purpose of this bill is to encourage the States to improve their workmen's compensation laws to assure adequate coverage and

benefits to employees injured in the mining industry.

It is an appalling fact that today by conservative estimates over 100,000 men suffer coal miners' pneumoconiosis—commonly called black lung disease. An additional 20,000 more coal workers have some state of silicosis and another 5,000 have a mixed dust pneumoconiosis.

Death and disability from coal dust inhalation is the price that coal miners have had to pay for their employment in an occupation among the most hazardous in the United States. In Great Britain, dust-derived diseases have been compensable since 1943, but in this country in only seven of the 26 States with coal mining is coal miners' pneumoconiosis specifically compensable.

Earlier this year, the eyes of the Nation focused on the activities of three courageous doctors in West Virginia who fought decades of apathy, tradition, and entrenched interests to lead the coal miners in a successful fight to win approval by the State legislature for a long-overdue black lung compensation bill.

Theirs was a noble effort. Today I propose that the Congress of the United States follow their leadership and consider this bill which would stimulate every State to compensate for these dust diseases in the mining industry and to provide compensation for those workers and their families who have suffered deaths and injuries prior to the enactment of this legislation and would have been entitled to compensation had this act been in effect.

The workmen's compensation system in this country is basically a series of independent State programs of private insurance administered by the States under State laws. Each system is separate from other disability programs, such as social security, and can be viewed as an independent unit.

This program is a major source of support for the families of about 14,000 persons who are killed at work each year and for a large number of the 2.2 million who are injured. In 1967, some \$2.2 billion of benefits was paid under workmen's compensation programs, one-third for medical costs and two-thirds for cash payments.

Despite the size of the program, some workers in the mining industry may not be covered because their employers elected not to come under the State's workmen's compensation law—23 States have elective rather than compulsory laws—or because their employers are exempt from the law as a result of an exemption for small firms. Even where the employment is covered, the workers may not be protected because of a restrictive definition or interpretation of what constitutes an occupational disease or because of inadequate time limit provisions for filing occupational disease claims.

The standard specified in most State laws for cash benefits is 66⅔ percent of the worker's own average weekly wage. However, because of statutory monetary maximums in these laws, only six States today actually equal or exceed this standard. In 1940, by contrast, 37 States met this standard.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to stimulate and encourage the States to conduct an inventory of the serious inadequacies of their present laws relating to compensation for employees in the mining industry who are disabled by work-related accidents or diseases, and to amend such laws so that these employees and their dependents will not suffer substantial economic hardship.

To assist the States in improving their administration, they are authorized to apply for grants up to 75 percent of any additional administrative costs they incur as a result of cooperating in this program.

If the States within a certain period do not have or extend the coverage of their workmen's compensation laws as prescribed in the proposed act, the act would apply the procedures of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act generally to uncovered employees of employers engaged in the mining industry. Further, if within the same period the States do not have or increase the benefits of their workmen's compensation laws for such workers to the level of the benefits of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, employers engaged in the mining industry must secure insurance providing benefits not less than that of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

Since this bill is applicable to the entire mining industry, the insurance costs would be applied uniformly throughout the country and thus would eliminate unfair competition among the various States.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATION

Over a period of 5 years the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the States for the additional cost of improving the administration of their workmen's compensation laws relating to the mining industry. Grants may be made for additional costs of administration during the fiscal year immediately preceding enactment and in subsequent years.

Thus, to determine the additional costs which will be financed under this title, the Secretary will use as a base, upon which to make the determination, the costs to the State during the second fiscal year prior to enactment of the act. Before payment of the grant may be made, the State law, as administered, must also meet certain specified reporting, expenditure, and reimbursement requirements.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT TO EMPLOYEES IN THE MINING INDUSTRY NOT COVERED BY STATE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

Two years from the end of the calendar year in which the proposal is passed all employees of employers engaged in the mining industry, if such employees are not covered by State workmen's compensation laws, will have extended to them the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended. This title will also extend specific coverage to employees in

the mining industry who suffer death or disability from pneumoconiosis.

The administration of this title will be under the procedures of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act in the same manner as the administration of extensions of that act to other classes of employees, such as those of defense base contractors. It will thus be necessary for employers subject to this title to secure insurance as required by such act.

TITLE III—MINIMUM COMPENSATION BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES COVERED BY STATE LAWS OBLIGATIONS OF EMPLOYERS TO SECURE

Two years from the end of the calendar year in which the bill is passed, employers engaged in the mining industry will be required to secure compensation for their employees covered by State workmen's compensation laws at least equal to the benefits of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended. The employer may satisfy his obligation either by purchasing insurance or by qualifying as a self-insurer. Certain terms of the insurance policy are specified.

CLAIMS PROCEDURE

In those States where the level of compensation benefits is less than that prescribed by the proposed Act and where an agreement has been made with the Secretary, the person claiming benefits under the State law may concurrently file a claim with the State agency for an order to bring total compensation to the level as herein proposed. Where there is no such agreement, the claim may be filed with the Secretary. The State determination will be final except as to benefits. In cases where uninsured employers within the time period specified by the Secretary or his designee fail to pay compensation due, the Secretary will make payments from the Employees' Benefit Fund established under section 305 of the Act. The Secretary would be subrogated to all rights of the person receiving such payment. Appeals from awards in excess of State levels shall be processed in accordance with section 21 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

AGREEMENT WITH STATES

The Secretary of Labor may enter into agreements with the States to utilize their services and employees in processing claims subject to his jurisdiction, and to recompense the States for the services performed.

EMPLOYEES' BENEFIT FUND

In order to provide a fund out of which the Secretary of Labor may pay compensation to employees of employers who fail to secure payment of compensation at the level of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as required by title III, the proposal establishes an employees' benefit fund in the Treasury of the United States. The manner of establishing the fund and for paying benefits from the fund is specified in the proposal. The fund would be primarily financed by amounts recovered by the Secretary from defaulting employers. Other sources of revenue, including appropriations from general revenues, are also authorized in order to

give the fund initial revenues and at other times when additional funds are necessary.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Employers failing to secure payment of compensation will be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. Employers who dispose of property with the intent of avoiding payment of compensation to an injured employee are subject to a similar penalty. Any person who willfully makes false statements for the purpose of obtaining or defeating any benefit shall likewise be subject to fine or imprisonment or both.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

RULES AND REGULATIONS—SUBPENA POWERS

The Secretary is authorized to issue necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act. The Secretary is also authorized to issue subpoenas, administer oaths, and compel the attendance of witnesses and production of books, and the district courts of the United States are given jurisdiction to enforce the orders of the Secretary under this section.

PRESUMPTION OF INJURY

Provides for a rebuttable presumption that the claim comes within the act if the worker was employed for 5 years or more in the mining industry.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NUTRITION

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the 1968 Republican National Convention as permanent convention chairman on August 6, 1968, I made a number of prophecies as to what the election of a Republican administration would mean to America.

One of my shortest predictions contained just five words—"And nobody will go hungry."

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are elated that President Nixon has moved swiftly and surely to make good that prediction during his first hundred days in office. In testimonial to that Presidential action born of compassion and determination to solve a shameful national problem, House Republicans today are placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement regarding President Nixon's national nutrition program.

I join with my colleagues in calling special attention to the President's program of nutrition for a healthy America because I believe the problem of hunger and malnutrition to be second to none in this land. I also take great pride in the fact that a commitment to free this Nation from hunger and malnutrition has been implanted in the heart of America by a Republican President.

No program coming before Congress in this or any other year can be more important than the Nixon administration's proposals for properly meeting the nutrition needs of low-income Americans.

I urge the Congress to go on record—

as the Nixon administration already has done—in support of a new national goal, an end to both hunger and malnutrition in America. This is one of the most meaningful contributions Congress could make to raising the level of life in our country.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's legislative and administrative recommendations to end hunger and malnutrition constitute a truly comprehensive approach to this pervasive problem.

The food stamp and food distribution programs are in need of an extensive overhaul, because quite simply those who are malnourished and hungry often do not receive the food. Substantial numbers of poverty-stricken families cannot even afford the cost of food stamps. Present commodity distribution programs result in severely limited quantities and varieties of food reaching those who most urgently need them. Hundreds of counties still do not have any kind of food supplement program. Hundreds of others administer the programs they have in such a manner as to exclude large numbers of malnourished individuals.

The reforms President Nixon suggests will bring a measure of effectiveness to the antihunger programs that they have lacked in the past. The President has responded to the challenge of hunger and malnutrition in America in an imaginative and responsible manner. The Congress can certainly do the same.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, the President's Science Advisory Committee reported on the world food problem. The report opened with a quotation from the Bible. As I recall, it began:

And lo a black horse; and he that sat on him had a pair of balances in his hand.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today who have presented a statement expressing support for President Nixon's proposal to get to the root of the problem of hunger. There is not a person within the sound of my voice who can—in conscience—reject this proposal embodied in the message of May 6, 1969, knowing that the specter of hunger haunts this land and that malnutrition weighs down the "pair of balances" by which the true progress of our Nation is determined.

Part of the President's proposal involves revision of the food stamp program. This well-intentioned plan has failed to meet the needs of hungry Americans despite the availability of surplus foods and the bargain services which our coordinated food stamp program can provide.

President Nixon seeks to correct these deficiencies by: First, providing poor families with enough food stamps to purchase a nutritionally complete diet, and, second, by providing food stamps without cost to the very poor and permitting others to purchase stamps at no more than 30 percent of their income. The President's plan is also aimed at coordinating the food stamp program with public welfare and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to work closely with county and local officials.

Many other changes have been recommended by the President, some of which

may need legislative support, and others which can be accomplished through administrative action.

To quote President Nixon:

More is at stake here than the health and well-being of 16 million American citizens. . . . Something very like the honor of American democracy is at issue. . . . America has come to the aid of one starving people after another. But the moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself. For all time. . . . It is a moment to act with vigor; it is a moment to be recalled with pride.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge my unqualified support to the President's program to banish the fifth horseman—hunger—from the American scene. Constructive action by Congress, consistent with the recommendations in President Nixon's message, can hasten the day when this goal may be attained.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's crusade against hunger has started, and in my opinion, it is more than mere rhetoric.

The President has found that we are still operating under programs which were started decades ago—noneffective programs that meant promise in the thirties, but not the seventies.

Mr. Nixon has stated:

That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable.

No one would disagree with that. Why should we—the richest and most progressive nation in the world—be in such a position?

True, we in Utah do not have the multitude of problems faced by Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, or here in Washington, D.C. But we are knowledgeable about the problems of hunger and economic deprivation as outlined in Mr. Nixon's message.

The root causes of hunger in our Nation must be examined and then dealt with comprehensively by all the agencies of government involved. If this requires legislation, then it should have the support of every Member of Congress.

As we all know, the Hunger Commission, established last year, did not receive Executive support. We now have that Executive support under President Nixon. His statement on hunger, announced on May 6, hits at the core of hunger problems in every State of the Union. I invite my colleagues to support his proposals and bring an end to what we all know exists—hunger in America.

Moreover, the President's message is proof of the administration's recognition of the hunger problem in America and its determination to deal vigorously with it, and to ascertain why our Federal food programs are not reaching millions of impoverished Americans.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in expressing approval of the President's national nutrition program, a program which will take great steps toward alleviating the disgraceful problem of hunger which plagues too many of the American people today.

By his action in this area, President Nixon has greatly complemented his progressive and action minded administration. By carrying the involvement of

the Federal Government beyond the stages of recognition and into a specific and comprehensive proposal, he has bolstered the faith of the American people in our commitment to meet this problem and deal with it squarely. Surely his response to this continuing dilemma will provide the leadership necessary to involve those outside of Government as well, recognizing as he has that participation by the private sector of our economy is of great importance if the battle against gross inequality is to be won.

I share the hope of other Members of this body that Congress will give its undivided support to the President's proposal, and that the ills of economic deprivation will soon be a thing of the past for all segments of our society.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in commending President Nixon on his plan to combat hunger which he presented to Congress on May 6.

The President has clearly outlined a program of action, a program that is not just an idea, but a practical plan for combating the very serious problem of hunger in this country. I concur with the President's statement that it is inconceivable that, in a country with the riches of America, there should be those who do not have food to put on their table.

On July 29, 1966, a House task force on agriculture reported, and I quote:

Unless the United States remains able to meet its own food needs without the fear of scarcity, our Government will never be in a position to provide even token assistance to the hungry nations of the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, we not only must assume the commitment to our own people, we have the responsibility of setting an example for the entire world. And, in "Famine, 1975," the authors predict that by 1975, the United States, even with its huge productive capacity, will be unable to produce enough food to stave off famine in the underdeveloped nations of the world, unless drastic measures are taken to meet this crisis.

I would remind you that communism has advanced only in areas where the people are hungry. As evidence of this, we need only recall the peasants of Cuba and the masses of China. We must remember that the minds and hearts of men can be most effectively won for freedom only after the pangs of hunger in their stomachs has been stilled.

How, then, are we to be able to supply the food to stave off the famine of the world, if in fact we cannot provide the necessary nutrition for our own countrymen?

To me, the answer can be found in two key words—"production" and "technological genius" that has put three men in orbit around the moon. Technology must be combined with our great productive genius in the agricultural field. We can no longer be satisfied with restricting our present level of production of agricultural products, but we can and must expand as we look to the future.

We also must make this genius available to the underdeveloped nations of the world. What is really needed are

"flying farmers"—men and women with the knowledge and bilingual capabilities who can go into hungry corners of the world to work with and to assist those people in increasing their food productivity.

In the final analysis, in my judgment, those countries that produce and/or control the world's food supply, will direct the destiny of man.

Mr. Nixon has set in motion a program that is well thought out, dynamic, and practical, and goes to the heart of the problem here at home. Also, we can and must push forward at our earliest opportunity with a viable, multinational program that has as its goal the monumental task of eliminating starvation worldwide, and gives the people of the underdeveloped nations the food resources and productive capability of filling the empty stomachs of their people.

I sincerely believe we have the technological and productive capacity and ability to turn our agricultural production efforts into a major advantage in our arsenal of "nonmilitary weapons" that will ultimately win the cold war and promote the cause of peace with freedom in every section of the globe.

At this point, I would like to insert a copy of a speech I made at a statewide 4-H convention at the University of California at Davis on August 22, 1967, with the thought that it might hold some interest for my colleagues:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN TO THE 4-H CONVENTION AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, AUGUST 22, 1967

No doubt you are wondering what a Congressman from Washington could possibly have to say at a 4-H Convention? First, let me say, as a statement of my qualifications to speak to you, that I was born and raised on a farm and that I am a product of the 4-H system. In Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, where I have spent the better part of my life, and where I have served in both business and public service, I have literally grown up with the farmer and his problems. My first elective office was to that of President of the Ferndale 4-H Club in Humboldt County.

Many of the concepts and principles on which my philosophy of government and life are based, were forged on my Father's dairy farm and in the rural atmosphere of Humboldt. And as a former County Supervisor in Del Norte County, I became intimately familiar with every phase of agriculture from beginning to end—or, you might say—from manure to marketing and that, I think, covers quite a broad spectrum.

This experience has been invaluable to me in Washington. As a Congressman representing the First Congressional District of California, it has been my great privilege to represent one of California's and, indeed, one of America's truly great agricultural areas. In Congress, I have worked closely with the agencies concerned, in an attempt to develop plentiful supplies of low-price agricultural water for our North Coastal counties. In addition, I have worked consistently to correct inequitable quotas on imports of foreign beef, poultry, dairy products, sugar, wines, lamb, wool and lumber. Mainly, however, I have devoted my efforts toward strengthening agricultural production in America which I have many times described as "The Backbone of Our Nation."

But, enough about me. What I really want to talk about today is agriculture and what I believe its role will be in the future—not only in California and throughout the Nation—but throughout the world.

In case you don't know it, many non-Californians are quite confused as to exactly what we do out here in the "Golden State". Many think our economy is based on making movies, or entertaining tourists, or in defense contracts. In fact many "out-of-staters" are, frankly, quite surprised to learn that our major industry in California is agriculture. For those of you who have not traveled far beyond our borders, I can tell you that, back East, we do not have an agriculture image here in California. But, what are the facts?

California agriculture, over the years, has set a record of productivity that is the envy of the world. This is so, mainly, because we have been able to operate units of sufficient size to make farm mechanization and farm technology feasible. We are proud of that record and we have every right to be proud. I regret to say, however, and I trust you will note this fact well—there is an effort underway at present to break up the very system which has made California's agricultural output the best in the world. I refer to the attempt by some misguided social planners in Washington to impose acreage limitations in large areas of California where Congress never intended them to be. To this end, a federal suit has been filed in the U.S. District Court in San Diego to impose acreage limitations in the vast 500,000 acre Imperial Irrigation District. And similar actions are reported to be in the making in the one-million-acre area of the Kings River and in the 350,000 Kern River basin.

If successful, these court actions would have the effect of destroying some of the world's most productive farms by breaking up our highly efficient and highly successful units into small, subsistence size farms. Such "land reform myths", in light of progress made and the tremendous challenge of the future, just don't make sense! This type of thinking, moreover, represents a dangerous trend in American agriculture which we have seen developing for some years.

Agriculture is still the major industry in California, in spite of the tremendous decrease in American farms in the past 10 years. In fact, it appears obvious to me that soon we will need to develop a term to replace agriculture, such as "Urbiculture", for instance. Your own organization is, perhaps, the best example of this trend.

Of the 40,268 young people now enrolled in 4-H projects in California, only 12,547 actually live on farms—less than a third! As a matter of fact, more are listed as "urban" than "suburban". This means, quite simply, that the majority of you who are engaged in 4-H projects, actually live in towns and cities. I hasten to add, that this in no way is detrimental to 4-H; it merely points up the fact that there has, indeed, been a vast shift in our geographical distribution in America. In contrast to this, nearly 75% of those involved with 4-H work lived on farms when I was a youth. So, we see vividly what is happening to the farm picture in general in this country.

What does all this mean—this apparent "phasing out" of the American farmer and our capacity to produce agricultural products? This brings us to the "nitty gritty" of the problem in terms of your future, America's role in that future, and which way the world is going to go in the next 15 years.

As you well know, the world has many problems today. We bounce from one crisis to another—each seemingly threatening to "blow the lid off" any hope for peace we ever expected or dreamed of. And, like people in crisis, we have a problem of being "too close to the forest to see the trees"—as we say in the Redwood Empire. What I mean is, that we have become so accustomed to viewing everything with alarm—such as Vietnam and the riots—that we have completely overlooked an impending crisis more critical than

Vietnam and more imminent than the dangerous threat of nuclear holocaust.

I submit to you today that, of all the world's problems, the awesome prospects of a world population explosion and the potential it holds for the year 1980, is, by far, the most critical.

What is at stake, quite frankly, is the fact that by 1980, the world is going to have five times more mouths to feed than it does now in 1967. With present world food problems and the curtailments which have predominated American agriculture in recent years—think for a moment what this means. In terms of escalating hunger, I see the world developing in three significant stages. The first is critical shortages of food in certain underdeveloped countries beginning in 1968. Unless this food crisis can be quickly met and resolved, the next stage will be widespread famine in about 1975. And, if we are not able to stem the initial stages, there will follow large scale hunger throughout the world accompanied by acute malnutrition and starvation of such magnitude as to stagger the imagination.

At this point, I want to say that I do not tell you this to frighten you but to "spur you on" to greater heights in 4-H work. What I am telling you is the best judgment of experts in the field of population growth and world food resources. Two such experts, are William and Paul Paddock who have written an excellent and authoritative book entitled "Famine 1975", which I commend to your reading. Last year, the Congress made extensive studies on the potentials of world hunger. The House Committee on Agriculture made its findings known in a 704-page report which they called "World War on Hunger—1968". From that title, I need not tell you what their specific findings were.

In view of these facts, what has been done to meet the awesome challenge that lies ahead? The President, several years ago, appeared concerned when he talked about "Food for Peace". In fact, he even appointed an Assistant Secretary of State for Food-for-Peace. Unfortunately, however, this man retired seven months ago and no successor has ever been named. In addition, the Administration has failed to make public its 1966 report on "Food-for-Peace", which it was supposed to do last April. This is tragic because President Eisenhower's "Food for Peace" program has been one of our most successful, in the field of foreign affairs.

The next logical question which arises, is, can we meet this challenge, based on our present capability and efforts in this regard? On July 29th, a House Task Force on Agriculture reported (and I quote): "... Unless the United States remains able to meet its own food needs without fear of scarcity, our Government will never be in a position to provide even token assistance to the hungry nations of the world." And, in "Famine 1975", the authors predict that by 1975, the United States, even with its huge productive capacity, will be unable to produce enough food to stave off famine in the underdeveloped nations.

At the present time, the underdeveloped nations of the world are capable of producing only about 650 million tons of food each year. To meet the population increase of those already born, these underdeveloped nations are going to require, by 1980, an additional 400 million tons each year—or more than half of what they are now capable of producing. To meet these minimum tonnage and nutritional requirements would require a capital investment of \$80 billion. That, in statistical terms, is the "long and short" of the problem.

Must America, however, in the face of such evidence try to pretend the problem doesn't exist? Should we, because of these findings, give up? When I think of a starving world pleading at America's doorstep for food to

survive—my mind conjures up all of the challenges we have had to face in the past. The answer, my friends, is no—we must not give up in the face of this crisis and, indeed, we cannot unless we are prepared to fall victim to it ourselves. If you share that feeling with me, let us, then, examine ways to overcome it.

As farm-oriented people, you know that food cannot be grown or produced over night. Crops take time and, like any other industry, agriculture has to be "geared up" before mass production can be realized. We tried this in WW II when our farm industry was operating at peak capacity and, I would remind you, we encountered serious problems. To meet the needs of the 1940's we had to revert to food rationing and food substitutes on a National scale.

Today, although we have made great strides in food production techniques, we nevertheless have fewer farms and fewer farmers, and the potential food demand of the 1970's makes the need of WW II seem like "chicken feed". The question then, is, "where is the food going to come from to feed five times more people?" In search of that answer, it is first necessary to examine the nature of the problem.

In some respects, the picture is not all black. Population growth need not continue to explode indefinitely even though those who will be 35 in the year 2000 are already born. Advancements of biomedical science have made family planning feasible and both the United States and the United Nations have made significant progress in the field of birth control. Decreasing the birth rate of the world is not the answer, nor the solution to this problem, alone, but it is a vital adjunct.

Quite honestly, I have long felt the need to completely overhaul our agricultural policies—it's time we "took the bit out of the mouth" of American agricultural production.

In the field of foreign assistance alone, we would be much better off to cut loose American agriculture and send our grain surpluses to hungry countries of the world rather than propping up some corrupt governments with U.S. funds—look what this would do to help our balance-of-payments problem.

All this money would be paid to American farmers—the dollars would remain in this country to re-circulate for the benefit of everyone.

We could then establish a phase-out of subsidies in this country and offset this unrealistic funding by permitting increased production.

As I've said many times, American agricultural genius and the food it produces can be the most effective weapon in our arsenal as we seek ways and means of beating the Communists in the Cold War.

The most critical aspect of this problem is the fact that a livable world cannot long exist where two-thirds don't get enough to eat while the remaining third is overfed. It goes without saying, I think, that the future of all mankind is now being ground out in India. If man fails to solve this problem, all the world will live like India, where, today, people die in the streets from starvation.

From what we have said, thus far, it is obvious that the United States just is not capable of feeding the world. The key is helping them produce their own food, concentrating first on the underdeveloped countries. To this end, we can furnish assistance but with a lesser emphasis on dollars. If our foreign aid programs of the past have taught us anything at all, it is that people can't eat money. Together—helping them produce their own food coupled with technical assistance from us—we can rise to the challenge with some assurance of minimizing its devastating effects. That, realistically, is the best we can hope for, but it is a goal.

In spite of the Administration's neglect in facing the reality of tomorrow, there are

some concerned Members of Congress who are aware of the problem. Last month, for example, I had the pleasure of cosponsoring a bill in the House calling for establishment of a "World Food Study and Coordinating Commission". This group of experts—the best minds we can find in this field—would examine every facet of an impending world food shortage and develop concrete plans to meet it, along the lines I have mentioned.

I have deliberately left for last, why it is so important that America rise to meet this challenge. If you remember anything I say here today—remember this: "Whoever Controls the World's Food Supply Will Direct the Destiny of Man!"

For more than 20 years, man has been forced to accept a very inadequate substitute for peace. "Cold War" has been that substitute while man desperately ponders how to achieve true peace. During that period, we, in this country, have had some widely varying views on just where we "lost peace" and how to regain it. The fact that we have yet to find the answer is indicative of the means we have employed to achieve peace and, tragically, we are now "paying the price" in Vietnam. Some have said that the "Cold War" is a battle to see whether Communism or Democracy can win the "hearts and minds of people everywhere". The "Cold War" in actuality is ideological warfare between free nations and the Communist states.

In the first instance, I would remind you that Communism has advanced only (and I stress only) in areas where people are truly hungry. As evidence of this, we need only recall the peasants of Cuba or the masses of China.

In the second instance, I submit that the "minds and hearts of men" can most effectively be won for freedom only after the pangs of hunger in his stomach have been stilled. The security that man seeks, begins with such basic needs as security from hunger and freedom from want. A hungry man cares very little about political idealism and the more hungry he becomes—the less he cares. Hitler proved this simple doctrine in "selling" Nazism to a hungry Germany after WW I and Communism has exploited this problem wherever they could. To me, it is inconceivable that we have failed to recognize this basic human factor and to employ it in the struggle against Communism.

In the final analysis, in my judgment, the country that can respond by 1980—not with promises but with food—for the general uplift of mankind everywhere, will truly win the hearts and minds of the people of the world. If America is that country and meets that challenge, Communism will fade like a "leaf in the Fall" and be exposed as the farce that it is. And that experience, in my view, will negate any need for guns and bombs being used to halt aggression.

This, then, is the challenge we face. No—on second thought, this is the challenge you face. Each of you here today, is in an extremely unique position, to make a meaningful and previously undreamed of, contribution to American agriculture and to world peace. As you emerge from 4-H projects into the world of "human projects", I challenge you—based on what you have heard today—to "think big." As we enter the 1970's (and that's only three years away), we can no longer afford to think in terms of food supply and demand as we have previously known them. The fact of the matter is, the supply is low, the source is limited—and the demand defies our present capabilities.

What I am saying, really, is that in the future, you cannot be satisfied with just being a good farmer—or home economist—or agricultural specialist—or farm management analyst. To extend the genius of American Agriculture to a hungry world, you must be willing and able to go out into that world

and communicate with the hungry and those who can do something about that hunger.

This requires us to tap another promise of the future—America's aviation genius. If we are to do the job for which we are being called—we must literally "Put Wings on American Agriculture." In a word—what we really need are "Flying Farmers", men and women with a bilingual capability who can go into the hungry corners of the world to work and talk with the people. This is the kind of an America I think we are capable of becoming.

It is true that we have our problems. Trying to do what's right in the face of insurmountable odds—always creates problems and that has been America's plight for too long. But make no mistake about it—America is a great country and great countries produce great people. Contrary to popular opinion in some circles, America has great faith in you—the youth of our Nation. This is a big order and a great challenge but I know you have what it takes to do the job that lies ahead.

In the long run, America has never "dropped the ball" and, so long as our freedoms remain intact, America will meet the challenge and grow greater than ever before. You the 4-H Clubber, can contribute to this worthy goal today by "thinking big" about tomorrow and then setting your course to make the "best of America even better."

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, we have been startled out of the complacent belief that the American people enjoy a universal high standard of health. Now that although we have obtained for a broad segment of our society a very high standard, we can see deep problem areas and we must move ahead to correct this situation.

We in Congress, I believe, should start by exploring legislation to expand the national health survey to cover each of the 50 States so that we will have a better understanding of the nature and extent of such hunger and malnutrition as exists in the country. It is disturbing that the U.S. Public Health Service can tell us in some detail about the health of much of the rest of the world, but is unable to provide a very full picture about our own Nation. I hope we will correct this situation in the very near future.

As we consider the various programs now operated by the Federal Government, we should give serious attention to the role which private industry, particularly food processing, can play. We must find new ways to develop the means that will contribute to balanced diets and good nutrition in the country. Protein-enriched food, for instance, is clearly needed as much as the vitamin-enriched bread and milk we now have.

The President's message has indicated some of the areas in which action is needed. But if malnutrition and hunger are to be removed from the American scene, all Americans must be involved, and we in Congress must start by taking positive action on those proposals which have been put before us by the President. We must act, not because of America's honor or some other abstract concept, but because the health and well-being of our people require that we respond meaningfully and effectively to the problem.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in commending the President for his bold and comprehensive proposal for a program to combat the problems of

hunger and malnutrition wherever they exist in this country.

President Nixon and his administration, with this proposal, have moved confidently forward to assume leadership in what must be a concerted effort—both public and private—to assure every man, woman and child in the United States of the opportunity to obtain adequate food and nutrition.

As a member of that small coalition of Representatives here in the House who 1 year ago called for a Presidential commission to make an emergency evaluation of the problem of hunger and to recommend remedial action, and who expressed our earnest desire to "press impatiently and urgently on every front available to us to alleviate this problem immediately and eliminate it quickly," I am highly pleased and gratified that the President has recognized the urgent necessity of a direct frontal attack with a force and battle plan adequate to do a thorough and effective job.

Hunger in this food-rich nation is indeed "embarrassing and intolerable," in the words of our President. But it is an exceedingly complex problem, he also pointed out, not at all susceptible to fast or easy solutions, and his program is not one that can be achieved with the wave of a magic wand. It will require time, energy and effort.

The issue of malnutrition and hunger in the United States has reached deeply into the social consciousness of the more fortunate and affluent of the American people. Weekly, or monthly, food expenditures are a matter of no small concern to the great majority of our families. But authenticated stories of real hunger in this land of plenty have carried heavy shock value.

It is less important in the national scale of values that food, for the family costs less than 1 day of work from a 5-day workweek; that no other similar-size population group in all history has obtained their food with so small a fraction of their total production effort; or even that our overall national affluence has reached the present high level. More important, to most of us, is that hunger—and hidden hunger—should exist among our fellow citizens, and show in the faces and bodies of children. The great majority of the American people are willing and eager to participate in a national effort to eradicate hunger and malnutrition from this country and have welcomed the President's recommendations to achieve that objective.

A factor of major importance in the President's national nutrition program is his recognition that the efforts of Government alone are insufficient. In seeking the involvement of the private sector through mobilization of the agricultural industries, the President has reaffirmed the need for creative Government-industry partnership in important areas of national concern.

President Nixon's hunger proposal is more than just a program recommendation. It is evidence of a commitment by this new administration to meet the problems of our Nation head on, to grapple with them face to face, and to deal with them through direct, effective action.

Our President has provided the leadership—now it is up to us to give him the support he needs to carry his plans through to fruition and success. It is my sincere and deep hope that my colleagues here in Congress and the American people will join together behind the administration to provide that needed support freely and in a spirit of national cooperation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent to Congress his proposal for a comprehensive program to combat the problem of hunger that exists in this country. I join our President in being concerned over the widespread hunger and malnutrition that exists in so many families. In our land of plenty and scientific know-how, it is hard to believe hunger and malnutrition could stalk so many of our people. Mr. Nixon has outlined his ideas for coping with the difficult task of reaching these people. We must endeavor to find out whether the principal cause of inadequate diets is poverty or ignorance. We must do everything within our power to improve our Government food programs. Our advertising industry must develop educational advertising and packaging campaigns to publicize the importance of good food habits. Whether or not we agree on the number of hungry persons in our land there is no doubt we must improve our food programs for the needy. We have a number of programs already operating but Congress must make an effort to improve and implement these programs. Mr. Nixon's program offers a redirection of our efforts. The efforts of the Government alone is not sufficient. We must seek the involvement of the private sector of our land through mobilization of our agricultural industries and advertising media. Our effort should be bipartisan and should involve all citizens of this country interested in making realistic the hope that in our land of affluence no one is hungry. I commend our President for his leadership and foresight in trying to get to the root of this problem.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, our consciences stirred by revelations that hunger and malnutrition are realities in the United States, this House last year called for the creation of a National Commission on Hunger. This House action followed on the heels of intensive hearings by the Education and Labor Committee during which the testimony we heard was often conflicting and the documents presented were frequently not as objective as they should have been, hence, the recommendation for a comprehensive study to determine the scope and extent of the problem, and thus the remedy.

The glaring disclosure of the hearings was testimony by the then Secretary of Agriculture that, in spite of the fact that the Federal Government had been spending over \$950 million a year since 1964 on food programs, he said:

The reason there have not been programs in some places has not been the lack of funds where direct distribution is concerned. It has been a lack of machinery.

Although our proposal for a Hunger Commission did not come to fruition, a Select Committee on Nutrition and

Human Needs was created in the Senate and a national nutritional survey was embarked upon by the Public Health Service. More to the point, I believe our proposal for a Commission on Hunger laid the groundwork for the study President Nixon's Council on Urban Affairs instituted on coming into office in January and the resulting machinery the President has started moving to make our food programs work, to make the funds for these programs do the job intended.

The national nutrition program announced last week by the President means action, not empty promise. I support the President in his commitment, and I believe Congress will, also.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, our President has demonstrated again last week that his first 100 days in office have been utilized as the catalyst for a broad legislative and executive program which will extend throughout his years in the White House.

The President's proposal for a comprehensive program to combat the problem of hunger wherever it exists in this country reflects the extensive research and analysis which have gone into its formulation in the past 3 months. Although any program of this type will require months of additional work to resolve the details of efficient administration, it is most beneficial that the President has recognized the urgency of this problem by laying the groundwork so soon in his administration.

While we applaud the President's early response, we must, however, recognize the fact that action on this problem is long overdue. This country has for many years harkened to the cries of famine and starvation in other lands and has replied with massive food assistance from our own agricultural surpluses. But while we heeded the summons abroad, it appeared that we could not even hear the call of our own plight.

Many of my distinguished colleagues in both Houses of Congress have investigated this problem in detail. With their findings before us, we can justify no recourse but to take the opportunity which the President's proposals afford us and establish a viable means of eradicating the dire conditions which exist in some parts of our country. The time for examination has past. The time for action—immediate action—by the legislative branch as well as the executive branch of Government has come.

I wholeheartedly urge that we listen and hear the domestic cries where, in the past, we have not heard but have ignored.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, despite our incredible standard of living, which is the highest in the history of the world, it is a shameful fact that there are children in the United States who go to bed hungry, and that there are Americans who suffer from malnutrition.

The President has given us a goal—to put an end to hunger in America. He has recommended various legislative and executive steps to accomplish this most worthy endeavor, and we should lose no time on our end of things in helping him accomplish it.

It is estimated that it will cost \$2.5 billion a year. This is a mammoth sum, not to be bandied about lightly. But really, is there any better place it could go?

If there were suddenly discovered a tribe of starving people in South America, a boat would already be on the way. If malnutrition walked the land in Canada, our Federal dollars would flow to our northern neighbor. If the war in Vietnam were ended tomorrow morning, our relief trucks would be feeding the Vietnamese people tomorrow afternoon.

Can we do less for our own?

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, hunger? Malnutrition? Surely these are problems of underdeveloped countries. At least this was the assumption until recent years. To Americans, whose standard of living is a wonder for the rest of the world, it is not only distressing to learn that millions of their countrymen suffer from malnutrition—it is embarrassing.

Recognition of the situation is but the first step in conquering a problem, and I applaud President Nixon's proposals to end hunger and malnutrition in our land by offering a plan of action.

The President's proposals are many faceted—the result of a 3-month study by the Urban Affairs Council. This comprehensive program calls for involvement of the private sector of our economy together with internal reorganization of Government programs to make more effective use of our resources.

Certainly this great Nation which has come to the aid of starving people all over the world must now take the necessary action proposed by our President to make these United States a land of plenty for all Americans.

I am proud to support President Nixon's national nutrition program.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, hunger—that faceless, formless enemy—has plagued mankind since its beginnings.

But here—in America—it had been our proud boast that we had beaten this enemy at home and were fighting it elsewhere. We were the breadbasket, feeding the hungry of other lands from our rich stores.

Now we must face the unhappy fact that this enemy has not been beaten here at home. We have our own hungry, our malnourished, our rickets-ridden, our belly-swollen, leading less-than-productive lives or falling early victim to disease.

But now we have the opportunity to strike at the roots of this problem of hunger. President Nixon has proposed a program of action, not of words, toward conquering this scourge. I pledge my full support to the President's program.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, the time for action has come. Hunger and its related problems should no longer be permitted to exist in the midst of our unparalleled wealth. On May 6 the President sent to Congress his proposal for a comprehensive program to combat the problem of hunger in America. This great step forward has conveyed a feeling of action on Capitol Hill, a feeling that at long last an administration is willing to act and commit itself to end-

ing once and for all the disgrace of hunger in America. I urge that Congress act positively as President Nixon expressed in his May 6 proposal:

I ask this of a Congress that has already splendidly demonstrated its own disposition to act. It is a moment to act with vigor; it is a moment to be recalled with pride.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who praise the President's bold efforts to mount an all-out campaign against hunger and malnutrition. During the 90th Congress, I was among the original sponsors of legislation to seek an open-ended authorization for the food stamp program. Bipartisan efforts in the 90th Congress to create a Commission to learn more of this critical problem were not sanctioned by the previous administration. However, we were successful in focusing attention on the breadth and seriousness of hunger in our American society.

Now President Nixon has put the full weight of his office behind the effort to eradicate this menace. Executive support should now lead to the establishment of the Hunger Commission and a better program for the distribution of food stamps. The President has clearly demonstrated his concern by making the hunger campaign one of the initial elements of his administration. Never before has any administration clearly acknowledged the problem of hunger or sought actively to eliminate it.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that there can be no right more basic than the right to have enough to eat in a land that produces a surplus of food. I wish to commend the President for his initiative and for the direction of his policy to rid the Nation of hunger once and for all time.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in expressing support for President Nixon's goal of eliminating hunger and malnutrition in America.

Sometimes we Americans forget how truly fortunate we are. With only 6 percent of the world's population this country has set a standard of agricultural production without equal anywhere on the globe. Nevertheless, many Americans today find themselves incapable for one reason or another of providing adequate and nutritional food for themselves and their families. While the solution to this problem is not to be found in any instant program expected to eradicate overnight the blight of malnutrition and insufficient diet, it is clear that we must pursue an effective and well-thought-out course of action. In this regard, President Nixon's proposals merit serious consideration and I applaud his initiative.

I am particularly gratified that our President has included as a key portion of his program the necessity of private sector involvement. This program should be particularly well suited to a creative Government-industry partnership of the kind the President has advocated in other important areas of national concern. With the help of Congress, President Nixon can inaugurate this drive to end hunger in America with sound, reasoned solutions to the problem.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, hunger can-

not be tolerated in the most affluent society in the history of man.

President Nixon and Congress are about to establish a program which will put an end to hunger in America.

The President's message, which follows guidelines recommended by congressional leaders, includes these major changes in the food-stamp program:

First, allotments of stamps to furnish a minimum adequate diet for all families;

Second, free food stamps for families at the very bottom of the income scale;

Third, a limit on the cost of stamps to other families at 30 percent of income; and

Fourth, authority for the operation of food stamps along with distribution of surplus foods simultaneously in localities where this is requested by local officials.

These measures are a step in the right direction toward the goal of eliminating the consequences of poverty and deprivation.

We cannot stop here.

Certainly, the virtues taught in the Judeo-Christian ethic should help guide us. A hungry man cannot work effectively. A nation of hungry people cannot work effectively either.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the President's nutrition program is a multipronged attack on hunger and malnutrition in this country. I trust Congress will soon approve the legislation necessary to implement it completely and that the Executive will move quickly to implement those portions which need no new authority.

Having authored the amendment to the 1967 OEO amendment which established the emergency food and health service program, I am pleased that the President has found the service "invaluable" and is recommending expansion of it. The community action agencies have proven that they are in a better position to find people needing emergency food and health care than other governmental agencies. An expansion of this program should go a long way toward eliminating hunger from that segment of society which has suffered in silence.

I support the President's proposal to have direct distribution of food programs in the same county with stamp programs. While the Department of Agriculture contends that the usual drop off in the number of persons participating in a supplementary food program when a county converts from a direct distribution program to a food stamp program results because ineligible persons accepted the surplus foods in the direct distribution program, I doubt that this is the case. The administrative procedures in the food stamp program should be simplified so that they do not scare off persons who are stymied by bureaucratic mazes. Providing both programs concurrently in a county will give eligible persons a broader spectrum from which to obtain required food elements.

It is also encouraging that the President's nutrition proposals portend a revision of the total welfare system. If his welfare reform is as comprehensive as his nutrition program, it should meet

the needs of deserving citizens very adequately.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the President's national nutrition program is the basic first step toward the national goal of a poverty-free nation. Certainly this plateau will not be easy to reach and may never come within our grasp. However, the recognition of the widespread deprivation of food for many in our land, and the implementation of a comprehensive program to combat it, is a giant stride forward.

As the Representative from a district which includes areas of Appalachia, I can testify to the need that exists. It is a deep need, of much wider scope than many of us like to admit. But now at last, we are going after it on a scale that will produce results.

The result will not only be more persons with full stomachs. Our efforts on this front will show up in the classroom where the hungry child before did not have the strength or motivation to concentrate on educational materials. It will be demonstrated, I predict, by an eventual lessening in the number of young men rejected for military service for physical reasons. It will, most probably, be reflected in a diminishing number of children born with mental deficiency caused by nutritional imbalance in the diet of the mother. Those trained in medicine and nutrition could go on and on as to the physiological effects that we can expect, I am sure.

And we, Mr. Speaker, can be proud that we have the opportunity to serve in Congress which will be the first to make an all out attack on this most fundamental of all problems. When we visit our districts now and are confronted with conditions of hunger, we can tell our people that thanks to the initiative taken by our President, vigorous action is being taken so that hunger does not continue to be a problem in our rich and bountiful land.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues in regard to the President's program to end malnutrition of millions of Americans. I believe that for the first time, very practical, solid measures are recommended to implement and to carry out this vital program.

The President's plan would extend the present food stamp program to provide more poor families with enough food stamps to enable them to have a nutritionally complete diet. More importantly, a flexible program would be implemented in the remaining 440 counties which do not yet have either the direct distribution or the food stamp program.

In addition to making these recommendations, the President's plan has also emphasized that it takes more than just making these programs available, and has made the necessary administrative changes which will coordinate all Federal food programs so that more needy people will have greater access to these programs.

We as a Nation should be embarrassed that poverty still exists in many areas, and it is time that we set priorities and meet these priorities with positive action.

The additional funds that have been requested can be furnished by an evaluation of priorities and reasoned judgment to make these funds available.

Food alone will not solve the complex problem of poverty but I am sure no one will deny that this program is a step in the right direction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have from the outset questioned the effectiveness and operation of the food stamp program in meeting the nutritional needs of those Americans needing such help. The Nixon administration's early review of the problem of hunger and the alarming conclusions drawn indicate that my doubts were well founded. It was better than nothing, but was doing the least for those who needed help the most.

Therefore, I strongly welcome the President's new approach to the problem and the meaningful steps he has already taken. We in Congress should rapidly implement them with necessary financial support and needed changes in operational authorization.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse President Nixon's program to eliminate the specter of hunger, wherever it may exist in this country. American agriculture produces an abundance of food—enough not only to meet the nutritional needs of our own people, but also enough to share with our friends in other lands. Certainly at this time in this country there can be no justification for the continued existence of hunger. Obviously our past efforts to provide food for the needy have not been completely successful. Now, for the first time, a comprehensive program to meet the problem of hunger has been put forward by President Nixon.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with President Nixon's statement that the persistence of hunger and malnutrition in America is intolerable. A nation that has come to the aid of one starving nation after another cannot continue to accept this contradiction in its midst.

I applaud the initiative of the President in calling for a unified and determined program to weed out the pockets of malnutrition scattered across our land.

The President's proposal for establishment of food assistance programs by 1970 in the 440 counties without any food stamp distribution will greatly accelerate previous commitments to this program.

At the same time the emphasis on balanced diet in the new programs will end one of the most serious criticisms of the program to date.

Mr. Speaker, the President's plans for better coordination of the food distribution effort and for tapping the expertise of the private sector through a White House Conference on Food Distribution Problems are positive steps toward ending the blight of hunger in America. But the most hopeful sign, I feel, is the priority given this entire program in the administration's domestic program. I am encouraged by such leadership and applaud the President for it.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been disturbed by the reports of malnutrition and hunger in our own country which have come to public atten-

tion in the recent past. Americans are accustomed to hearing of these problems in other nations and acting vigorously to alleviate them. Certainly we must respond with the same compassion and energy to these conditions in our own country.

President Nixon has summoned the Nation to meet the needs of those Americans who are not receiving an adequate diet. Typically he has called upon the private sector as well as the Government to join in efforts to eliminate hunger; wisely, he has recognized that the problem is more than a matter of money and food, but also one of education, distribution, and cooperation.

The direct distribution program has the capacity to make large quantities of basic goods available economically and efficiently, and I am pleased that the President proposes to expand these efforts to areas where the need is evident. The special aid he proposes to prevent malnutrition among pregnant women and infants is highly commendable. Concentrated administration of the food programs in a single agency is also desirable to make the best use of our food resources.

Creation by the President early in his administration of an Urban Affairs Council to coordinate planning and direction of domestic programs was a sound decision, and I believe the food program devised to meet this basic national problem testifies to the valuable role being fulfilled by the Urban Affairs Council.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year I have worked diligently pursuant to my deep concern over the problem of hunger in America. In that time, through the work of my Committee on Appropriations, we have taken substantial steps toward alleviating the problem of hunger among our school-children in the District of Columbia.

Now there has come a step from the White House that all of us must applaud vigorously. I refer, of course, to President Nixon's statement on hunger in his message to Congress on May 6 of this year.

I vigorously concur with the President's request to add a billion dollars to our fight against hunger in America. Added to the \$1.5 billion already requested, this \$2.5 billion represents a wise, prudent, and very humane expenditure of our national resources. I am certain all of my colleagues will applaud the President for his message, and will support it vigorously when it comes before the Congress in legislative form.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty clear that President Nixon and this administration, with the cooperation and help of Congress, intends to wage a real fight against the hunger and malnutrition which exists in the most bountiful and, yes, compassionate, country in the world.

On May 6, the President announced his special message and the action that was to be taken. He spelled out a major five-point program which included family food assistance programs; special supplemental food program; administration of food programs; private sector involvement; and interagency efforts.

The President also said it well when he stated:

More is at stake here than the health and well-being of 16 million American citizens who will be aided by these programs and the current Child Food Assistance Programs. Something very like the honor of American democracy is at issue.

I applaud the President's vigorous program. It is of particular significance that this is one of the major domestic programs that he has presented in the early days of his administration.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, few, if any of us have ever experienced the gnawing pain of hunger that many Americans feel each and every day of their lives.

National attention has been focused on the plight of our poverty stricken and the severe effects of malnutrition, especially among the young.

The President has proposed actions to combat malnutrition in America, and in doing so has made a major commitment to meet the nutrition needs of every American. His proposals deserve our fullest and unqualified support.

When he took office, the President found that our food and nutrition programs were not doing the job. He did not seek to place the blame on anyone—he sought answers to why the programs were unworkable. He asked us for a new legislative approach to more effectively use this country's resources—both private and Government. The President proposes a great crusade to banish hunger from our land and deliver on commitments made decades ago.

In President Nixon's words:

The moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself. For all time. It is a moment to act with vigor.

I urge my colleagues to devote their immediate attention to respond in a manner similar to the President. Let us work together with the hope that America—the land of plenty—will no longer have many who have so little. In a land as bountiful as ours, we should not have anyone feeling the gnawing pangs of hunger.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in discussion of President Nixon's attack on hunger and the tragic results of hunger in our Nation. The program to combat hunger as outlined by President Nixon combines both wisdom and heart—the wisdom to promulgate a program that will cut at the root of hunger, the heart to know that such a program is long overdue in our country.

President Nixon well understands that one of the basic drawbacks to the food stamp program as it existed in the past, is that the very needy could not participate, as they had no money with which to purchase stamps. Yet, any county could elect either the stamp program, or the surplus commodity program. They could not elect both. President Nixon's proposal that food stamps be provided at no cost to those in the very lowest income brackets will adequately surmount this problem.

Mr. Speaker, although I only touch on this one aspect of the President's proposed program, the same combination of understanding, and sympathy runs throughout it. I believe such a solid na-

tional attack on hunger in the United States is long overdue. That this new approach is needed one realizes when it is indicated over 440 counties have no food assistance programs of any sort at the present time. I believe President Nixon's program will fill the need, and meet the crisis problem of malnutrition in the United States.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues today in endorsing the President's message to Congress on hunger in America. He has called for an expansion and improvement of Federal food assistance programs and for the development of comprehensive data on which future improvements can be based.

The President's nutrition program can play a key role in attacking the problems of the disadvantaged. I see our long-range goal as enabling the children of today to have the sense of responsibility and the capability to care for the children of tomorrow. We cannot expect to achieve a society which all have the opportunity to develop and flourish if we cannot achieve a society in which all have the opportunity to survive. If we want to see each child of today grow up to be a responsible, educated, contributing member of our society tomorrow, we have to take steps to provide his mind and body with the food they need to grow and develop normally and adequately.

The most advanced nation in the world, a nation which pays its farmers not to produce, certainly has the resources and the technology to do this. And I would like to applaud in particular the President's plans to give special attention to the needs of pregnant women and mothers of infants, to study the relation of malnutrition and mental retardation, and to educate families about good nutrition.

Last year I cosponsored legislation to establish a National Commission on Hunger. The Commission would have identified the problem of hunger and malnutrition in detail and recommended improvements in Federal programs to meet it. This legislation was passed by the House, but not by the Senate. I commend the President for assuming the leadership role in accomplishing these objectives.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, hunger in America is often virtually invisible. We rarely see the physical deformities that can result from sheer starvation; yet malnutrition can leave marks that are just as deadly. Even though the effects are not always clearly visible, it is an acknowledged fact that hunger and malnutrition have far-reaching consequences for their victims in our country. As the National Nutrition Survey pointed out, "hidden hunger" in America often irreversibly cripples the physical and mental development of its victims. The survey also reveals:

No one seems to be more vulnerable to this insidious . . . hidden hunger than the child under six years.

Tragically it is too late to help many Americans whose developments have already been irreparably damaged. The individual who has been anemic through-

out his school years, always lacking the energy to learn, has been harmed beyond the possibility of complete cure. But President Nixon's proposals offer an opportunity to revise the trend for millions of children who are potential victims of hidden hunger. The President's plans to improve the food stamp, direct distribution, and special package programs would set up immediate means to alleviate malnutrition. The establishment of a Food and Nutrition Service and the encouragement of private assistance would make it possible for programs to be extended, strengthened, and supplemented by long-range solutions.

I urge my colleagues to act immediately on the President's proposals so that we may help those children for whom there is still time. In the recent past, Congress has demonstrated a concern about malnutrition that went beyond partisan considerations. I am convinced that continuing this nonpartisanship will strengthen our efforts to combat the tragic hidden hunger in our Nation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my 1-minute speech today, the President's message on nutrition.

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

There was no objection.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

(Mr. LANDGREBE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, inserted in the RECORD of May 19 was a statement by the Honorable ABNER J. MIKVA of Chicago, Ill., who availed himself of this means for attacking my bill H.R. 11084, which was introduced with the intention of restoring some sanity to the matter of providing for a Federal park in North Porter County. Mr. MIKVA's surprise by my proposal is no greater than mine at his reckless statements of yesterday. For the record, I should like to make the following comments in response to Mr. MIKVA's statement, which I find to be loaded with misleading statements and glaring untruths.

H.R. 11084 does in fact specifically define the boundaries for a national park in Porter and La Porte Counties in Indiana. While Mr. MIKVA contends the boundaries of countless other national parks, national seashores, and national recreational areas have been defined by reference to a public map or drawing, I wish to point out that those areas that he refers to specifically such as Spruce Knob, Bighorn Canyon, et cetera, are all Federal parks established in undeveloped and, in many cases, completely unpopulated areas of our country. I beg to remind the gentleman from Illinois that there is no comparison to highly popu-

lated Porter County, where in 1966 the Honorable Paul Douglas, then senior Senator from Illinois, with the political power available to him by virtue of his seniority, and with the cooperation of a Democratic administration and Democratic controlled House and Senate, was able to impose upon the good people of Porter and La Porte Counties the seven-segmented, noncontiguous monstrosity called the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, defining its boundaries only by reference to a public map or drawing.

Yes, H.R. 11084 would reduce the overall land area in comparison to the Douglas bill, and it is my intention to do just that. H.R. 11084 exempts the heavily developed areas of Beverly Shores, Tremont, and Baileytown, which have hundreds of homes, small businesses, streets, roads, and so forth. Not only would confiscation of those homes and businesses result in substantial hardship to the present occupants, but would result in permanent loss of local tax revenue so badly needed to provide education, transportation, protection, and other services of vital importance in a fast-growing community.

Mr. MIKVA makes reference to the 8,721-acre area in the proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. But the fact is that the 2,100-acre Indiana Dunes State Park is always erroneously included in the total land area by the proponents of the original Douglas bill. This is completely misleading to the general public and extremely offensive to Hoosiers who still believe in States' rights and who are proud of the fine park that has been operated in the dunes area by the State of Indiana for many years. Indiana, to the best of my knowledge, has no intention of giving up the Dunes State Park under any circumstances.

The land area encompassed in my bill when added to the Indiana Dunes State Park will provide for a total of about 7 square miles of recreation and conservation areas and preserve those areas in north Porter County which still remain in their natural state. It is my sincere opinion that the Federal park as defined in my bill plus the Indiana Dunes State Park will provide adequate and reasonable recreational facilities as well as retention of areas of educational and conservation value.

Mr. MIKVA states further:

If it is true that the present boundaries of the park include private homes—which I do not know of my own knowledge * * *

Yet he has told me personally that he enjoys a summer home just east of the area encompassed by the Douglas bill. He, therefore, must be familiar with the many homes in the area that will be destroyed should the Douglas park remain in its present form.

The Chicago South Shore Railroad is not building a marshalling yard on land supposedly set aside for park purposes nor has anyone proposed a jetport in that specific area. Mr. MIKVA's statement, "I know that some people still think longingly of building a harbor facility on Dunes land," must be a figment of his imagination and further evidence of the "big lie" aimed at the destruction of

hundreds of homes and millions of dollars worth of private property under the guise of conservation and recreation. I personally do not minimize the importance of conservation or recreation. However, in America today, food, shelter, and gainful employment are still of primary importance and must be balanced against the 765 million acres of land already under the ownership and control of the Federal Government.

Also, Mr. MIKVA makes reference to the need for recreational facilities for the millions of persons within a 2-hour drive of the dunes. I wish to remind the gentleman from Illinois that within a 2-hour drive of his own congressional district in Chicago, there are 15 State parks located in Illinois, five in Michigan, 10 in Wisconsin, and four in Indiana, in addition to the many parks and forest preserves provided by the city of Chicago itself. If, however, the gentleman wishes to become involved even further in the Federal park issue, perhaps he could consider establishing a Federal park between 55th Street and Garfield Avenue in Chicago. Such a park would be even more convenient to the people that he is elected to serve than the Indiana Dunes Area. This idea is no more ridiculous than destroying hundreds of homes and consuming large developed areas in northern Indiana for a Federal park.

In conclusion, I find that the arguments put forth by the gentleman from the Second District of Illinois regarding my bill to be equally as invalid and misleading as those of his political mentor, the former Illinois Senator Paul Douglas.

If Congressman MIKVA would agree, I would respectfully suggest that hereafter he address his time and energies to the problems of the Second District of Illinois and I, in turn, will confine my interests to those of the Second District of Indiana, which it is my privilege and honor to represent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

NATIONAL NUTRITION PROGRAM

(Mr. BROWN of Michigan 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 Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the new national nutrition program honors an oft repeated American commitment. Mr. Nixon has put first things first for hunger is the most pernicious of the facts of poverty.

Severe protein deficiency in pregnancy and the early years of life can cause irreversible brain damage, condemning its victim to a lifetime of dependency.

Hunger in later years saps the will to learn and thus the ability to earn.

The medical toll of malnutrition in terms of lowered resistance and diseases is measured in lost pay, industrial accidents, and listlessness.

Clearly, the inroads of hunger impair, if not frustrate, other programs, both public and private, to help the poor help themselves, yet we have pathetically little precise knowledge of how and why.

The President has directed intensive

research to determine with scientific accuracy the relationship between malnutrition and human development. This action, long overdue, offers at least the hope that we may at last be on the road to discovery of one of the root causes of poverty.

TRADE RESTRICTIONS

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for new initiatives to spur East-West trade by reducing export restrictions on trade between the United States and the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the Export Control Act, which expires on June 30 unless extended by the Congress, was enacted in 1949 as a temporary measure as a necessary weapon in the evolving cold war. Western Europe, still economically weak from the ravages of the Second World War, appeared to the Congress then to be in realistic danger of attack from the monolithic Sino-Soviet bloc under the leadership of Stalin; and it was further believed, comparing our industrial might with both Eastern and Western Europe at that time, that goods withheld from the Soviets by means of controls on American commodities could not be elsewhere obtained.

Now, 20 years later, these underlying premises have drastically changed. From the standpoint of our national security and the conduct of foreign affairs, which of course remain paramount in our consideration of export controls, as well as from the vantage point of domestic economic considerations, the time has come for Congress to assess realistically the changes that have taken place and to reshape our export controls so that they are in accordance with and responsive to policies being pursued by the United States today.

Responding to the aggressive, monolithic Communist structure which confronted the free world in 1949-50, two separate administrative agencies were established to impose restrictions on free world trade with Eastern Europe. One was our own Office of Export Control and the other was the combined CoCom apparatus by which Western Europe, Japan and the United States sought cooperatively to withhold certain goods and commodities from the Communist bloc countries.

One of the controlling facts before us is that these two mechanisms, both designed to restrict trade with the Communist nations, have never been closely coordinated. In mid-1968, for example, there were some 1,300 export control commodity classifications unilaterally administered by the Office of Export Control of the Department of Commerce but not controlled by CoCom.

Of these 1,300 commodity classifications, each of which requires the issuance of a validated license for each shipment by an individual U.S. exporter, it is estimated that 1,100 represent goods

which cannot be unilaterally controlled by the United States because they are freely available from other sources, including CoCom nations. And of the remaining 200, many are not of a military or strategic character.

I think it can be accurately stated that the reason for the disparity in the administration of our Export Control Act and the multilateral CoCom arrangement is that the United States has taken a very different view of East-West trade than Japan and the countries of Western Europe have taken.

The United States has demonstrated an almost compulsive tendency to regard the denial of trade with Communist nations as a primary instrument or weapon of the cold war, whether trade be in strategic or nonstrategic goods. The countries of Western Europe and Japan, on the other hand, have sought through CoCom to prevent strategic exports to Communist bloc nations but they have regarded trade in nonstrategic goods and commodities to be not only in their commercial interest but also a means of reducing East-West tensions.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, this lack of alignment between the policies of the United States and our trading allies has hurt our country economically far more than it has the Communist nations, and instead of improving the political relationship between the United States and the Communist world, it has resulted in tensions between the United States and our CoCom partners while political relationships have been building between Western Europe plus Japan and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

If there is any question about this, we need only consider the fact that the trade of Eastern Europe with the non-Communist world in 1967 was almost \$14 billion, of which Western Europe and Japan accounted for almost \$9 billion. The United States is virtually a nonparticipant in this trade. While we account for about 16 percent of world exports, we have only about three-tenths of 1 percent of the exports to Eastern Europe. It is worth mentioning, too, that East-West trade has more than doubled during the past 10 years and has grown faster than trade either within the Eastern European bloc or among the Western countries themselves. Over the past decade, world trade has been growing at about 8 percent a year, while East-West trade has been growing at about 12 percent. But because of the frozen trade policy pursued by the United States, we have forfeited any advantage from this increased commerce, and in so doing have given other trading nations a most unique and enviable competitive position.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am introducing today is predicated upon the same essential findings as the Export Control Act of 1949; namely, that the availability of certain materials at home and abroad varies so that the quantity and makeup of U.S. exports and their distribution among importing countries may affect the welfare of the domestic economy and may have an important bearing upon fulfillment of the foreign policy of the United States; and that the unre-

stricted export of materials without regard to whether they have significant military applicability may adversely affect the national security of the United States.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear about the changes that are incorporated in my bill. Most important is the additional finding that expanded trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations can further the sound growth and stability of the U.S. economy as well as further its national security and foreign policy objectives. Let me emphasize that I am talking about trade in peaceful goods. The United States and CoCom nations would continue to maintain lists of products of direct military relevance which we all agree should not be sold or transferred to Eastern Europe. These include direct military items, items in the atomic energy field, and a list of non-military items which are considered to be closely related to the military capabilities of the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations of Eastern Europe. These items are embargoed and are not sold at all, or if sold, are sold only after full consultation with the members of CoCom. This would continue to be the situation.

Briefly stated, the basis for this new finding is no more than a return to the historic and traditional policy of the United States to engage in world commerce with nations with whom we are not at war. Our Nation has many obligations but none is more important than our responsibility to the cause of peace. This cause, as we know from our history, can be promoted by contacts—including trade—with nations with whom we have very real ideological differences. It is equally clear that inflexibility and refusal to communicate and explore contacts can only foster deeper antagonisms and bring us closer to war.

There logically follows from this a new, additional congressional declaration that it is the policy of the United States to encourage trade in peaceful goods and technology with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except those countries with which such trade has been determined by the President to be against the national interest. There has been an entirely unwarranted stigma attached to legitimate trade with Eastern Europe which has inhibited many firms from actively pursuing trade opportunities which would cumulatively serve our national security, foreign policy, and economic welfare. It is time to remove what may be even so much as a hint or trace of any such stigma.

American exporters should feel free to trade in peaceful goods with any nation other than those for which an embargo has been instituted. Such embargoes should be established only in an emergency for the most compelling reasons of national interest, and subject to review by the Congress which has the authority "to regulate commerce with foreign nations" under article I of the Constitution.

To effectuate the policies set forth, the President is authorized to prescribe rules

and regulations requiring that express permission and authority be sought and obtained to export articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, or any other information, from the United States, its territories and possessions, to any Communist nation if the President determines that such exported item is capable of a significant military application which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States. It is further provided that the export of a particular item shall not be denied unless there is substantial evidence that the particular exportation is likely to be used for military purposes.

The grant of this authority would enable the President to remove from the commodity control list administered by the Department of Commerce the hundreds of classifications which are unrelated to any significant military application which would prove detrimental to our national security. Denials of validated licenses would be based on evidence of an item's likely military use, not speculation or conjecture.

Finally, the bill establishes the requirement that the Government agencies and their officials responsible for implementing export controls more fully inform exporters about any considerations which may cause prospective license requests to be denied or to be the subject of lengthy examination, that these officials advise of any circumstances arising during the Government's consideration of an export license application which are cause for denial or for further examination, and that these officials inform the exporter of the reasons for a denial of an export license request.

This provision is meant to better enable U.S. exporters to coordinate their business activities with our export control policies and procedures. I have already mentioned the stigma attached to trading with Eastern Europe. It is not the only factor inhibiting an aggressive marketing campaign in that area by U.S. firms. Many businessmen believe, either correctly or incorrectly, that a sales trip through Eastern Europe might come to naught because their subsequent license applications would be denied or so delayed so as to make such sales efforts fruitless. The framework should be established to insure that there is no lack of information available here which might diminish the incentive to seek trade opportunities.

The businessman who does decide to pursue Eastern European opportunities and who obtains sales orders which lead him to request export licenses should be informed of circumstances making for delay or probable denial, so that he can better communicate with his prospective customer and make better choices in allocating his marketing resources. And in view of the fact that there are a variety of bases for denial, often arising out of the specific circumstances of the case, the exporter should not be deterred from further effort in this area because he does not know how general or special and specific is the ground for the denial.

In sum, within the framework of na-

tional security, the American exporter should be afforded, to the greatest extent possible, information which will minimize uncertainty about the Eastern European market.

Mr. Speaker, it has been many years since a positive step has been taken in our posture toward Eastern Europe. Extension of the Export Control Act with the proposed amendments offers a distinct opportunity to advance our foreign policy and strengthen our economy while we maintain national security.

THE HONORABLE JOHN M. COYNE

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn, Ohio, has had an outstanding civil servant as their mayor for the last 22 years. His name is John M. Coyne.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer recently printed an article about Mayor Coyne. The story of this unusual man is of interest to all concerned Americans because his example of fine civic leadership is one that should be emulated.

Mayor Coyne has guided Brooklyn in the right direction. His positive leadership in all areas is noteworthy. I believe that it is appropriate that I include this informative article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. It follows:

BROOKLYN MAYOR KEEPS IN PERPETUAL MOTION

Dear Everett Dirksen: If people who sniff at naming the marigold the national flower and rock'n'roll recording magnates ever cause you to decide to retire from the U.S. Senate, you might drop off in Brooklyn, O., on your way home to Illinois to pay respects to a man who says you're the only politician he would go 25 miles just to see. He thinks you are fantastic.

He also is a politician. The mayor of Brooklyn, in fact. The first time he ever voted, he voted for himself. He has not been without a public office for 30 years.

What makes his feelings for you a bit unusual is that he's a Democrat. In fact, he was a delegate to their last national convention.

John M. Coyne was in his office in Brooklyn City Hall, perpetual motion in one man's museum.

There on the wall were Bobby, Lyndon, G. Mennen Williams, Hubert, Walter Reuther and even Dick Nixon. All with John Coyne.

On the desk and bookcase and window sill were Buddhas, ceramic cowboy boots, a pair of fighting cocks made out of feathers. Gifts from small boys or distinguished foreign visitors. You never know when one might come back unexpectedly.

Never at rest among his dust catchers, Coyne is always either getting up or sitting down. He takes down the autographed picture of Bobby Baker from the corner where he keeps him just for kicks. He puts up his picture of Tony Celebrezze framed with a pre-depression oversized dollar bill. He dashes out to another office for a statistic or a scrapbook.

Fifteen years ago, Coyne was a 118-pound weakling with an ulcer. He quit smoking and became a full-time mayor, and his stomach settled down.

Coyne got into politics because something was wrong in the community, he decided. His parents' home burned to the ground because Brooklyn had inadequate fire equipment.

Years later, when Cleveland sought an income tax, Coyne was the only suburban mayor to support it. He remembered the times Cleveland fire equipment had helped Brooklyn.

Coyne was first elected mayor 22 years ago. Before that he was treasurer for two years and clerk-auditor for six years.

"I don't know about retiring," he said. "I look at some of my friends who have retired from public office and they're not happy. This job is like a personal electric train. It's a fascinating business."

Coyne sees his job as "taxes and services." "Keep the taxes down and the services up."

Because industry pays more than 75% of Brooklyn's tax dollar, services are good. The city is one of the few in the county that picks up all garbage and rubbish. The school district plans to build its own vocational school. Most other districts have had to combine for this service.

"We need good schools more than the school needs the city," Coyne said. "I really care about what happens to them." So he favors all the industry Brooklyn can get.

Coyne is known around the county for the tight rein he holds on his council and city employees.

"Nine times out of 10, the guy making a fuss in council wants to be mayor," he said. "We don't have that here. I don't think people like fighting in their city administration any more than they like domestic fights. At least that's not our tradition in Brooklyn."

Coyne is a member of the study commission that is looking at new ways to run the county government. He personally thinks the county government is in pretty good shape now except for a low budget.

He is intrigued with the idea of an elected executive who could be called a mayor. He thinks the mayor of Cuyahoga County might prove impressive to federal money holders.

A countywide airport commission or water commission is out, he thinks, because Cleveland would not give up control of anything that makes money.

JUSTICE WILLIAM DOUGLAS AND THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

(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, high in the hills overlooking the Pacific Ocean at Santa Barbara, Calif., is located the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

This controversial enterprise has among its more recent projects the promotion of U.S. recognition of Red China as well as a seat for her in the United Nations and rewriting the U.S. Constitution.

The center over the past 8 years has been the eager recipient of some \$177,000 advanced by the Albert Parvin Foundation whose manager is Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court. But then Justice Douglas is also identified as the chairman of the board of the center.

While Justice Douglas is salaried for his labors at the tax-free foundation, the reports indicate that he only receives fees and expenses from the center, which are recorded as \$500 per day plus expenses.

Other notable fellows connected with the center are Robert M. Hutchins, Stringfellow Barr, Linus Pauling, Bishop James A. Pike, John R. Feeley, Rexford

Guy Tugwell, and Harry Ashmore, the center's executive vice president.

Are we expected to believe that Justice Douglas' association and remuneration from these institutions carries no influence on his judicial opinions? As shocking as the very questionable financial arrangements are, how could any person, especially a judge, remain moderate and open-minded when saturated with such one-sided philosophy and narrow intellectual contacts?

What is good behavior in a Supreme Court Justice? This perversion of our judicial system cries for congressional action. We must reform our Federal judiciary so that Americans can regain confidence in "equal justice under law"—the motto inscribed over the building housing our Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker several articles on this subject follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 19, 1969]

MORE TROUBLE IN PARADISE

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.—The Union Oil Company continues to soil paradise. The natives hear reports that the wells still aren't repaired although the volume of refouling liquid has lessened. They report that when the wind blows from the wrong direction, the sticky stuff returns to smear their beaches again.

Even when the wind isn't bringing in more, they say so much oil has soaked into the sands that your feet are black after a short walk on the shore. A few days ago 150 seal pups, half the baby seal population, were found dead on San Miguel Island. Santa Barbara probably hates all politicians.

But not all that's slippery and slick around here is the black goo spoiling one of the world's most moving combinations of sea and mountain. There's another sticky situation. High up in the hills overlooking the ocean is the intellectual lamasery called the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

The Center's president is Robert M. Hutchins, its board chairman, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. It has many famous and highly regarded fellows, writers, philosophers, social and physical scientists: Stringfellow Barr, Linus Pauling, Bishop James Pike, John R. Feeley and Rexford Guy Tugwell, who is working on the 35th draft of his new constitution for the United States.

Every day when Dr. Hutchins rings a bell, these men and their guests meet to discuss the problems of mind and man. Their words are carefully taped, edited and printed in pamphlet or book form for us to read and be guided by.

Two hundred and forty-two of these tapes are available for \$7.50 each. One is called *The Ocean and Common Heritage*, which the Center might consider offering gratis to the Union Oil Co. or the Secretary of the Interior.

Justice Douglas is the manager of the Albert Parvin Foundation, which has given the Center \$177,000 over the past eight years. Harry Ashmore, the Center's executive vice president, is a director of the Parvin Foundation. Carol Agger Fortas, Abe's wife, is the Parvin Foundation's lawyer. Ashmore says that while Douglas received no compensation as the Center's Board Chairman, he gets fees and expenses for lectures and consultations, as is the case with members of Congress. The ordinary honorarium, as it's called in these circles, is \$500 a day plus expenses.

This information isn't new. It was developed by the Los Angeles Times, which has been digging into the Douglas-Parvin relationship for a long time. It hasn't received wide play in the East, perhaps because the liberal editors there are reluctant to bring

out such questions about men they admire and who are in many respects admirable.

Ashmore certainly is. He was the editor of the Arkansas Gazette during the bad days of Little Rock, the man whose newspaper fought the segregationists. After being the editor of the Encyclopedia Britannica, he came here and in the course of his work went to Hanoi, bringing back a version of the war which put him forehead to forehead against the Johnson Administration.

For all the good things that he and his circle of friends have done, what they are doing now at the lamasery may raise some eyebrows. If it were discovered that H. L. Hunt was paying Justice Byron R. White to run a foundation that had Sen. John Tower on the payroll, you can bet your sweet bippy there would be a big noise.

"Bill gets \$12,000 a year from the Parvin Foundation. It's a Caesar's wife case, somewhat different from Abe's," says Ashmore. "Bill keeps the whole foundation's business in his hat. Bill's the entire staff. He didn't want to take expense money. He took it that way so it could be reported as income. I can't imagine he could net more than \$5000 or \$6000 on it.

"Douglas is a slightly unconventional fellow by Supreme Court standards, but to blow this up like the Fortas matter is to compare apples and oranges. There has never been any secret about it, and you have to remember he has alimony to pay. He bats around the country lecturing in order to get along. I suppose any lawyer of equal status would probably be making \$250,000 a year in private practice."

Ashmore feels pretty much the same way about members of Congress even when they get their stipends from an organization whose board chairman is a Supreme Court Justice: "They work from morning to night. There's no lolling around the beach. In the case of Congress, this sort of thing goes back as far as I can remember. I've known a hell of a lot of them in the past 30 years. They've had to supplement their incomes by going on a sort of Chataqua circuit. This seems to me the most innocuous way of doing it."

Members of Congress are paid \$42,500 a year; Supreme Court justices get 60 grand. By the standards the fellow citizens must live by, these are gigantic salaries, and yet apparently they're not enough. They seem to feel they must scavenge the countryside for more dough while explaining to us self-sacrificing they are to endure the penalty that public life imposes on them.

Even leaving aside the question of undue influence, which might border on the unconstitutional in the case of the judge sitting on top of an organization hiring members of Congress, there is still the question of when do these guys get time to do their proper work? If the Parvin Foundation is a bonafide operation, how can Douglas handle it, and also be the head of the Center and still run around making speeches for money while reserving his best attention for judging?

But what gives with the Parvin Foundation? You call Albert Parvin's office in Los Angeles and you're given the run-around by a girl on the phone who says she is alone there and doesn't know where her boss is, and isn't going to know where her boss will be, and he's the only one who can talk about the Foundation. Ashmore, on the other hand, argues that, "It's all a private crusade of the Los Angeles Times. They've whacked time after time.

"Parvin's constantly being shaken down by the Internal Revenue Service. I've never seen anybody who's been gone over as often, but nobody's ever charged him with anything. The allegation was made by the IRS that Parvin was using the Foundation's funds to his own benefit, but that wasn't

proven. He's one of those wheeler-dealer types."

Maybe you have to be a wheeler-dealer to get rich. Another contributor to the Center's work is Bernard J. Cornfeld, who put up the money for a conference in Geneva, Switzerland, where people and their wives were flown over, all expenses paid, to discuss world peace. Cornfeld is an international stock market and mutual fund operator who, like Parvin, has had his troubles with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Ashmore contends that the Center is not the place to look for abuses of tax-exempt foundations, that the real scandals are elsewhere. He may have something there. Some miles south of the lamasery in Santa Monica you will find the J. Paul Getty Museum. Some \$10 million worth of classical art has been taken off the tax roll by the museum, whose board of directors consists of four members of the Getty family, Getty's lawyer and a Getty Oil Company employee. The collection is sequestered on Getty's baronial estate. There, behind walls and "no trespassing" signs, guarded by dogs, this public exhibition may be viewed between the hours of 2 and 4 p.m. on Wednesdays and Saturdays by appointment only. A maximum of 24 appointments are granted on each day.

This sort of thing backs up Ashmore. But it doesn't satisfy doubts about the way people in Government are behaving. There is now a great calling for real tax reform, including the use of foundations as tax shelters, but how are members of Congress going to act if they are beneficiaries of the system? What are they going to do about the clubby arrangements of you-sit-on-my-board-and-I'll-sit-on-yours? To ask the question is to answer it.

[From Human Events, May 24, 1969]

AS RESULT OF FORTAS REVELATIONS: WILL LOOK INTO DOUGLAS' AFFAIRS COME NEXT?

(By Alice Widener)

While the Justice Department and Congress are looking into Associate Justice Abe Fortas' allegedly questionable activities from the moral and ethical point of view, why don't they look into those of Justice William O. Douglas, specifically, his connection with and fund-raising for the tax-exempt Fund for the Republic and its Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif.?

The May 1969 issue of the *Center Magazine* lists Justice Douglas as chairman of the Fund for the Republic. As chairman and fund-raiser for the Fund, what subsidies or fees or travel expenses does Justice Douglas receive? Moreover, is Justice Douglas the Center's supreme voice? In matters involving issues before the Supreme Court, do the Center's "occasional papers" and "discussions" (all of which are printed and widely distributed) form the basis of Justice Douglas' decisions on the bench? Or does he formulate issues for the Center that involve eventual judicial decision and sort of shepherd them on up through a tortuous path to the High Court?

All this is of much greater import to the American people than it might seem. For example, important cases involving student subversion probably will be brought before the Supreme Court before we see the end of violence on campus.

In a May 1969 press release by the Center, Robert M. Hutchins, director of the Fund for the Republic, president of the Center, and close associate of Justice Douglas, declares that no matter how bad things get on campus the police should not be called in. "They cannot be trusted," declares Hutchins, "and an invitation to them to enter in the name of 'law and order' is evidence that the university has given up trying to become a center for independent thought and criti-

cism, for such a center can live only by discussion."

How much discussion can take place during a race riot and arson, such as occurred at City College in New York City recently? What does Hutchins mean by saying the police cannot be trusted? Trusted by whom for what? And how can Justice Douglas remain chairman of a Fund and "consultant" to a Center in company with a fellow executive who believes the police cannot be trusted to maintain law and order?

How much money does Justice Douglas receive as "consultant" to the Center? Is he paid on a per diem or annual basis? Does anyone know? What is the connection, if any, between his having been a director of the Parvin Fund in Las Vegas and his being chairman of the Fund for the Republic? Is there any interlock between the Las Vegas gambling enterprise and the Santa Barbara tax-exempt funds?

Recently, Americans were shocked by black militant James Forman's demand to churches for \$500 million "reparations" to blacks for their "exploitation." But we ain't seen nothin' yet. John R. Feeley—permanent "Fellow" of Chairman Douglas' Funded Center—proposes in a May 1969 press release issued by the Center that universities "issue a full and general confession, plus a self-imposed and large-scale penance, plus an irrevocable promise of radical reform, plus guarantees thereof" and declares the penance might be "a refund to all students of all expenses, say, for five years of their lives of the 15 or so given over so far to their miseducation."

Obviously, it isn't only Justice Fortas' finances and ethical conduct that ought to be investigated. Justice William O. Douglas' activities ought to be, too, because his extracurricular association with the Fund for the Republic and Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions appears to be much more serious and has far graver implications.

[From "Strike From Space" by Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward]

THE OFF-CENTER STUDY

An indispensable factor in creating the climate is to have a "foundation"—a rich, free-flowing gusher of tax-free money to finance books and publications, sponsor prestige meetings, and discreetly subsidize those in education, communications, religion, and even Government, who will spread the gravediggers' message. The perfect answer turned out to be the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. It soon began to play the same role in promoting U.S. unilateral disarmament that the notorious Institute of Pacific Relations played in the 1940s in persuading the U.S. State Department to assist the Communists to take over China.

The Center, a wealthy offshoot of the Ford Foundation with lineage through the malodorous Fund for the Republic, defines itself as an "intellectual community." The Honorary Chairman is Paul G. Hoffman, who has made a life career of losing other people's money: at Studebaker, as U.S. foreign aid czar, and now with the UN Special Fund. The Chairman of the Board is William O. Douglas, Supreme Court Justice who advocates recognition of Red China but non-recognition of God in our public life and public schools. The President is Robert M. Hutchins who, when asked by an official State legislative investigating committee how much he knew about Communism, replied under oath: "I am not instructed on the subject." In 1964 Hutchins wrote: "My candidate for President is Norman Thomas. I voted for him in 1932 and I'd like to do it again."

The Center's own list of Directors, Consultants, Staff Members, Participants in Publications, or Recipients of Grants, shows how far-reaching are the tentacles of this

foundation in education and communications. This list includes Professor Linus Pauling; Henry Luce of *Time, Life* and *Fortune*; Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary; George Gallup of the Gallup Poll and Elmo Roper of the Roper Poll; Harvey Wheeler and the late Eugene Burdick, co-authors of *Fail-Safe*; Eleanor Garst, co-founder of Women Strike for Peace; Barry Bingham, editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*; Cyrus Eaton, moneybags of the Pugwash Conferences; Erich Fromm, friend of SANE; Justice William J. Brennan, Jr. of the Supreme Court; Arthur Larson, chairman of the discredited National Council of Civil Responsibility, a hypocritical front which claimed to be impartial and available for tax-deductible gifts, although it was secretly subsidized by the Democratic National Committee; nuclear strategist Henry A. Kissinger; Hans Bethe, Pugwash and participant in another gravedigger conference called "Scientists on Survival"; Stanley Kramer, director of the movie *On the Beach*; Mike Wallace and the late Edward R. Murrow of television; James Reston of the *New York Times*; Adam Yarmolinsky, the man who had the strangest background and the most sensitive job in the Pentagon; Walter Reuther; and Hubert Humphrey. The President's Report in 1962 listed Robert S. McNamara as one of the 54 Founding Members who "contribute \$1,000 or more each year."

The senior gravedigger on the staff of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is Walter Mills, author of numerous books and pamphlets urging the dismantling of American military strength. In his pamphlet *Permanent Peace* published by the Center, Mills says:

"If the price of avoiding all-out thermonuclear war should prove to be acquiescence in the Communist domination of the world, or any other of the unpleasant imaginings against which we cling, futilely, to the war system to preserve us, it seems probable that the price will be paid." (emphasis added)

The Vice President of the Center is the same W. H. "Ping" Ferry who, at the Democratic Party's Western States Conference in Seattle on August 6, 1962 made an attack on FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover so outrageous that Attorney General Robert Kennedy immediately apologized to Mr. Hoover for the insult. On January 13, 1960, the *Santa Barbara News-Press* printed a long letter to the editor by Ferry urging the U.S. to junk all its weapons "of whatever kind," and "accept as a possibility" that "this country would be taken over by the Reds" as well as Western European countries. Though such a future is a "desperate and repellent vision," Ferry nevertheless finds it "thinkable" and urges unilateral disarmament upon us as "an alternative to our present policy."

Is the Center influential? Justice William O. Douglas boasted that more than 2,000,000 copies of its pamphlets and reports are now in circulation; and that "the faculty and students of hundreds of educational institutions—ranging from large universities to high schools—are using the publications as reference material and classroom texts."

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1969]

LAS VEGAS TIES ARE SEVERED BY DOUGLAS' FOUNDATION

(By Robert L. Jackson)

The Albert Parvin Foundation, the charitable organization of which Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas is the only paid officer, has severed virtually all its ties with Las Vegas gambling interests, it was learned yesterday.

Harvey Silbert, secretary of the Los Angeles based Foundation, said it sold its remaining 21,791 shares in the Parvin-Dohrmann Co. in early March. The firm owns three Las Vegas casinos.

Silbert said a mortgage on the Flamingo Hotel and gambling casino, from which the Foundation has derived income, also has been paid off within the last few months.

Douglas first came under criticism in Congress three years ago after the Los Angeles Times revealed he was being paid \$12,000 a year by the Foundation, which drew substantial income from the gambling industry.

This arrangement with the Parvin Foundation was recalled by newspapers and Congressmen during the recent controversy that forced another member of the high court—Abe Fortas—to resign last week.

Spokesmen for the Foundation had said all along that they knew of no appreciable change in the organization's assets. However, Silbert, in discussing the stock sales yesterday, said the Foundation's board—which includes Douglas as president—decided to dispose of its Parvin-Dohrmann stock "because we thought it was a good price at the time."

The Foundation sold its shares through a New York brokerage house for \$1,999,324, or more than four times the value assigned to the stock on its 1967 Internal Revenue Service return. The selling price was \$91.75 a share.

ANNIVERSARY OF CUBA'S INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANNA). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago today, on May 20, 1904, a great moment came to pass in the history of the Cuban people:

The flag of the sovereign Republic of Cuba was unfurled in Havana, marking the success of one of the longest, most costly in human terms, and tragic struggles for liberty in the Americas.

On that memorable day, Spain's colonial empire in the Western Hemisphere reached its end.

And the history of the free Cuban Republic began.

Like the records of much of mankind's progress through time, that history has been filled with different, at times contradictory, passions and emotions—joy and tragedy, hope and despair, exhilaration and disillusionment.

Yet at all times, the history of the Cuban people has been characterized by a certain air, a certain style: It has been, above all, the history of a people who passionately love life and freedom, who delight in a song, beauty and excitement; who work hard and achieve much; but who also know how to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

Unfortunately, their moment of freedom was short. History, which has a habit of repeating itself, came the full circle. Tyranny once again reestablished its sway over the beautiful island of Cuba and its people.

In Fidel Castro, the Cuban people came to experience the embodiment of all the dictators, demagogues, petty ideologists and other assorted tyrants who have had their moment on the Latin American political scene—and then, in the words of William Shakespeare, "were heard of no more."

Propped up and supported by his shadowy masters in the Kremlin, thinly disguised in the garb of a self-pro-

claimed "liberator," Castro has occupied the center of the stage in Cuba for nearly a decade—talking, haranguing, oppressing, squelching the people's initiative, stamping out freedom.

In many respects, therefore, this is a sad day—because Cuba's present condition is tragic.

But it is also a day to honor and celebrate—for the cause of freedom continues alive, dwelling in the heart of every true Cuban, be it in Havana, Miami, Fla., or in some distant part of the world.

We must recognize this fact as we commemorate the anniversary of Cuba's independence.

And because of that factor, the day will come when the political and spiritual heirs of such great Cuban patriots as Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, and Jose Marti will once again feel at home in Havana and in every hamlet and town across the length and the breadth of the island of Cuba.

Thousands of Cubans, in and out of Cuba, are longing and working for that day. Here in Washington today are Jose R. Julia, president of the Cuban Crusade for Relief and Rehabilitation and other representatives who join in this commemoration and pledge undying zeal for the restoration of liberty to Cuba.

To those of us who share their love of freedom and liberty, the course before us is clear:

We must continue to do all in our power to hasten the day when the legitimate aspirations of the Cuban people—for freedom, justice, and a better life—will be realized.

The United States of America has supported that goal. I am confident that under the new administration of President Richard Nixon we will continue to work with freedom-loving Cubans, and all the sons of liberty in our hemisphere, for the achievement of the goal of Cuban liberation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to read the following communication from Joseph R. Julia, president of the Cuban Crusade:

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1969—CRUSADE 1969-70 MESSAGE HONORING PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S MEMORY

His Excellency, President Richard M. Nixon and administration, Hon. Speaker John McCormack, Congressman Dante B. Fascell, and Members of the House and Senate.

May 20th Anniversary of the liberation of Cuba, gained through the payment of American and Cuban blood, spilt purchasing freedom and liberty to live as free men under God is the very symbol of American hemispheric brotherhood. For the first time in United States history, its citizens volunteered offering their lives to defend the birthright of every north or south American, it being, life, spiritual and material, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness unhampered by any colonial system of oppression.

Today, more than ever, Americans and Latin-Americans have an urgent call to heed, the distant cry of the Spanish-War American and Cuban dead to remember the first victory won by Hemispheric brethren fighting as one to win freedom for all. May 20th, Cuban-American or Latin-American Solidarity Day is the Anniversary of the very first day of Hemispheric Brotherhood.

We honor today, the late Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States, leader of the American Rough Riders, who aided their Cuban brothers win their liberty and who once stated, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick". This message should be remembered and heeded by all of our hemispheric peoples, especially Americans on this date. We should extend charity to all wherever possible, but *always* be prepared to defend yourself and way of life at all times against aggressors.

JOSEPH R. JULIA,
President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 20, 1969.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to the Cuban people freedom and independence came the hard way, and after suffering under the oppressive Spanish colonial government more than 400 years. Even after they had attained full freedom in 1902 by the withdrawal of the U.S. military authorities and the establishment of the Cuban Republic, the people of Cuba did not enjoy their freedom in peace, because political disturbances and the resulting rise of dictatorial regimes made a mockery of freedom.

This large island with an area of 44,000 square miles, rich in natural resources and fertile soil, was part of the overseas Spanish empire from its discovery by Columbus in 1492 until 1898. During that time the Cuban people worked hard and were exploited by their overlords. At times they rebelled against their rulers, but were not successful in their fight until they were aided by the intervention of the United States in 1898. When the short Spanish-American War ended by the Treaty of Paris in December 1898, Spain agreed to relinquish Cuba to the United States "in trust for its inhabitants." From January of 1899 until May 1902 Cuba was governed by U.S. military rule, though most of the offices were filled by Cubans. After this brief period of tutelage and training, on May 20, 1902, the U.S. authorities granted full and unconditional freedom to the Cubans. That day marked the Cuban Independence Day and became a memorable date in its history.

After that historic event Cubans became masters of their national destiny, and their government became a member of the community of free and sovereign states. They made good use of the riches of their island homeland and lived in prosperity. But they have not always lived in peace. Political disturbances have been frequent there, and often these have given rise to dictatorial regimes. And the freedom for which the Cuban people fought and which eventually they won, became a casualty under such regimes. That was true for certain periods before the last war, and has been true since the end of that war, especially since the establishment of Fidel Castro's Communist regime in 1959.

In today's Cuba Castro's dictatorial regime is the master of Cuba's destiny, but some 8,000,000 Cubans do not enjoy the freedom which is their inalienable right. Today they are almost as cruelly treated and exploited by Castro's tyrannical government as were their ancestors by the colonial rulers of Spain. They are prisoners in their island homes, and at present they are unable to better their political

lot. But on the observance of Cuban Independence Day, let us all hope that soon a way will be found to free these unfortunate Cubans from Fidel Castro's tyranny.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is sad and tragic that Cuban people in exile are forced to observe the 67th anniversary of Cuban Independence Day today removed from the native land they love and cherish. I am reminded of the verses:

Yo soy un hombre sincero
de donde crece la palma,
y antes de morirme quiero
echar mis versos del alma.

Cultivo una rosa blanca
en julio como en enero,
para el amigo sincero
que me da su mano franca.

Y para el cruel, que me arranca
el corazón con que vivo,
cardo ni ortiga cultivo;
cultivo la rosa blanca.

The Cuban patriot understands well the meaning and longing of these verses for its author, Jose Marti, was as revered in Cuba's struggle for independence as was George Washington in this country.

Marti, called the Apostle of Cuban Independence, still commands the widespread devotion of the Cuban people, who consider him the greatest hero of their independence movement.

The Cuban Revolution of 1895 began with the Grito of Baire—a town near Santiago in eastern Cuba—on February 24. Maceo from the Dominican Republic, and Marti and Gomez from the United States, set sail for Cuba with recruits gathered in the United States, Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean islands. Gomez and Marti landed on the Cuban coast on April 11, 1895, and began a march to Santiago to unite the revolutionists. On May 19, en route to Santiago, the group was attacked by a Spanish patrol, and Marti was killed in the skirmish. Of Marti's death, a Cuban historian wrote, "Jose Marti died, but a people was born." The loss of the beloved leader fused the people of Cuba into an adamant struggle for their freedom. The revolution had been his creation, and he remained the first among many martyrs and heroes of revolutionary Cuba.

It is regrettable that there is today the need for further struggle and a call for more heroes to challenge the Communist dictatorship that has been entrenched for a full 10 years just off our southern shores.

We, as Americans, must pledge and dedicate ourselves to the task of working with the Cuban patriots in exile to achieve the liberation of our island neighbor.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, 67 years ago today a new feeling of hope and encouragement spread through Cuba as that nation convened its first all-Cuban congress and proclaimed itself a republic.

Today that feeling of encouragement is gone, but for many there remains hope that they will overcome the yoke of Communist domination which suppresses their individualism.

As we rejoiced in their success 67 years ago, so we join in the sorrow today that

they are unable to express that freedom for which they fought so long.

But we must marvel at the strength and determination of the majority of the Cuban population who continue to strive to return liberty to their nation.

There have been many, who, fearing death because they disagree with the present government, have fled to the United States.

Twice a year in Birmingham, on Law Day and Thanksgiving, naturalization ceremonies are conducted in the United States District Court. In nearly all of these sessions, former Cuban citizens disavow their homelands to embrace U.S. citizenship. The story behind these changes is evident in their expressions as they verbally renounce allegiance to their native lands.

For, many fled their homeland—a country which they dearly loved but one in which they could no longer live because of the suppression of freedom. Each has a story to tell of his happiness in at last finding liberty, but each also carries the sadness of friends and family left behind to live in oppression.

There are many thousands more, however, who remain in Cuba to take what action they can to restore the hope their nation held in 1902 as the first republic's flag was raised.

The Cuban Government, under Fidel Castro, cannot deny that its citizens are unhappy. Last year incidences of sabotage against the Castro regime rose to 28,000 according to official Cuban Government reports. And so far this year, the rate is known to be even higher.

Cuba's population is increasing at a tremendous rate and is expected to reach 8.35 million by next year and 18 million by the year 2000.

Although it is a rapidly growing country, it faces many economic problems—difficulties which have led to the rationing of almost everything from shoes to gasoline and cigarettes.

But Premier Castro has been quoted as saying:

With technology and science it is possible to produce enough so that a large population can receive everything it needs.

He made no mention of the freedom of expression and political belief that his countrymen need and for which they have so long striven.

Their struggle has been a continuous one. In recent years it has taken tantamount strength on the part of non-Communist Cubans to merely survive. But, the spirit of independence which the nation revelled in in 1902 persists in the hearts of many and urges them forward today to recapture their now lost liberty.

It is fitting today that we pay tribute to the thousands of Cubans who fought several bloody wars to overthrow the domination of a foreign nation. The parallels to today's Cubans are evident, but this time they seek to eradicate domination by an internal power.

And so, although Cuba obtained its independence 67 years ago, its people are still fighting today to maintain that freedom. With their continuous courage it is my hope and belief that they will prevail.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleague from Florida, the Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, in commemorating Cuba's Independence Day.

Many of us, I am certain, greet this occasion with mixed emotions. While we rejoice with freedom-loving Cubans in honoring their country's long and successful struggle for liberty, we cannot ignore the tragic plight of their countrymen today.

What Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, and Jose Marti fought for, what another generation of Cubans was able to wrestle from Spain, is no longer being enjoyed by the people of Cuba.

They are neither free, nor well-to-do, nor content with their present condition.

As much as Castro may try to deceive the world and the Cuban people themselves with his endless diatribes about the Communist paradise which he is attempting to fashion for Cuba, the facts of life in that country stand out for all to see.

Under Castro's regime, most of the people who possessed the skills and talents necessary to develop a nation have been decimated and driven from Cuba.

The average Cuban worker lives today in a condition of enforced labor and persistent want—rarely able to secure even ordinary articles of clothing and footwear for his family.

And the entire "socialist" experiment—and I use that word in quotes—survives on two key factors: the reign of terror instituted by Castro to do away with all political opposition; and the massive outpouring of Soviet dole which props up the faltering economy and enables it to stagger along.

We should not mistake these facts. No matter how much Castro may try to flaunt his "independence," he remains a stooge of the Kremlin, critically dependent on the Soviet Union for his very survival.

Similarly, his ruthless elimination of all opposition makes a lie of his claim to be the vanguard of a democratic, socially-oriented revolution in Cuba and elsewhere in Latin America.

All of us, I am certain, are aware of these facts.

We decry them—and we extend our profound sympathy to the people of Cuba who have been isolated from their brothers and friends in this hemisphere, and forced to suffer their present condition, by Castro's shenanigans.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of liberty which sustained the Cuban people during the bitter decades of the 19th century while they struggled to shed the Spanish colonial yoke, will again sustain them in their hour of trial.

I am certain that all Cubans, wherever they may be for the present, cherish the dream of one day living again in a free and independent Cuba, ruled by a government responsive to the aspirations of the Cuban people.

I know that we, in the United States, will continue to do all we can to help them realize that dream.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Congressman FASCELL's special order on Cuban independence.

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

There was no objection.

THE GENERAL FUND FOR THE OPERATIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS STILL IN DEFICIT AND NOT IN SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MARSH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended on the revised budget, particularly for the reductions it reflects; however, it still must be understood by the Congress and by the country that the general fund for the operations of the Federal Government is still in deficit and not in surplus based on present estimates.

True, the deficit has been reduced below the deficit in the proposed Johnson budget for fiscal year 1970, but it is still in deficit.

President Johnson's budget anticipated a surplus of estimated gross receipts collected by the Federal Government from all sources including social security trust funds—which are not available for expenditure for general operating costs of government—over all Federal payments including checks to social security beneficiaries—to be the sum of \$3.4 billion.

Some time ago, I pointed out to the House the serious misunderstanding occurring because of the new budget concept which was first adopted for fiscal year 1969. This system of showing Federal accounts is misleading, unless all those who consider Federal surpluses clearly recognize what the new budget concept includes in Federal receipts, trust fund receipts, particularly social security collections. The Congress cannot spend for the operation of Government over \$45 billion of expected receipts because these are social security funds collected in trust from employers and employees for future beneficiaries of the social security system. The new budget concept as applied to fiscal year 1970 budget merely states that the total number of dollars paid to the Federal Government from all sources will exceed total Federal payments for all purposes—including social security checks—by over \$5 billion under President Nixon's budget, and \$3.4 billion in the Johnson budget.

The surplus which many are applauding but some are criticizing is a surplus in trust funds, not in general revenues. The trust fund surplus is about \$10.2 billion over amounts paid to the Treasury and amounts to be paid to trust beneficiaries. The hard cold fact is there is a deficit in general fund revenues which go to the operation of Government and come from the following principal

sources—personal income tax, corporate income taxes, excise taxes, and miscellaneous collections. This deficit in general funds in the proposed Johnson budget is \$6.8 billion. In the budget revised by President Nixon, it is approximately \$5.5 billion. It is quite likely that this deficit will be financed in whole or in part by borrowing from the trust fund receipts. The fact these trust fund loans must be repaid demonstrates clearly we do not have a surplus in the true sense of the word.

In this connection, I am particularly grateful to Mr. Paul Wilson, assistant clerk and staff director of the Committee on Appropriations, for his assistance to me in pulling out of the original and revised budgets the key figures necessary to an understanding of the revenue and expenditure projections.

I should emphasize, however, that the remarks I make at this time represent my own observations and conclusions and do not reflect, necessarily, those of any other member of the committee, or of any member of its professional staff.

In the Johnson January budget for fiscal year 1970, using the so-called unified budget concept, the outgoing President projected a budget surplus of \$3.4 billion. The word projected is the right word to use here because like all budgets, it rests on a number of assumptions, and these assumptions include certain legislation on both the revenue and expenditure side.

The \$3.4 billion projected surplus is a net figure; that is, it is a combination of a projected surplus of about \$10.3 billion in the trust funds of the Government, offset by a projected deficit of about \$6.8 billion in Federal funds.

Trust fund receipts are projected at \$58.693 billion; trust fund expenditures are projected at \$48.431 billion; producing a projected surplus in trust funds of \$10.262 billion.

As to Federal funds, expenditures are projected at \$154.722 billion; receipts are projected at \$147.874 billion, with a resulting projected deficit in Federal funds of \$6.848 billion.

Thus deducting the \$6.848 billion deficit in Federal funds from the \$10.262 projected surplus in trust funds produces the projected unified budget surplus of \$3.414 billion in the Johnson budget.

President Nixon's review of President Johnson's budget did two things. It first went through an exercise of "correcting" certain of the estimates in the Johnson budget which the Nixon administration said were underestimated. On the expenditure side, those corrections amounted to an addition of \$1.6 billion in round figures, and involved principally interest on the debt, farm price supports and several other items.

From the expenditure side of the Johnson budget as thus corrected, the Nixon administration review and revisions proposed expenditure reductions of \$4 billion. Thus, the net reduction from the Johnson January figures is \$2.4 billion—increase of \$1.6 billion offset by \$4 billion of proposed cutbacks.

A significant item of the \$4 billion proposed cutbacks by Nixon is \$1 billion relating to social security trust funds.

President Johnson had included in his spending total for trust funds, \$1.6 billion of additional expenditures relating to his legislative proposal to increase social security benefits effective early next calendar year. In the Nixon budget review, this \$1.6 billion was skimmed back to \$600 million—thus the cut of \$1 billion.

Since the net cutback in proposed spending by President Nixon as compared to President Johnson's original spending estimate is \$2.4 billion, and since \$1 billion of that relates to the social security item just mentioned, \$1.4 billion relates to various Federal programs.

Proceeding with the arithmetic, first as to the trust funds:

First. The \$1 billion cutback on social security, being a reduction in proposed expenditures, would increase the projected surplus of \$10.3 billion to \$11.3 billion.

Second. The remaining net cutback of \$1.4 billion mentioned above would operate to reduce the Johnson budget deficit in the Federal funds by that amount—that is, from \$6.9 billion down to \$5.5 billion.

Third. Thus, combining the \$11.3 billion surplus projection for trust funds with the \$5.5 billion projected deficit in Federal funds gives the net surplus of \$5.8 billion projected by President Nixon in his April 15 budget release.

An important footnote to this is that the \$5.8 billion projected Nixon surplus is an interim, incomplete figure for the reason that, while President Nixon updated the Johnson spending budget, he did not update the Johnson revenue budget.

If he had updated, or when he does update, the revenue side of the Johnson budget, at least two main factors would have a bearing on the \$5.8 billion projected Nixon surplus:

First. President Johnson had included in his revenue assumptions \$1.7 billion of increased social security taxes that would be collected in fiscal year 1970 under the proposed legislation to increase social security benefits. Well, President Nixon has proposed that that proposition be cut back on the spending side by \$1 billion, but he did not propose any corresponding cut back in the \$1.7 billion revenue figure. Not to do so seems unrealistic; the two more or less hang together.

Second. The most important consideration in estimating Federal revenues is the performance of the economy. Probably, if either President were making a forecast today rather than last December as to the revenue outlook based on the economic outlook, he certainly would produce a revenue estimate different from the one that is in the January budget, and I believe most economists probably would say that the revenue estimate would be higher than what is in the Johnson budget.

In any event, a reestimate of revenues would have some effect on this \$5.8 billion-surplus projection—you cannot realistically update one side of the budget without updating the other side.

Third. The principal legislative assumption involved in the Johnson budget

revenue estimates was the assumption that Congress would extend the 10-percent surtax for all of fiscal year 1970. President Nixon has subsequently recommended that it be extended at the 10-percent rate only for the first 6 months of fiscal 1970, and at a 5-percent rate for the last 6 months of fiscal 1970. This would mean some revenue loss, but it probably would be either wholly or substantially offset if Congress adopts President Nixon's recommendation for repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

There are some other big "if's" in the Johnson budget as revised by President Nixon which, if not met, will send the above deficit figures soaring. The first "if" is extension of the surtax. If it is not extended at the rate of 10 percent, then add \$9-plus million to the deficit. Another "if" is the postage hike. If it is not enacted, add nearly \$600 million. Another "if" is the user fee revenues. If these transportation user fees are not enacted, add about \$400 million.

If these budget conditions are not met, instead of having a deficit of nearly \$5.5 billion, it could exceed \$15 billion.

This unreal, or at least unavailable, surplus contained in the new budget concept harbors a risk for the country, the Congress, and the administration as we face up to the hard realities ahead in this first session of the 91st Congress. This is the risk of misunderstanding what we can or cannot do.

If the country believes the Federal accounts are in surplus, when for the operation of Government they are in deficit, where will be the support for additional revenue measures such as the surtax extension on which the current budget is predicated? If it is believed there is a surplus, can we expect less demands on the Federal purse, or adequately explain expenditure controls if the Congress enacts them?

If the Congress believes there is a surplus, will there be more or less legislative restraint in authorizing and funding programs?

The reduction made by the administration in the budget, including approximately \$1 billion in proposed improvements in social security benefits, are modest, and, outside of defense, total \$2.9 billion. Already, however, the attack is being mounted on these reductions. Why, some are asking, should such reductions be made, in the face of great domestic needs, to obtain a surplus of \$5 plus billion? Why not reduce the surplus and thereby not achieve it at the expense of domestic programs?

The irony is there is no surplus, there never has been, there never will be—at least not in fiscal year 1970.

WHAT IS BEING DONE WITH OUR MONEY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANNA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, during the decade of 1957 to 1966, America spent upward of \$520 billion on armaments

and space programs. Our entire society has been affected and partially militarized. Half our national budget now is spent on arms which increasingly are called into question in terms of actual performance. Repeated failures of military contractors to produce workable systems after years of time and billions spent is undermining faith of many Americans in our system. They question military performance, truth of their Government, viability and meaning of their institutions, and intrinsic worth of their own contributions.

We have been struck in recent months by a series of stunning revelations on useless weapons systems. Among these have been the TFX airplane, C-5A, Cheyenne helicopter, and main battle tank. Massive cost overruns have come to light which have run into billions. This is especially true of the TFX-F-111 and C-5A transport aircraft. No wonder Members of Congress are asking why we have allowed such expenditures and countenanced such failures. In a case involving the main battle tank, we are confronted with the Army's continuation of work on a project it knew was a failure in order to maintain a flow of appropriations. In the case of the Lockheed C5A, a high Pentagon civilian official acted in a highly questionable manner, in order to protect the stock market position of a major military contractor.

The list of faulty or canceled projects undertaken in the name of national defense is as sad as it is lengthy. Billions upon billions of dollars have been poured into one dead end endeavor after another. A list of their names is a catalog of frustration and national shame.

We tried to create a jet-powered seaplane, abandoning the attempt after it cost us in excess of \$400 million; \$1,100 million sailed down the drain marked "useless projects" before we canceled the atomic-powered bomber. Before the Snark missile was canceled, we spent \$677 million. We wasted \$679 million on the Navajo missile before heaving it onto the national junkpile. Of course, the B-70 is a classic. For a mere \$1 billion we received exactly one museum piece—perhaps the most expensive one in history. The Skybolt missile, masterpiece of inaccurate missilery, drained off \$440 million before it was aborted. An already obsolete Bomarc missile merited \$2 billion before its gravy train was derailed. Knowing the missile was unworkable for its basic purpose, the military still insisted on constructing more of them. Yet the little black box and how it grew provides us with perhaps the most damning evidence of the monster raging unchained across the Potomac from this Capitol. The little black box is otherwise known as Mark II, the avionics of the black box electronics of the F-111, including radar, navigating equipment, and computer. Mark I was not precise enough, so the Air Force gave the contract to produce a new, advanced model to Autonetics Division of North American Rockwell Corp. Just 2 months after receiving the contract, the contractor asked for relaxation of agreed-upon standards. In March 1967, the first batch of finished products was found to be

costing \$357 million, almost three times original projected cost.

What choices confronted the Air Force? Strict enforcement of contract regulations to set an example throughout the defense procurement and production establishment was one. Weak-kneed kowtowing to the contractor, making a mockery out of the agreement and giving every contractor carte blanche to violate contracts with impunity was the other.

The decision was in favor of allowing the company to triple its cost at expense of the Nation. The black box, in fact, makes Topsy seem like a century plant. In June of 1966, cost of an estimated 800 of these units was \$610 million. In November 1968, costs for the same number had escalated, to borrow a term, to \$2,510 million.

Yet how are we to know of these overnight gems of growth? The Air Force began bunching together all F-111 costs, including avionics, to hide the Mark II cost spiral. Another method discovered of doctoring cost estimates is the tidy maneuver of omitting cost of auxiliaries for any piece of hardware. We delved into this world of many wonders on the C-5A, of blessed memory.

Perhaps it is a mistake to operate under the assumption that a contract, legally binding and solemnly covenanted, is enforceable and binding. Perhaps it is correct for chief procurement officers of a military service to act as if they were vice presidents in charge of profits and protection of the contractor involved. Maybe it is honorable for senior military officers to hide cost figures in memos to their superiors on cost of a project.

These are but a few highlights of a situation which is already insufferable. In light of projected major new military projects which would stretch out over many years and involve even greater expenditures, Congress must prevent further repetition. It must create an agency or method of scrutiny to act as a critical, revealing, scanning agent.

Some would argue against such action, citing already existing safeguards on Capitol Hill and in the executive branch of Government. Such procedures and agencies are either ineffective, unable or unwilling by their very makeup to play a guardian or watchdog role.

The second line of defense for Government and taxpayer has become just as weak for purposes of scrutiny and criticism of military expenditures. It was my understanding that our Bureau of the Budget was supposed to act as a devil's advocate, scrutinizing and criticizing all budget requests to keep all agencies of Government fiscally responsible. Such has not been the case as far as military matters are concerned. It is increasingly obvious that while the Bureau of the Budget painstakingly requires projected civilian expenditures to be fully explained, it does not treat Department of Defense fund requests similarly. No eloquent denials, explanations, excuses or hedging explains away the fact that the Pentagon and major military contractors have all but placed the U.S. Treasury on wheels, treating it as a private preserve, all to the detriment of crying social needs. No hand has been

raised to stop this headlong rush over the fiscal precipice.

We know the Bureau of the Budget consults with the Pentagon closely on all money matters, in a cozy family-style manner more conducive to polite questioning and acquiescence than to constructive criticism. A limited number of staff members are assigned to review Pentagon fund requests. Further, the Bureau of the Budget is a Presidential agency, responding to the Executive's wishes, rather than those of Congress.

The broad outlines emerge clearly. Fund requests are brought with minimal critical questioning from the Pentagon to appropriate committees on Capitol Hill. After secretive meetings and agreements within these committees, bills for military spending emerge and go to the House floor under a closed rule. They are then slammed through the House with a maximum of swiftness and a minimum of critical probing. This is how the lion's share of our annual Federal budget is being allocated and spent. Is it any wonder why our military and major military contractors feel free to perpetrate such atrocities upon America as the TFX, main battle tank and the C-5A? Should there be surprise over difficulties which beset the M-16 rifle? Is this not an explanation of the fiscal horror of the Cheyenne helicopter? Do not worse pitfalls lie ahead in the form of the ABM, if we allow such permissive procedures to continue? There is no agency which critically examines or holds the Pentagon and contractors responsible for mistakes.

Congress, which is supposed to act as critic, financial watchdog and guardian of the public interest, has allowed the many closed committees of the House and Senate to spend vast sums as they see fit. Members of Congress may not question past rulings or daily determinations.

So instead of mass transit, we have the TFX. Instead of low-cost housing, we got the main battle tank. Rather than air and water pollution funds, we have been given the C-5A. The only trouble is that none of them work, or are worth even a portion of money poured into them by agencies I have referred to. Blame responses as much in Congress as in the Pentagon. Furthermore, the greater the abdication by Congress of its overseeing function, the faster temptation grows to take advantage of the power vacuum left by our non-performance.

Those who question are taken to task by innuendo, direct attack, or other methods of assault on grounds we are unpatriotic or indifferent to defense of the Nation. How macabre. If questioning these military abortions is unpatriotic, then show me patriotism. Does it consist of blind obedience to orders and patriotic catchwords? Criticism of established policy is the hallmark of a society which places premiums upon people and their rights rather than on slogans and hardware.

It devolves upon Congress to rectify the situation by placing a permanent, unforgiving eye upon any major expenditure such as those already touched upon.

Congress must find a tool with which to exercise its overseeing function. We have it close at hand in the form of our General Accounting Office.

The GAO is an independent agency under the Comptroller General of the United States. In short, he is the chief accountant of the Nation. This is our potential tool and probe which Congress may utilize to obtain proper objective investigation and scrutiny of executive branch expenditures, especially military ones. Therefore, Congress should and can provide GAO with a specific legislative command to provide regular, annual scrutiny of Government contracts of all executive agencies, and report publicly to Congress and the public any violations of contract agreements, particularly in the area of date of delivery and cost increase.

In this manner, Congress would restore its own and the public's rightful access to knowledge of fraud and misuse of funds by those who now consistently hide such information from public view. This is money we are charged with responsibility for, and this measure would allow us to fulfill that responsibility, reclaiming our prerogative to do so in the process. Once this information is in such a manner reported to Congress and the Nation, it will be a matter of open record for both Congress and the public to debate and correct.

This is a reform in guise of a congressional tool, a means for acquiring knowledge now denied us. Arguments about patriotism and national security simply would not wash. There must be an end to abuse of trust, misspending of money, and self-defeating secrecy.

I am, therefore, submitting this day a bill that would effectively curb this intolerable situation, placing us in a position to insure that there will be no more C-5A's; insuring that highly placed civilians in the Pentagon will never again dare to protect a company's position in the stock market at expense of the American people. It will insure that the Pentagon will not be able to disappear behind locked doors on Capitol Hill, hiding another national disgrace like the main battle tank. It will allow us to see what is being done with national resources, so that never again will a group of uncommunicative elected officials be able to stand and say that in the name of God, mother, Bunker Hill, and apple pie, the people have no right to know. Our people do have the right to know, and they will exercise that right.

My measure would amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to Congress by the Comptroller General concerning price increases in Government contracts and failures to meet Government contract completion dates.

The bill reads as follows, amending section 206 of part I of title II of the act (31 United States Code, section 60):

H.R. 11493

A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 206 of part 1 of title II of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (31 U.S.C. § 60) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" immediately following "Sec. 206.", and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Within 90 days following the close of each fiscal year the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on each contract of the United States in which the price was increased in such fiscal year to an amount in excess of 110 percent of the price estimated by the person contracting with the United States at the time the contract was signed or which was completed in such fiscal year at a date more than six months after the completion date estimated by the person contracting with the United States at the time the contract was signed. For purposes of his subsection, the term 'contract of the United States' means any contract executed by the United States (including contracts subject to chapter 137 or 139 of title 10 of the United States Code) for—

"(1) services, including research and development,

"(2) the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work of the United States, or

"(3) the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in which the price estimated by person contracting with the United States at the time the contract was signed was \$10,000 or more."

(b) The heading for such section 206 is amended by adding at the end thereof "; reports on Government contracts".

This, then, is the shape of the reform I introduce now. Let us remember that if we do not control this monster we have created, it will, in the end, destroy us.

SCANDAL AT SBA—VII

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the newspapers that Albert Fuentes, Special Assistant to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, is on leave of absence without pay, at his own request. I assume that the leave without pay is being taken not as a gesture of his concern for the public purse, but simply because he is not entitled to any other kind of leave, not having worked long enough to have earned any leave.

In any event, this man is still employed by SBA, and the Administrator has taken no action to suspend him, despite my repeated requests that he do so, and despite growing evidence that he, indeed, is not worthy of the high trust that was placed in him. Indeed, Chairman PATMAN informs me that the SBA has gone to great lengths to conceal the results of its investigation into this affair, having lost contact with the Administrator for a mysterious period when he was "out of town" and could not be reached, until his subalterns turned over what they claim is the sole copy of their investigation to the Department of Justice, where it remains safely out of reach of this House and its committees.

I would be interested in studying the investigation into this case. Although both the SBA and the FBI say that they have completed their studies, neither the

FBI nor SBA investigators ever contacted me to ask for the material and information in my possession. That being so, one can only wonder how zealously the investigators carried out their tasks. One wonders, too, how closely the Civil Service Commission investigated Mr. Fuentes, and what, if anything, they found.

Whatever has been found is now sealed in the safes of the Department of Justice, whence it may never emerge. Fuentes, conveniently, is in San Antonio conducting a campaign against those who have dared reveal their mistrust in him, and their fears that he has done wrong, and acted contrary to the public interest.

Fuentes has filed—or rather mailed in—several affidavits regarding his conduct. Even assuming these affidavits to be wholly true, and assuming that the case is what Fuentes himself says it is, he is still subject to serious questioning, and I believe that enough evidence exists out of his own mouth that he should be dismissed, forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I shall examine the case from Mr. Fuentes' side, and show the reasons for my concern and belief that he has violated the public trust, even conceding him every benefit of the doubt.

TRIBUTE TO A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in this moment from my regular congressional duties to pay tribute to a fellow Coloradan, who has gained a monumental reputation among the people of Colorado for his perceptive ability, willingness to serve, and his sound commonsense approach to his administrative responsibilities.

I have had great pleasure in serving with Mr. Hamil while a member of the Colorado General Assembly and have maintained throughout these years a most harmonious working relationship with him in whatever capacity he has accepted to dedicate his time, energy, and ability.

At this point, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

A HOMECOMING: WHAT LIES AHEAD FOR REA?

For many new Nixon appointees, the adjustment to life in the Washington Establishment has been decidedly painful. Not so for David A. Hamil, administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Hamil's return, in fact, was a homecoming of sorts. He had been REA administrator under the Eisenhower Administration between 1956 and 1961. The faces of many of his aides were familiar. When he sat down at his desk, it was with the smooth grace of an accomplished horseman (which he is) easing himself into the saddle of Old Paint, the faithful ranch horse he used to ride regularly but hasn't seen in years.

The new REA administrator arrived in Washington with mixed emotions. On the one hand, he was eager to get to work tackling new problems facing REA—for example, the growing accumulation of rural electric and rural telephone system loan applications—but on the other, he found Washington, the city, more problem-ridden than it had been during his earlier tenure ("you see whole

busloads of people and not one smiling") and the creaky Federal bureaucracy somewhat stifling to a Colorado rancher used to getting things done promptly in a congenial Big Sky Country "can-do" atmosphere.

A genial, friendly man with a Westerner's natural story-telling ability, David Hamil is an expert both at the legislative and public relations infighting, which has marked the relationship between the REA and private investor-owned electrical companies over the years, and the tough task of placating members of his constituency—the rural electric cooperatives—when the latter complain that the Federal Government is not doing enough to protect their interests.

Since its establishment in 1935 by Franklin D. Roosevelt as an emergency relief program to alleviate widespread unemployment and rejuvenate depressed rural areas, the REA has spent considerable amounts of its institutional energy fending off charges by the commercial power industry and other that it is a classic example of a bureaucratic agency which was set up for one specific purpose, but which continues to endure by developing new reasons for its existence long after its original goals have been met.

In recent years, commercial power companies and electrical cooperatives getting low-cost REA loans have been at each other's throats over the issue of territorial invasion of certain regions in the area of power generation and transmission, as opposed to power distribution. From the power companies' point of view, in short, the rap against the REA over the years is that the REA, using its advantage of Government subsidization, has steadily encroached on the prerogatives of the free enterprise power industry, to the latter's disadvantage.

A spokesman for the Edison Electric Institute, the national trade association of investor-owned electric light and power companies serving about 80 percent of the Nation's electric customers, summed up the EEI position this way during congressional testimony last year:

"Our position is that the distribution cooperatives should continue strong and healthy, and that they should be granted subsidies where needed," he said. "We believe firmly, however, that there is no need for authorizing monies to be loaned by the Rural Electrification Administration for generation and transmission purposes when the distribution cooperatives can obtain their power supply at reasonable rates from existing sources of supply."

And a Wisconsin power company official, testifying against "rural electric bank" bills, said: "The original concept of REA has been badly warped by decisions of its administrators in recent years. The original purpose, to distribute power into rural areas, would be officially scrapped . . . and the new concept of a totally integrated power system would be given the blessings of the Congress."

Representatives of rural electric cooperatives, however, see the matter quite differently.

One testified that the commercial power companies have been "high-handed and monopolistic," had launched a "shameful propaganda campaign" against his cooperative and were trying to "harass and spend" the cooperatives into "submission."

The battle continues, and the man in the middle these days is David Hamil, who must constantly remain aware of his obligations both to the forces of economy in the White House and on Capitol Hill and to the needs of his rural constituents.

"Just during the period between June 1956, when I left this job, and the present," Hamil said, "there's been a tremendous change in the electric utility business. It's bigger and more complex than ever. The increase in capacity of transmission lines has been dramatic . . . voltage has doubled . . .

it's the same ball game, but it's being played before a larger crowd in a bigger park."

"The way we see it is that both the REA and the commercial companies are needed to meet the demand. The REA cooperatives have developed into a part of the utility business that is on the scene to stay as long as the service is needed. Territorial integrity can't be handled only one way, and that has to be by legislation within the states."

When he got to Washington, Hamil said, he found a "flood" of rural electrical and telephone system loan applications on his desk.

The electric loan, backlog reached \$386 million in February, and continued to rise. By March, REA was holding 226 applications—all but 10 from its rural distribution systems—for a total of more than \$416 million in loans. And by the end of March, the figure totaled \$436 million.

Addressing cooperative members, Hamil said: "During the period ahead, we ask your continued cooperation in holding cash requisitions to as low a figure as possible and in increasing your cushion of credit."

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 requires that "no loan shall be approved unless the administrator certified in his judgment that it was reasonably well secured" (opponents in the past have attacked loan grants for specific projects on this ground alone). Congress later fixed the interest rate on REA loans at two percent per annum and the maximum repayment period at 35 years.

To many hard-headed businessmen, the two percent loan provision rates in the same class with the penny newspaper, the 35-cent steak dinner, the nickel cigar and the \$12,000 house. To them, it is offensive on principle in an era of high-interest loans and highly damaging to them as free enterprise competitors.

Among the problems facing Hamil is the present campaign by rural cooperative leaders to establish a nongovernmental financing agency that will provide an estimated \$4.25 billion over 15 years for expansion of co-op electric systems.

During the past 34 years, the co-ops, now numbering about 1,000, have gotten their financing almost entirely from Government loans. Congressional loan authority has averaged about \$350 million during each of the past few years. But as of March, the REA loans available were far less than the backlog of requests.

Last January, co-op leaders recommended creation of a private credit institution to be held by co-ops and to provide funds to members.

As is the case now, all loan applications would come through the Washington REA office, and REA would determine the best way of handling applications.

When the proposal was first made, Hamil said: "I will need a little time to study it . . . it will be necessary to check with important committees of Congress which provide funds for REA programs, and the Bureau of the Budget will also have something to say about the proposal."

Hamil said, however: "I'm in 100 percent agreement that there should be a means of bringing outside credit into the rural electrification program in addition to that provided by Congress."

Since his college days, Hamil has been a rancher engaged in the cattle-feeding business in Logan County, Colo., and he and a brother, Donald, also raise sugar beets, alfalfa and corn.

"I miss the ranch," he said, "and I don't mind a bit when REA business takes me out that way and I can spare a few hours to check on things at home."

He first became active in the rural electrification program in 1939 when he helped organize part of the Highline Electric Association of Holyoke, Colo.

"People today don't realize the thrill thousands of rural residents got back in those days when they first got electricity," he said. "Electricity and a phone meant the whole world to a farmer whose nearest neighbor was four or five miles away. It's hard to remember that a lot of today's suburban areas were quite rural 25 years ago."

Under House Agricultural Committee consideration this session was a bill (H.R. 7) to create a telephone bank which would make intermediate, four percent loans to rural telephone systems. The loans would be intended to serve rural telephone systems capable of paying a higher rate than the two percent required under the existing REA loan program, but not capable of paying higher rates in the private money market. As amended in committee, the bill would bar applicants from receiving two percent loans if their net worth amounted to 20 percent of assets.

REA Administrator Hamil said: "The Administration rejects the ridiculous claim we hear so often that the job of rural electrification is done. Nothing could be further from the truth."

"How can the job be done in rural America when the record shows that the input of power into our systems is doubling every seven to 10 years and that new consumers are coming on our lines at the rate of better than 150,000 a year?"

Unlike many other, Hamil sees the rural-to-urban population trend reversing itself in the not too distant future.

"There's just no other solution to the problems of city overcrowding," he said with a faraway Big Sky Colorado glint in his eye. "Rural areas will be where the opportunities are in years to come."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Chamber will soon be called upon to vote on the fiscal 1970 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. Before this matter is before us for a vote, I wish to raise an issue which reflects on the ability of the Department of Agriculture to expend those sums in accord with Federal law.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits the use of Federal funds in programs that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin. I am distressed to report that the Department of Agriculture is a flagrant violator of that law. As Attorney General John Mitchell recently wrote in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin:

Patterns of violations of Title VI and the Department of Agriculture's implementing regulations persist, . . . and despite the evidence of these widespread violations of law . . . I am not aware of any meaningful action which has been taken to correct this situation.

In 1965, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights released a shocking report entitled "Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs." Its review of the Cooperative Extension Service, Farmers Home Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and Agricultural Stabilization Service showed widespread discrimination in

employment and discriminatory program administration.

Unfortunately, the situation is little changed today. A staff report on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights hearings in Montgomery, Ala., last year includes the statement that—"the Extension Service and Farmers Home Administration have been important in increasing the incomes and economic well-being of farmers throughout the Nation." In Alabama and the Blackbelt they have been instrumental in assisting and financing the transition from cotton to other agricultural enterprises. Their services however, have not benefited the black poor of the 16-county hearing area. In short, the Commission found that "Testimony at the hearing in Montgomery showed conditions described in the 1965 report are substantially unchanged in 1968."

Among the Commission's findings are the following:

First. The Cooperative Extension Service renders assistance on a racially segregated basis with whites serving whites and Negroes serving Negroes.

Second. In 12 Alabama counties studied by the Commission last year, there were 46 white extension workers and only 26 Negro extension workers to serve a rural population of potential recipients of more than 72,000 blacks and 27,000 whites. Thus each Negro agent had a potential caseload almost five times as great as each white worker.

Third. Widespread discrimination in 4-H club programs persists. For example, white agents who work with 4-H club youths are assigned to white schools in Alabama while Negro agents are assigned to Negro schools. Local program administrators argue that instead of desegregating the 4-H clubs they are waiting for the schools to become desegregated. Some States have desegregated these clubs since 1965, however.

Fourth. There is a great disparity in the programs to which Negro and white 4-H club youths have access. For example, in Alabama, white youths tended to be enrolled in programs such as tractor use, raising of beef cattle, and so forth, while black youth were enrolled in such projects as field crops and poultry.

Fifth. The Farmers Home Administration gives Negroes in the same economic status as whites smaller loans. In a 16-county area of Alabama, whites in 1966 and 1967 constituted 24 percent of the borrowers but received 57 percent of the funds; blacks, who constituted 76 percent of the borrowers, received only 43 percent of the funds.

Sixth. Loans by FHA to Negroes are for different purposes than loans to whites; 64 percent of the money loaned to Negroes in the 16-county hearing area in 1966 and 1967 was for subsistence or marginal development. Most of the money loaned to whites was for rural housing and farm ownership loans which are rarely available to blacks.

In addition, findings of the 1965 study covering the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Committee in the South revealed widespread discrimina-

tion. The SCS provided less service to Negroes. No Negro had ever been appointed to a State ASCS committee in the South and Negroes were not employed in Federal or county ASCS positions in the South. While not specifically covered in the 1968 staff report, these conditions have improved only slightly.

The Civil Rights Commission has prepared yet another report which also documents the serious failures of the Department of Agriculture to provide equal opportunity. This report, the "Mechanism for Implementing and Enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964," was transmitted to the Department of Agriculture and the Attorney General in October 1968. It finds that the Department's title VI operation is severely understaffed and suffers from a lack of clear cut authority to command agency performance. It scores failure to collect the racial data which precludes meaningful evaluation of the effect of USDA programs on minority group recipients. It documents the lack of civil rights training for program staff charged with implementing the civil rights aspects of the programs. In addition, it makes a series of specific recommendations designed to correct some of the deficiencies in the administration of agriculture programs. Unfortunately, most of the recommendations of this report have not yet been implemented. Further, it is my understanding that additional funds requested by the previous administration for the civil rights enforcement program have now been stricken from the Department of Agriculture budget request.

Attorney General Mitchell, who has chief responsibility for coordinating the title VI enforcement efforts of the Federal agencies, in an April 16, 1969, letter to Secretary Hardin outlined some of the flagrant violations of law perpetuated at Agriculture and made a series of specific recommendations for substantial change in the USDA procedures.

The Attorney General's recommendations include the following:

First. Replacement of the present Office for Civil Rights in the USDA with a centralized Equal Opportunity Office, directly responsible to the Secretary, with authority like that of the Office for Civil Rights at HEW and the Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity at HUD. The new organization's proposed functions are spelled out in the Attorney General's letter and are sufficiently comprehensive so as to affect a major change in the Department's ability to achieve equal opportunity should the recommendation be implemented.

Second. Improved functioning of the Equal Opportunity Office. The recommendations specifically note the need to (a) clear up long-standing refusals to file adequate program assurances, including refusals of the State of Louisiana to submit an acceptable plan for desegregating its extension service; (b) increase the use of complaint investigations and compliance reviews made by the Office of Inspector General; and (c) provide a more uniform and comprehensive compliance review procedure for all program areas supervised by the Equal Opportunity Office.

Third. Assignment of full-time equal opportunity personnel to program areas and provision of training programs specifically related to types of assistance provided by the Department so as to increase delivery of services to eligible minority group beneficiaries.

Fourth. Establishment of a comprehensive racial data collection system to provide a factual basis for follow-up efforts aimed at improving minority group participation.

The Attorney General prefaced these recommendations to Secretary Hardin with the comment:

In my view it is imperative that your Department develop and implement an effective program to assure compliance with the requirements of law that federally assisted programs be conducted on a basis which provides for equal opportunity to all; and that it commit its time and adequate resources to accomplish that end.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the statement of the Attorney General. Because this matter is vital to the integrity of the entire Federal civil rights program and critically affects the lives of so many of our citizens, I have written to Secretary Hardin asking what steps he has taken or is planning to take to implement the recommendations of the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Commission.

Hunger and rural poverty need not exist in America today. The exclusion of millions of the Nation's rural Negroes from full and equal participation in the programs administered by the Department of Agriculture has severely crippled their ability to improve the basic conditions of their lives. If USDA programs are not to be administered as required by law so as to provide equal participation for all, the Congress should evaluate whether continued support for the programs is justified.

Mr. Speaker, in order to inform my colleagues more fully as to the seriousness of the issue at hand, I include my letter of May 19 to Secretary Hardin at this point in the Record. I also include the Attorney General's letter of April 16, as well as the two reports to which I have referred in my remarks. The first report is a staff report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on farm programs and was released in July, 1968. The second report, the mechanism for implementing and enforcing title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, has been withheld from the Congress and the public until recently. I urge all Members to study these documents which reveal the extent to which Federal law is being subverted by the USDA:

DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Several reports prepared by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights documenting the failures of your Department to enforce laws against discrimination in federal programs have recently come to my attention. In addition, I have reviewed Attorney General Mitchell's letter of April 16, 1969, to you commenting on the seriousness of the situation and recommending several

specific steps to improve civil rights enforcement in the programs of your Department.

I find the materials included in the Civil Rights Commission report of its hearings in Montgomery, Alabama last year and the report entitled *The Mechanism for Implementing and Enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964* extremely shocking. I am further concerned by reports that additional sums requested for the USDA Title VI implementation program by the previous Administration have now been stricken from the budget requests. In addition, I understand that several authorized positions on the USDA staff for civil rights program monitoring remain unfilled.

The above facts coupled with the Attorney General's conclusion in his April 16 letter that "Despite the evidence of widespread violations of law disclosed by your Department's investigations, I am not aware of any meaningful action which has been taken to correct the situation," raise serious questions as to the ability and willingness of the USDA to conduct its programs in compliance with federal law.

Therefore, I ask that you advise me at your earliest convenience—and in any event before the Agriculture Appropriations bill reaches the House floor—of the steps you have taken or are planning to take to implement the suggestions of the Attorney General and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Sincerely,

DON EDWARDS,
Chairman,
Task Force on Civil Rights.

APRIL 16, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HARDIN: By letter of October 8, 1968, the United States Commission on Civil Rights forwarded to your Department its report on a study of the Department of Agriculture's implementation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination in Federally assisted programs. In connection with our responsibilities under Executive Order 11247 (1965), assigned the Attorney General the function of coordinating the Title VI enforcement programs of all Federal agencies, we received and have reviewed the report of the Commission based on that study.

Before commenting upon the specific recommendations made by the Commission, however, I want to express our concern as to the adequacy and effectiveness of the past efforts of the Department of Agriculture to achieve equal opportunity in its programs.

The underlying objective of Title VI is to assure that all persons are given a fair and equal opportunity to participate in, and receive the benefits from Federally aided programs. Viewed in terms of the programs receiving assistance from the Department of Agriculture, this objective coincides with the priorities which we understand you have established for your Department that are directed at alleviating hunger and malnutrition among the rural poor and other deprived members of our society.

Title VI took effect on July 2, 1964. Since that time, as pointed out in your predecessor's letter of January 17, 1969, to Mr. Gluckstein, the Department of Agriculture had made some progress in eliminating discrimination in programs receiving financial assistance from the Department. Yet patterns of violations of Title VI and of the Department of Agriculture's implementing regulations persist. For example, audits of six state cooperative extension services conducted by the Office of the Inspector General of your Department revealed substantial and widespread noncompliance with civil rights

requirements in each of these states (see Report p. 37). An earlier publication of the Commission, *Cycle to Nowhere* (1968), states (p. 22) that in Alabama and elsewhere in the South the practice of assigning extension workers on the basis of race is widespread. Since there are proportionally fewer Negro extension agents, that practice means that Negro farmers do not receive a fair and adequate share of the services provided. Thus, even apart from being a flagrant violation of law, this practice denies Negroes the opportunity to improve their farming methods and economic status. The evidence available to this Department suggests that the conditions found by your investigations are widespread and continuing.

Despite the evidence of these widespread violations of law disclosed by your Department's investigations, I am not aware of any meaningful action which has been taken to correct the situation. The failure of state extension services to achieve their full potential with respect to serving members of minority groups could aggravate such problems as migration from rural to urban areas and the inability of families to provide adequate diets. Conversely, meaningful enforcement of Title VI in regard to the cooperative extension services and other programs of your Department could contribute to your effort to alleviate hunger and rural poverty.

In my view it is imperative that your Department develop and implement an effective program to assure compliance with the requirements of law that Federally assisted programs be conducted on a basis which provides for equal opportunity to all; and that it commit its time and adequate resources to accomplish that end.

The recommendations for substantial change which I set forth below reflect our concern over the lack of adequate progress to date.

1. ORGANIZATION OF TITLE VI ENFORCEMENT

Our experience with the Title VI compliance operations of other Federal agencies tends to support the view of the Civil Rights Commission that the present office for Civil Rights in the Department of Agriculture be replaced by a centralized Equal Opportunity Office, directly responsible to the Secretary, with authority like that of the Office for Civil Rights at HEW (see 32 Fed. Reg. 15190) and the Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity at HUD. The new organization would have responsibility for implementation and enforcement of Title VI, including the authority to initiate all compliance reviews and complaint investigations, and to secure compliance where the reviews indicate lack of compliance. It would also be given authority to conduct negotiations; make settlements; initiate compliance proceedings; refer cases to the Department of Justice for suit where necessary; and work with constituent program agencies at Agriculture in translating equal opportunity requirements into program delivery terms. The director of this Office would need direct and continuing contact with and support from the Secretary, as well as authority commensurate with these responsibilities vis a vis the program administrators. In addition to a substantial staff which should be assigned directly to the new Office, it may be desirable to assign one or more full-time equal opportunity personnel to each of the major Agriculture programs affected by Title VI (FES; C and MS; FHA; and ASCS).

We would also agree with the desirability of combining in this Office all equal opportunity responsibilities, including those derived from Departmental regulations, from Executive Order 11246 with respect to contract compliance, and those concerning the programs directly administered by your Department.

2. FUNCTIONING OF THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY OFFICE

The Commission's report highlights several specific areas where improvement in the effectiveness of the equal opportunity office's functioning might be sought. Of particular interest to us among these findings were those related to (a) clearing up long-standing situations of refusals to file adequate assurances, including the refusals of the State of Louisiana to submit an acceptable plan for its extension service (see page 16 of the Report); (b) increasing the use made by the equal opportunity office of complaint investigations and compliance reviews conducted by the Office of Inspection General, particularly their three-phased audit of the overall civil rights enforcement operation, and their special audit of the activities of six of the State Cooperation Extension Services (see pages 19 and 34-37); and (c) providing a more uniform and comprehensive compliance review procedure for all program areas, supervised by the equal opportunity office (see pages 26-33.)

3. PROGRAM IMPACT

The strengthening of the equal opportunity office would be the necessary first step towards improving the Title VI compliance capability of the Department of Agriculture. In addition, we think it important that your Department adopt methods for making certain that equal opportunity requirements are effectively translated into increased delivery of services to eligible minority group beneficiaries who presently may not be receiving their fair and intended share of Department of Agriculture assistance. Assigning full-time equal opportunity personnel so that continuing day to day liaison with program personnel can be maintained, and organizing a training program specifically designed to relate to the types of assistance provided by your Department, are two methods mentioned in the Commission's Report for moving towards this objective which we support.

4. RACIAL DATA COLLECTION

We agree with the Commission that there is a need for establishing a comprehensive racial data collection system that would provide a meaningful factual foundation upon which follow-up efforts aimed at improving minority group participation can be based. We believe this to be an essential part of any effort aimed at making the equal opportunity requirements of Title VI meaningful in program terms.

Although a Committee on Program Review and Evaluation has been created in your Department, I understand that this Committee has not considered its mandate broad enough to implement a uniform agency-wide policy for data collection and evaluation in terms of minority group participation. The providing of such authority, either as part of the function of a reconstructed equal opportunity office, or as a responsibility to be shared between that office and the regular program, planning and budgeting staff, would be one available method for initiating the data collection and evaluation function at your Department.

I hope that these comments, in conjunction with the more detailed findings and recommendations of the Commission's Report, will be of some assistance to you.

If you feel that it would be useful, the Attorney General's Special Assistant for Title VI would be available at your convenience to discuss the Commission's Report and our comments with your representative, and perhaps also a representative from the Civil Rights Commission.

I will be looking forward to your response.

Sincerely,

JOHN MITCHELL,
Attorney General.

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS: STAFF
REPORT
FARM PROGRAMS

The Cooperative Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration, together with the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) and the Soil Conservation Service, are the major technical and financial assistance agencies of the Department of Agriculture. This briefing paper deals with the Cooperative Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration. The Soil Conservation Service was not treated at the Montgomery hearing and the ASCS is the subject of a separate report by the Alabama State Advisory Committee to the Commission on Civil Rights, copies of which have been distributed.

The Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration have been important in increasing the incomes and economic well-being of farmers throughout the nation. In Alabama and the Blackbelt they have been instrumental in assisting and financing the transition from cotton to other agricultural enterprises. Their services, however, have not benefited the black poor of the 16 county hearing area.

The Commission on Civil Rights in 1965 studied the Extension Service and the Farmers Home Administration in its report, "Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs". The testimony at the hearing in Montgomery showed that the conditions described in the 1965 report are substantially unchanged in 1968.

Cooperative Extension Service

The Commission investigated the Alabama Cooperative Extension Service to determine whether black farmers are receiving its benefits and whether the Service is effective in improving the farming practices and home life of black farmers and rural residents.

The Cooperative Extension Service, a joint Federal-State program of the Department of Agriculture, supplies current information about improvements in farming and home-making practices to farmers and rural families, helping them identify their problems and assisting in devising solutions. At the Commission's hearing, testimony indicated that (1) the Alabama Cooperative Extension Service is not meeting the needs of black people—particularly those who are poor with only a few acres to farm; (2) the services it provides are racially segregated and unequal in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and (3) the Extension Service discriminates in employment against black people.

Failure of Program To Reach Low-Income People

The work of the Cooperative Extension Service is carried out by the State Extension Services of the land-grant colleges in each State through a system of more than 11,000 farm and home agents in almost every county of the United States. These agents, acting as joint representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges, work with local people on how to apply knowledge and information developed at the colleges to improve their farm, home, and community life. Linking the agents to the colleges are subject matter specialists who keep the agents informed on new agricultural advances and conduct demonstrations on how this knowledge should be applied.¹

¹ Extension work is financed from Federal, State, county and local sources. Primarily the funds are used to employ the county agents and specialists who conduct the educational programs of the Extension Service. In fiscal year 1967, the breakdown of funds for Alabama was as follows: Federal: \$2,585,740 (41.4%); State: \$2,579,270 (42.0%) and County: \$1,035,694 (16.6%). Hearings of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Committee on Appropriations "Department

In addition, the Extension Service organizes 4-H clubs and home economics clubs. The 4-H clubs, usually organized in public schools, enroll young people in projects which provide information and demonstrations on such subjects as farming and career exploration. The home economics clubs provide women with information and demonstrations on such subjects as food preparation, family budgeting and money management, health and sanitation.

The Extension Service programs, however, are not reaching many poor people. No special plan to reach low income people has been devised in Alabama. Dr. Fred R. Robertson, the State Extension Service Director, said that there are some demonstration programs but that they are inadequate because they are "vastly under-funded." The failure to reach low-income people particularly affects black people, who in the 16 county hearing area constitute 66 percent of the rural population and over 87 percent of the rural poor. Common responses to Commission investigators by black farmers and women were that they had never seen or had rarely seen Extension agents.

A reason for the Extension Service's failure to reach low income black farmers was suggested by Calvin Orsborn, black owner of a cotton gin in Selma and business manager of the predominantly black Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA). Mr. Orsborn told the Commission that the inability of many poor black farmers to follow recommended farming practices stems from their lack of resources to finance the necessary costs.

(We) can determine how many pounds or tons of fertilizer a man needs or what variety of seeds he needs and all this. And how much insecticide he needs on his crop. That is all well and good, to tell this man this. But now, if this man cannot follow recommended practices, if he doesn't have the finances and . . . the means to get finances to follow recommended practices, you are telling him (something that) does no good.

I think Extension realizes this, and if they are short staffed, then why bother with these little people who can't follow recommended practices anyway? . . . you're spinning your wheels really, so Extension has to concentrate on people who can follow recommended practices so their program will be successful. . . .

Mrs. Clara Walker, a farmer in Dallas County and an administrative assistant in SWAFCA, testified that many members "did not even know what a soil test was, they hadn't heard about it."

The Department of Agriculture has programs under the Farmers Home Administration which provide loan funds to farmers to follow recommended practices. But, as the hearing testimony on the Farmers Home Administration indicated, the loan programs of the Farmers Home Administration have little impact on the poorest black farmers. SWAFCA has attempted to remedy this by lending money to its members so that they can put into practice the recommendations of SWAFCA's field representatives and horticulturists.

Discriminatory and Unequal Service to Negro Farmers

Even when black farmers receive services, they generally are not equal to those received by white farmers. The inequality stems from the fact that (1) nearly all visits by white agents are to white farmers and nearly all visits by black agents are to black farmers, (2) black agents have a much heavier caseload than white agents, since there are many more white than black agents serving a population which is predominantly Negro,

of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1968," 90th Cong., 1st Sess., Pt. II, p. 431.

and (3) white agents have received better inservice training than Negro agents and have been able to specialize, while Negro agents remain generalists.

(a) *Racially segregated services.*—Historically the Extension Service in Southern States was segregated. Black agents were trained at segregated agricultural schools, occupied separate offices and worked only with black farmers, families and youth. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited racial discrimination in programs receiving Federal financial assistance, and the Department of Agriculture in implementing regulations specifically prohibited "discrimination in making available or in the manner of making available instructions, demonstrations, information, and publications offered by or through the Cooperative Extension Service." Nevertheless, the Commission in its 1965 report, "Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs" made the following finding:

Responsibility for work with Negro rural residents, in counties where Negro staff are employed, is assigned almost without exception to the Negro staff and the caseloads of Negro workers are so high as not to permit adequate service.

In 1968, the conditions disclosed at the hearing showed that there has been little change in blackbelt Alabama since the Commission made its finding three years earlier.²

Staff members in their investigation analyzed activities reports of agents in 12 Alabama Black Belt counties. These reports show services rendered to rural persons by race in two months (April and October) of 1967. It was found that 91 percent of the office and field visits made by white extension personnel were made to whites. At the same time, 97 percent of visits to black farmers, rural families and 4-H youths were made by black agents. Dr. Robertson, the State Extension Service Director, testified that the Extension Service is "supposed to work by the demonstration method, and through volunteer leadership." Service has "always been on a freedom of choice basis" and "this perhaps is due to custom and tradition and longevity that you would have a natural inclination by many Negro farmers and homemakers to request services from people of their own race." The Extension Service, however, was racially segregated as a dual system until 1965 and there is no evidence to suggest that any procedures for a meaningful choice have been instituted since that time. "Freedom of choice", moreover, cannot explain why black agents are assigned to work with 4-H youth only in black schools and white agents only in white schools. Dr. Robertson testified that

² In its 1965 Report "Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs" the Commission recommended that the President direct the Secretary of Agriculture to end discriminatory practices in the Department. In a report on "Progress of Cooperative Extension Service in Meeting Adverse Findings of the Report 'Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs'", the Department's statement on segregated service is as follows:

Subject matter assignments are made with increasing frequency on the basis of agents working in their areas of specialty without regard to race. However, with regard to 4-H and Home Economics activities, progress is particularly needed to ensure that no assignments are made on the basis of the race of the agent or the clientele. Since consolidation of white and Negro county offices, and the assignment of staff members on a program or subject matter basis, efforts have been made to increase the amount of time Negro agents spend in assisting white clientele, and the amount of time white agents spend in assisting Negroes. (Letter of May 23, 1968, from Secretary Freeman to Rev. Abernathy in response to requests made by the Poor People's March, Attachment D.)

instead of desegregating the 4-H clubs he was waiting for the schools—now, fourteen years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, virtually segregated, with roughly 1.7 percent out of the Negro children in the 16 county area attending all-Negro schools—to become integrated:

You have to make a choice as an administrator. What you can do to serve the most good—now, I had the choice to pull out all the 4-H clubs from the schools and go to a community basis and say, these are going to be open to 4-H Club meetings and no discrimination—or, in other words, just let the chips fall where they may.

And the other alternative was to remain in the schools, and as the schools become integrated, the clubs would become integrated. I chose the latter.

... Now the State of Mississippi did [the former], and I think they have perhaps a fourth as many 4-H Club members. So it is a value judgment as an administrator, which course to take.

(b) *Disparity between case loads of white and Negro agents.*—In the twelve counties studied, there were 46 white extension agents and only 26 Negro extension agents to serve a rural population of potential recipients of more than 72,000 Negroes and 27,000 whites. In view of the degree of segregation in services, each Negro agent had a potential workload almost five times that of each white agent. In Greene County, for example, there was a single Negro male agent for more than 2,400 Negro farm operators and young men of 4-H club age—potential recipients of extension services—while there were two white male agents for only approximately 400 white farm operators and young men of 4-H club age. In Hale County there was a single Negro female agent for nearly 3,100 Negro women and girls of home economics club and 4-H club age but there were two white female agents for only 1,100 white women and girls of home economics club and 4-H club age. Thus if a black person was served at all, it was by a Negro agent who was overworked; the white person was served by a white agent who had the time to spend on his problems.

(c) *Better inservice training and greater specialization.*—Black and white agents, most of whom have been graduated from segregated land grant colleges, may have been equally well trained at the time of graduation. Over the years, however, black agents have been left out of the information meetings, seminars and training institutes attended by their white peers, and their land-grant institutions have received less appropriations for agricultural research than white agricultural schools and therefore have been less able to serve them well. Furthermore, counties generally hired only one black agent and two or more white agents. The whites were able to concentrate on specialties, such as 4-H work, livestock and agricultural enterprises. The black agent, on the other hand, served a much larger population and had to be a generalist. As a result the black agents, knowing less than the white agents, have provided less satisfactory service to the farmers they serve.

The gap in training between white and Negro agents was confirmed by the State Extension Service Director. Asked whether there would be problems if Negro agents were told that in the future they should go out and serve white people and white agents were told to serve Negroes, Dr. Robertson said it would be difficult to select which agents should serve those of another race and that if a Negro were sent out "you might run into trouble on some of the technical information in relation to beef cattle or some of the other highly technical subjects."

(d) *Underenrollment of black youth in 4-H Club projects aimed at furthering social and economic opportunity.*—Among the aims of 4-H projects are giving young people knowledge of scientific agriculture and home eco-

nomics, exploring career opportunities and continuing needed education. These aims, however, are more fully realized for white youth than for black youth. For example, in Alabama white youth tended to be enrolled in such projects as tractor use, raising of beef cattle, personal development, career exploration and home management while black youth tended to be enrolled in such projects as field crops and poultry. This difference in project emphasis is explained in part by the fact that, following "custom," the Extension Services assigns black agents to service the Negro schools. The black agents usually do not specialize in the subject areas involved because historically Negroes have been limited to traditional agricultural activities and restricted in their opportunities.

3. Discrimination Against Negroes in Extension Service Employment

The testimony also disclosed that black people are excluded from significant positions in the Service. Although twelve of the counties in the hearing area were predominantly Negro, the State Director, Mr. Robertson, who appoints persons to the positions of County Extension Chairman and associate chairman, testified that no black people held these positions because no local governing board—all of which are controlled by white persons—had ever recommended a black person.³ He gave the following explanation:

"... as you know, we work on a cooperative basis, about 42 percent of our budget comes from Federal and about 58 [percent] from the State and county. And over the years we have, and we still think this is a basically sound idea, to stay with the power structure in order to keep the lines of communication and the rent coming in."⁴

Asked whether he would affirmatively suggest to a local governing board that it recommend a Negro county chairman, Dr. Robertson replied:

"I don't think this would be a good administrative move, frankly. I don't do it because he is a Negro but I have a lot of compassion and feeling for his effectiveness and his future.

"I think you have to recognize the fact to be a county chairman there is a great deal more than just being a representative of the county. You have to maintain contact with the technical field, with the land grant universities and with the business community. And the county people and so forth.

Negro extension workers in the Alabama State Extension office at Auburn are given titles different from whites although they do the same work. For example, in 4-H work the black agents are known as 4-H Club Specialists and their white counterparts are known as 4-H Club Leaders. In home economics work, two black workers are known as District Home Agents while their four white counterparts are known as Associate District Extension Chairmen. In work with farmers, the two black agents are known as District Farm Agents while their four white counterparts are known as District Extension Chairmen. Of the 112 employees, only eight—all transferred from Tuskegee Institute in order to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964—are black. Black extension workers, regardless of experience, are subordinated to white extension workers.

The Commission's hearing and investigation also disclosed that the Department of Agriculture has not dealt satisfactorily with the matter of eliminating segregated offices.

³ Of the approximately 1,385 county chairmen in the 16 Southern States, none are Negro.

⁴ The county contribution to Extension work in Alabama averages only about 16 percent of the total Alabama Extension Service budget.

In Montgomery, a Commission staff member observed that the black agent and his secretary occupy an office in the Post Office building isolated from the area where all of the white agents and their secretaries have their offices. Another incident was described in testimony at the hearing.

When the Sumter County Extension Office was directed to desegregate in 1965, the black employees were moved from another building into the same building as the white employees, but their offices were located in another section of the building. The Chairman of the Sumter County Extension Service, B. B. Williamson, Jr., testified that in 1967 he was ordered by the Department of Agriculture to desegregate his office. This was accomplished by moving the black secretary into what had been the storage room and moving the supplies into the office used by the two white secretaries. The white supervisor of the home demonstration agents shared her office with a white subordinate, while the subordinate black demonstration agent was placed in an office by herself. The two white farm agents also shared an office, while the black agent had an office to himself.

This practice of office segregation not only violates the prohibition of the 1964 Civil Rights Act against discrimination in federally assisted programs, but it facilitates choices by whites to seek service from whites and blacks from blacks. Sumter County had one of the highest rates of segregated service in any of the counties investigated by the Commission—95 percent of white agents' time and visits were with whites and 98 percent of black agents' time and visits were with blacks.

Farmers Home Administration

The Farmers Home Administration was established in 1938 to help small tenant farmers get out of debt, acquire family size farms, and build decent homes and communities. The financial and technical assistance provided by FHA over the years has been an important factor in maintaining the family farm as a significant part of American agriculture.

The Commission discovered, however, that in the 16-county Black Belt region of Alabama FHA programs have had only a negligible effect on black rural poverty and that white farmers and rural residents, who represent only 38 percent of the rural population in the 16 counties, receive by far the greater share of FHA resources. Testimony at the Commission's hearing also showed that the loan practices of FHA tend to perpetuate rather than alleviate the economic dependency of black farmers and rural residents by providing them primarily with marginal subsistence loans rather than growth and development loans.

The Commission learned that for Negro farmers agriculture is little changed from the 1930's. They continue to plant only a few acres of cotton and some feed corn. They plow and cultivate with mules and sow, fertilize and spread insecticides and weed poisons by hand. They mortgage their crops before the planting season to their landlords and to the furnishing merchants⁵ for rent, seed, fertilizer, poisons and rations or cash for subsistence, for which they are charged six to eight percent interest on the principal and outstanding indebtedness. At the end of the harvest they have nothing and often owe more than they have taken in. Approximately two-thirds of the black farmers in the 16 county area of rural Alabama investigated by the Commission farm less than fifty acres. Economic progress has been made in Southern agriculture, but today black farmers are not significant in the farm econ-

⁵ A "furnishing merchant" makes advances of goods to farmers in return for a mortgage on the farmer's crop.

omy of the Black Belt except as a source of economic exploitation by white landowners, furnishing merchants and others.

Unequal Participation in FHA Programs
 Contrary to the original intent of Congress in establishing the Farmers Home Administration, poor black farmers in Alabama have benefitted little from FHA programs.

Much of the capital required to finance the shift from row crops, such as cotton, to diversified farming has been provided by FHA at favorable interest rates. In addition, FHA County Supervisors have been active in encouraging many farmers to diversify and have provided the necessary technical assistance to make the transition a successful one. But this assistance has mainly benefitted white farmers.

Today only 32 percent of white-operated farms in Alabama are still classed as cotton farms; 78 percent of Negro-operated farms are so classified. Robert C. Bamberg, State FHA Director, explaining the role of FHA in financing the shift from cotton to diversified agriculture, stated that "I expect that we financed 75 percent of the dairymen in Alabama. . . ." Dairying was a \$50 million farm business in Alabama in 1967, but of the State's 1,400 commercial dairy farms only 65 were operated by Negro dairymen. The Farmers Home Administration has helped many farmers with only small acreage to enter the poultry business, which is Alabama's number one source of farm income for 1967. But of the State's 5,900 commercial poultry farms only 32 are operated by blacks. FHA has been the single most important source of financing for livestock operations of all sizes, but less than 4 percent of the black operated farms were considered livestock farms while nearly one-fifth of the white operated farms were livestock operations.

FHA Loan Programs

Generally individual farmers and rural residents obtain five types of loans from the Farmers Home Administration—operating loans, farm ownership loans, rural housing loans, emergency or disaster loans and economic opportunity loans. The loans are made on favorable terms at low interest rates. FHA closely supervises the loans by placing funds in supervised accounts, devising a farm-home plan with the borrower, and furnishing him with technical assistance from FHA experts in farm management, home construction, livestock management and other farming practices. This active supervision of high risk loans reduces the rate of failures and affords the borrower the benefit of FHA management experience.

The testimony of Charles Griffin, a black farmer who farmed all his life on the plantation of J. H. Hain in Dallas County and who was evicted two years ago, suggests what FHA could mean to poor black farmers. He and 11 other black tenant farmers, after great effort, secured economic opportunity loans from FHA which they used to purchase some acreage. He testified what his first year of farm ownership meant to him.

"When I was on the Hain place, I was just blind, didn't know nothing but work, make it and give it to him, but now if I make anything I know which way it went, I know what I made and know what it bought

⁶The Commission's 1965 Report "Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs" noted:

"A borrower is not left to decide for himself what kind of loan he will request and receive. The FHA staff plays a vital role in helping him decide the uses to which FHA funds will be put. . . . When a farmer comes in to apply for a loan, the FHA county supervisor often takes the initiative, and recommends the acquisition of additional land, enlarged allotments, off-farm employment, soil conservation assistance, and the use of extension specialists or other educational resources to improve the economic position of the farmer." at p. 72.

and everything. That's a lot better; just 25 or 30 years too late. I hope it ain't though. I hope I have some more years to live and get some enjoyment out of it."

Black farmers however, are not participating in proportion to their numbers in FHA loan programs. White farmers and rural residents received the majority of FHA loan funds in the 16 county area and a proportion of funds far greater than the proportion of the population which they represent. Whites in 1966 and 1967 constituted 24 percent of the borrowers but received 57 percent of the funds; blacks, who constituted 76 percent of the borrowers, received 43 percent of the funds.

In the 16 county area, during 1966 and 1967, applications for loans and loans to black farmers were concentrated in the operating and opportunity loan programs. Of a total of 1,875 FHA loans made to Negroes in this area, 1,565 were operating or economic opportunity loans. Operating loans consist of advances for the purchase of feed, seed, and fertilizers. Although these funds can be used to purchase machinery or livestock, very few of the operating loans made to Negroes were approved for these purposes. Economic opportunity loans are made to increase the income-producing capacity of rural residents.⁷

In dollar amounts, FHA loaned \$3,034,960 to Negroes in all FHA programs in 1966 and 1967; of this amount \$1,958,840 was in the operating and economic opportunity loan programs. This means that 64 percent of the money loaned to Negro farmers went for subsistence or marginal development purposes rather than for growth and capital improvements. Most of the money loaned to whites was concentrated in rural housing and farm ownership loans, and thus were for growth and development.

NUMBER AND TOTAL AMOUNT OF FHA LOANS, 16 ALABAMA BLACK BELT COUNTIES, FISCAL YEARS 1966 AND 1967

	White		Black	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Operating.....	306	\$1,208,220	1,226	\$1,493,700
Farmownership.....	71	950,832	53	359,380
Rural housing.....	184	1,730,300	155	664,590
Economic opportunity.....	26	43,840	339	465,140
Emergency.....	9	41,660	102	52,150
Total.....	616	3,974,852	1,875	3,034,960

The size of a loan, in part, is related to the ability of the borrower to repay the loan and those borrowers with larger operations, proportionately more of whom are white, are more likely to be able to repay larger loans. As State FHA Director Bamberg explained, "some people have more resources to borrow more money than others . . . it goes back to this, in many cases our nigger [sic] population has small acreage . . . Well, there is a tremendous difference [between] what we would loan to a man who has 170 acres and one who had 2 or 12."⁸

⁷Thus, the situation is substantially unchanged since the Commission, in its 1965 report "Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs", surveyed 13 Southern Counties (two of which were Wilcox and Greene Counties in Alabama) and found that 33 percent of the borrowers were white and received 66 percent of the funds.

⁸The maximum limit on economic opportunity loans is \$3,500 per borrower. The average economic opportunity loan to Negroes in the 16 county area was \$1,506 (the average economic opportunity loan to whites was \$1,712).

⁹Mr. Bamberg—the person responsible for administering Farmers Home Administration programs in Alabama—also operates a 4,000

The Commission heard testimony that to borrow money, a farmer needs security, a history of crop production and some means of repaying the loan. Many of the black farmers were unable to meet these conditions.

Calvin Orsborn, business manager of the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association, a predominantly black farmers cooperative, testified:

"A large segment of our people don't either have one of these basic requirements . . . most of these fellows have worked 30 or 40 years in a plantation type setup. All of the production that they made, everything that they did for 30 or 40 years, the credit did not go to him, the credit went to the plantation, which means when this fellow is put off of this place or when he decides to move he has no history. He can show no basic method of repaying this loan and he has no security nine times out of ten."

One result is that black farmers must seek credit from furnishing merchants who have done business with them for many years instead of going to banks or the Farmers Home Administration. L. R. Haigler, a white furnishing merchant who does business in Lowndes County, was asked why black farmers came to him rather than to banks for financing, despite the fact that his interest rates were higher. He answered:

"Well, just been doing business with us so long. I reckon that would be the answer. We have been in business down there—my father did this business and my grandfather did it. So I just imagine that's the reason . . . The banks don't—wouldn't go out on a limb like I would, naturally, because they don't know too much the history of these people like we do, see."

Rural Housing Loans

The Commission heard testimony that the need for housing for blacks in rural areas of Alabama is "grave." More than 90 percent of the rural housing occupied by blacks is substandard. Farm tenant evictions continue to create many homeless black people in the 16-county area.

In 1966, FHA made rural housing loans to 64 whites and 63 blacks in the 16 counties; blacks received less than half the money loaned to whites. In 1967, the Farmers Home Administration made 212 rural housing loans in the 16 counties. Whites received 120 of the loans which totaled \$1,141,140. Blacks received loans totaling \$440,460.

Reverend Daniel Harrell, who directs a self-help housing project in Wilcox County, testified that even if FHA loaned all its rural housing money to blacks it would not help those who need help the most:

"Now through Self-Help housing we can reach only a certain group of people. Because they have to have the ability to repay the loan. And a lot of people in Wilcox County are not making over \$500 a year . . . these people are left out."

Reverend William Branch of Greene County told the Commission how the black

acre farm in Perry County. He rents on a share basis to about 25 black farm families, advances them seed, fertilizer, cash for rations and charges six percent interest on balances through September 1 of each year. As State Director of the Farmers Home Administration he is responsible for administering loan programs that provide funds for purposes similar to those for which he lends money to his tenants and for which the Government charges five percent interest. Asked whether this practice was inconsistent with his responsibility for administering programs designed to lift tenant farmers out of the debt cycle Mr. Bamberg stated that he runs his office by the rules and his farm to make the most money for his family. He also volunteered to the Commission: "The 'human kingdom' is just like the 'animal kingdom'. The strong take it away from the weak, and the smart take it away from the strong."

community drew on its own meager resources to house evicted tenant families after they were turned down by FHA:

"Many of them went to the FHA there in the county to try to secure some help in building these houses. But, due to the small acreage or the small lots, and due to having no income whatsoever, they were not approved, their loan was not approved."

"And we have spent many, many nights calling people together who already have land. We couldn't buy land from the whites, and calling these people together who had land and we had to sit down and sometimes had to reflect on the Scripture saying, "When the Master came," we said, "When I was outdoors you took me in, when I was naked you gave me clothes." And we used that statement, and we have converted a lot of people who owned land to be willing to permit those people to either live on their land free of charge, until they can do better, or sell them a portion of that land."

Discrimination by FHA Committees

All loans made by the Farmers Home Administration are first approved by a local committee in each county composed of three persons representative of the rural population eligible for FHA assistance. Negro witnesses stated their belief that racially discriminatory attitudes on FHA County Committees may be a factor in refusing loans to black applicants.

Reverend Daniel Harrell, who has assisted a number of evicted tenant families in purchasing land on which to build, testified that:

"I think FHA is okay, but I am kind of questioning FHA's committee. I do know of a case down in Coy, where Mr. Le Croy (the county supervisor) and I sat down in his office. I took into him 14 applications, we discussed them and he knowing most of the people because he has been in the county for maybe 15 or 16 years, maybe more than that. He and I came to the conclusion that nine of these said persons would pass. However, out of the whole group after the committee meeting, out of the total group of 14 persons, only one passed. And so I kind of question the committee a little bit."

The Farmers Home Administration has directed that at least one black person be placed on each local committee. Although this directive has been followed, in no county in which black rural residents predominate has more than one black person been named to the local committee.

Supervised Credit

Testimony was heard that the supervised credit policy of FHA when applied to self-help cooperatives conflicts with efforts to establish initiative and self-reliance in the members. William Harrison, president of the largest black cooperative in Alabama, the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA), told the Commission that "the whole idea behind SWAFCA is to create some kind of economic basis by which people will be able to think for themselves." Supervised credit by FHA, according to Mr. Harrison, "would simply destroy the whole philosophy behind the co-op . . . that individuals will learn and do for themselves. As I view the restrictions, it simply means that FHA will have a co-op in Southwest Alabama, rather than a board of directors running the co-op . . ."

Mr. Calvin Orsborn, business manager of SWAFCA, stated:

"Under ordinary circumstance, I wouldn't hesitate one minute to take this loan. But SWAFCA, being as controversial as it is, being a whipping boy for politicians, having all of the difficulties that it does have, there is a possibility that this loan, would be carried to the letter."

The proposed loan restrictions included such requirements as FHA participation in all meetings of the board of directors, weekly and monthly reports on specific accounts, a ban on demonstration plot farming and loans by SWAFCA to members, all sales on a 30-day cash basis to members, and a number of others relating to reserve accounts and security. The State Director of FHA is authorized to require additional security or to release security as well as to make other important decisions within his discretion to determine "that such action will not be to the financial detriment of the FHA."¹⁰

Mr. Bamberg, State FHA Director, who is responsible for administering the FHA loan to SWAFCA, testified that supervised credit "is one of the successes of the Farmers Home Administration." He added:

"Of course you can see this, it takes less supervision with certain intelligent people than others. You have got that, it doesn't take as much with some people as it does with another one."

Mr. Bamberg did not think SWAFCA's chances for success were great. He said:

"The chairman here [Dr. Hannah] knows the ingredients that is necessary for a successful co-op, and if they haven't the ingredients, I see no reason. All I can say is that that we, that are employed in FHA are dedicated to try and make it a successful venture if and when the funds are funded."

Mr. Bamberg's position on the requirement of supervised credit and the total involvement of FHA in all management decisions of the board of directors is shared by FHA officials in the Department of Agriculture. Thus FHA, which is not reaching many poor black farmers with its programs, also is imposing restrictions which probably will inhibit aid to black farmers who seize the initiative and join together to help themselves.

RESOLUTION BY VIRGINIA JAYCEES

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Jaycees share the concern of many citizens, including the President, on the need to strengthen public support of the American position in Vietnam in order to achieve an honorable conclusion of that war. Evidence of this Jaycee concern is manifested in a recent resolution that was adopted by the Virginia Jaycees, which is set out below.

It is interesting to note that during World War II, the Jaycees similarly went on public record in support of extending the draft, which support, many feel, was crucial to the success of the extension effort.

I call to the attention of my colleagues this resolution of the Virginia Jaycees, and point out that the resolution follows with only slight modification the proclamation issued by the U.S. Jaycee president, Wendell E. Smith, who met with President Nixon on Monday to give him the Jaycee proclamation:

RESOLUTION

The following is a resolution the Virginia Jaycees adopted in support of President Nixon's recent peace proposal:

¹⁰ FHA Instruction 451.3, Sheet 1, Pt. III, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration (5-25-65).

"A proclamation in support of President Richard M. Nixon's peace proposal.

"Whereas, the Jaycees stand at full support of the efforts of President Nixon in his quest for an honorable and positive peace in the country of South Vietnam, and,

"Whereas, we support the more than one-half million Americans in South Vietnam and salute and pay tribute to those 35,000 men who gallantly and unselfishly sacrificed their lives in this quest for peace, and

"Whereas, we seek nothing for America but rather a climate for a self-determination of the proposals of South Vietnam, and

"Whereas we believe that now is the time to indicate to the other side that they should not plan on the resolve of the United States to crumble from within, be it, therefore, resolved that we, the United States Jaycees, seek the individual support of every organization, every American, to provide a positive unity behind the President of the United States of America in his efforts to effect a lasting world peace."

As evidence that this expression is national in spirit, although individual resolutions may differ in phraseology, Mr. Speaker, I include a press release dealing with the meeting with the President of United States Jaycees executives on yesterday, as follows:

U.S. JAYCEES FAVOR WORLD PEACE PROPOSAL

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 19.—President Richard M. Nixon learned today at a White House conference that the United States Jaycees firmly support his proposal for world peace through self-determination for all mankind. The Jaycees feel that only through a strong display of national unity can the goal be achieved.

During the meeting, U.S. Jaycees president Wendell E. Smith pledged the support of the 300,000-member Jaycee organization in spearheading a move to unite the American people. Smith was joined at the conference by Richard Headlee, a past national president of The U.S. Jaycees.

Jaycee Chapters throughout the country are working to have Memorial Day also observed as a Day of National Unity in support of the President's position on Vietnam as enunciated in his address to the nation on May 15. The program was organized and initiated by the Jaycees immediately following the speech.

"We would like the world to see and hear what support a vast majority of Americans, young and old, give to the principles laid down by President Nixon," Smith said.

"We firmly believe that a strong show of unified support for the administration's efforts toward world peace will definitely aid in future negotiations," stated the 35-year-old Jaycee leader.

"Toward this goal," added Smith, "Jaycee chapters in 6,400 communities across the country will conduct special Memorial Day observances in our effort to bring about a renaissance of positive public support toward our country's commitment to world peace."

Plans also include a national "Lights for Peace" project, whereby drivers will be encouraged to drive during the entire Memorial Day weekend with their headlights on to symbolize peace. All citizens will also be asked to light up the exterior lights of their homes for the full weekend of May 30-31.

Endorsement telegrams from local Jaycee chapters began arriving today at the White House. In the past three days, seventeen states have passed resolutions and are mobilizing unit drives.

The official Jaycee proclamation presented to President Nixon by Smith stated:

"Whereas, The United States Jaycees stand in complete support of the efforts of President Richard M. Nixon in the quest for honorable and positive peace in the country

of South Viet Nam as well as the rest of the world, and

"Whereas, we enthusiastically support the more than one-half million Americans in South Viet Nam and proudly salute and pay tribute to those 35,000 Americans who have gallantly and unselfishly sacrificed their lives in this quest for peace, and

"Whereas, we believe that the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese government should unquestionably understand the resolve of the people of the United States, not to crumble from within but to stand firmly and resolutely in support of our President in the quest for honorable peace and the right of self-determination in South Viet Nam;

"Therefore, be it resolved, that we, The United States Jaycees, encourage and solicit the support of every organization and every American in providing complete and positive unity in support of the President of the United States of America in his efforts to effect a lasting world peace and pledge to him our continued support for his endeavors in our behalf as Americans."

Some eighty-seven civic and service organizations have been contacted by the U.S. Jaycees and encouraged to adopt similar resolutions and forward them to the President.

Several times in the past, the Jaycees have endorsed national policies of the President of the United States. In 1940, the organization was the first group to give full endorsement to the peacetime draft. In 1965, the Jaycees adopted a resolution supporting the nation's Viet Nam involvement in defense of freedom throughout the free world.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the superintendent of education for the State of California, Dr. Max Rafferty, writes a syndicated column which appears in most newspapers in the country. In one of his recent articles, Dr. Rafferty drew attention to the real aims and purposes of the National Education Association, being complete federalization of the American education system.

In the official indoctrinating manual called *Profiles of Excellence: Recommended Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of a Local School System*, NEA advises that a school district is superior if its lunch program is educational as well as nutritious, but inferior if it refuses to provide payroll checkoffs for National Education Association dues; it is good if its teachers are all certified by the State, but is not so good if it uses merit pay to reward good teaching; and it is commendable if the system spends at least twice as much per pupil as it did 10 years ago, but not among the superior school systems if it does not take advantage of all Federal-aid programs.

As Dr. Rafferty has indicated, anyone familiar with the power and influence of the NEA is aware of the "futility of questioning such an establishment bible as this." However, it is a sad and ironic tragedy as well as an indictment against the NEA and its practices, that increasing numbers of our young people today, after 12 years of schooling for which they receive a high school diploma, are

unable to obtain a job because they do not know the fundamentals of mathematics, or how to read an instruction and understand its meaning, or even write a letter which is coherent.

I agree thoroughly with Dr. Rafferty in his statement that our school districts have a fetish for raising tax money and then spending it on the most glamorous, most attractive programs, but none of them having much to do with the basics of education.

I include, as a part of my remarks, the article by Dr. Rafferty:

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, Apr. 28, 1969]

GOOD SCHOOLS DEFINED

(By Dr. Max Rafferty)

You didn't know, I'll wager, that a school system is good (a) if its lunch program is educational as well as nutritious, (b) if its teachers are all certificated by the state and (c) if it spends at least twice as much per pupil as it did 10 years ago.

Contrariwise, I doubt your awareness that a school system is automatically no good (a) if it uses merit pay to reward good teaching, (b) if it refuses to provide payroll checkoffs for National Education Association dues and (c) if it doesn't take advantage of federal aid programs.

See? I told you you'd be surprised. You question my criteria? I'm sorry. You simply cannot do that. They aren't my criteria at all, you see; they're the National Education Association's criteria.

I was, in fact, citing examples from an official NEA manual called "Profiles of Excellence: Recommended Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of a Local School System." There are 124 of these criteria, and presumably any school district lucky enough or sufficiently diligent to meet all 124 would qualify forthwith for education's Hall of Fame, with its superintendent a cinch for either canonization or apotheosis.

If by any chance you happen to be an educator, you're aware of the futility of questioning such an establishment bible as this. It would be unthinkable.

However, to be purely hypothetical, here's what you might be saying if you did dare to disagree with the NEA's definition of what makes a school system good.

"A school district is superior not because it's big enough to provide all necessary educational services within its boundaries, as NEA avers, but because the educational services it does supply turn out graduates who are cultured, learned and good citizens.

"And despite 'Profiles of Excellence,' school system is not necessarily inferior just because it refuses to grab all the federal money in sight. It's inferior only if its pupils do not read and spell and calculate up to their own innate potentials."

I guess I'm a little bothered about a rating system for schools which refuses to concern itself with the only reason for a school's existence: the systematic imparting of organized and disciplined subject matter to its pupils in such a way as to insure their maximum mastery of the essentials of human knowledge.

This isn't so tough an outcome to measure, incidentally. In California, statewide annual tests in the "Three Rs" are required by law and have been conscientiously administered by every public school since 1962. We know precisely which are our best school systems, and we are even now conducting research to find out exactly how they get that way.

Certainly America's schools need more money. Equally certainly, money alone will not make children learned. Beautifully kept

school grounds are nice. Good teacher salary schedules should be the goal of every school system. Adequately staffed guidance and counseling services are highly desirable.

But confound it! A school can have all these advantages and at least 121 more, and it can still turn out graduates who can't tell the difference between Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson or between the Wars of the Roses and the Flowering of New England.

The trouble with so many school districts is their penchant for first raising tax money and then funneling it into umpteen glittering, seductive channels, all glamorous, all attractive, but none of them having much to do with education in depth.

Remember this: If your school system's philosophy includes such concepts as abolishing report cards, using the look-say Egyptian-hieroglyphic approach to reading, abandoning history and geography in favor of the mishmash known as "social studies," then it won't make much difference how much money it uses to water its educational wastelands.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROGRAM TO COMBAT THE PROBLEM OF HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MORTON), in expressing support for President Nixon's program to combat the problem of hunger in America.

The elimination of hunger in America must be given high priority. There is simply no justification for hunger in any nation, let alone one whose agricultural system produces more food than it can consume.

The President has given the necessary high priority to this problem by adding over \$1 billion to family food assistance programs, strengthening special supplemental food programs, and streamlining administration of these and related programs.

The existence of hunger in the United States is distressing. It is regrettable that it has taken so long to publicly acknowledge it. On the other hand, recognition of the problem is encouraging because it represents a first step from which we must, and we will, move forward.

There has been much publicity in the last few months about hunger in America. I remember watching the highly acclaimed CBS special on hunger not too long ago. What I saw was amazing. I doubt that anyone who saw that show will soon forget those vivid scenes.

The problem of hunger is, as President Nixon has said, an "exceedingly complex" one. To those who would falter because of its complexity, I would merely point out the implications of their inaction.

We are all aware of the rising tensions in every segment of our society. There is no easy answer to this unrest just as there is no easy answer to each of the factors responsible for it. This does not

mean that we should close our eyes and ignore it.

On the contrary, the need to work toward solving these problems is greater now than it has ever been in the past. Hunger is certainly one of the great problems facing us today. We have a moral obligation to eliminate it. We also have a social obligation to eliminate it because it is such an important factor contributing to domestic unrest.

For all these reasons, I am pleased with the President's forthright initiative. I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress in this fight against hunger in America.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

LOW INTEREST RATE ON SERIES E AND H BONDS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my concern with the low interest rate paid by the Government to the purchasers of series E and H bonds has been previously noted. I had been encouraged, however, by the Treasury Department's expressions of realization that the holders of savings bonds should receive a more realistic interest rate than the 4¼ percent that is presently paid. In the past several months Treasury has indicated that it is working on the matter and that it expected to request some legislative relief from the 4¼ percent interest ceiling, but it has not yet taken any decisive steps in that direction.

The large purchasers of Government obligations are earning as much as 6½ percent on their investments. Most savings bonds, however, are bought under regular payroll plans by our lower and middle income citizens. That they should receive a more equitable rate of interest is beyond argument. I realize that the savings bonds interest problems must be considered in the whole context of the Government's financial needs and the actions that are necessary to stem inflation. The plain fact is, however, that the purchasers of savings bonds are being hit twice, both by the low return on the bonds, and the eroding effect of inflation.

A very realistic appraisal of the situation was made in a recent editorial in the South Dade News Leader of Homestead, Fla. I commend its May 5, 1969, lead editorial to all Members and am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

INFLATION IS GNAWING AT U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Suppose the deal were put as follows: Deposit your money with us, let us use it for 10 years and at the end of that time we'll give you back something less, maybe a lot less, than 100 per cent of what you deposited.

Takers, obviously, would be hard to find and no financial organization interested in attracting loose money would think of offering such disadvantageous terms. Neither would the U.S. Treasury. But it is, in effect, the deal investors in U.S. savings bonds are receiving.

The government is not, of course, deliberately defrauding citizens. The villain is

inflation, currently chewing into the dollar's real value at a 4.7 per cent annual rate. It doesn't take an expert in economics to recognize that at this rate, savings bonds, at 4.25 per cent for series "E" and "H," are obviously losing ground in the inflationary spiral.

And to the Treasury's increasing concern, savers—millions of Americans currently holding some \$52 million in bonds—are becoming increasingly aware of the situation. For the first quarter of this year, more savings bonds were cashed in than sold—a net overflow of \$61 million in January, \$13 million in February and a record \$78 million in March. Should redemptions continue to exceed sales, the Treasury could find itself in a real payments pinch after June 30, when the annual budgetary doldrums set in.

One way out would be to raise the interest rate, set by Congress, to something like the return the small investor can expect from private institutions, currently around 5 per cent from savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. The administration is reported considering such a move.

But it would be only partial and temporary at best. Congress already has raised the interest rate five times since 1941, when the original "E" bonds returned 2.9 per cent. The latest boost, from 4.15 to 4.25 per cent, came as recently as last June.

Curbing inflation is the only satisfactory solution. Until the erosion of the dollar's real value is brought under control, the government will continue to offer a poor deal to millions of its citizens. Neither they nor the government can afford it.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS TO COMBAT HUNGER

(Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am joined in this statement by Representatives JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois; WILLIAM H. AYRES, of Ohio; MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota; J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., of Maryland; DONALD G. BROTZMAN, of Colorado; GARRY BROWN, of Michigan; JAMES T. BROYHILL, of North Carolina; JOHN BUCHANAN, of Alabama; LAURENCE J. BURTON, of Utah; DANIEL E. BUTTON, of New York; JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP, of Oklahoma; DON H. CLAUSEN, of California; BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr., of New York; SILVIO O. CONTE, of Massachusetts; WILLIAM O. COWGER, of Kentucky; WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida.

JOHN R. DELLENBACK, of Oregon; FLORENCE P. DWYER, of New Jersey; JOHN N. ERLBORN, of Illinois; MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan; PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois; HAMILTON FISH, Jr., of New York; GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan; JAMES R. GROVER, of New York; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; JAMES HARVEY, of Michigan; LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, of Maryland; CRAIG HOSMER, of California; THOMAS S. KLEPPE, of North Dakota; DAN KUYKENDALL, of Tennessee; ROBERT McCLORY, of Illinois; PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr., of California.

Also Representatives CATHERINE MAY, of Washington; ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois; JOSEPH M. McDADE, of Pennsylvania; MARTIN B. McKNEALLY, of New York; CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota; WILEY MAYNE, of Iowa; CLARENCE E. MILLER, of Ohio; WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, of Ohio; JERRY L. PETTIS, of California;

HOWARD W. POLLOCK, of Alaska; ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota; CHARLOTTE T. REID, of Illinois; JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona; HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York; PHILIP E. RUPPE, of Michigan; HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; FRED SCHWENGL, of Iowa; GARNER E. SHRIVER, of Kansas; J. WILLIAM STANTON, of Ohio; WILLIAM A. STEIGER, of Wisconsin; ROBERT TAFT, Jr., of Ohio; BURT L. TALCOTT, of California; GUY VANDER JAGT, of Michigan; WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, of Virginia; LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., of Connecticut; G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, of Virginia; LARRY WINN, Jr., of Kansas; WENDELL WYATT, of Oregon; JOHN W. WYDLER, of New York; LOUIS C. WYMAN, of New Hampshire; JOHN M. ZWACH, of Minnesota; FRANK HORTON, of New York.

The President's national nutrition program, submitted to the Congress on May 6, exemplifies the new approach to the Presidency. Born of the first 100 days, blending compassion and pragmatism, in the Nixon style, the new food programs mean action, not empty promise.

On taking office, the President found our food and nutrition programs were not doing the job. He sought not scapegoats, but answers. He offered not promise, but action to meet the needs of several million forgotten Americans.

He found stopgap programs for the thirties had become permanent institutions. So he directed that solutions for the seventies be devised.

He found legislative oversight and contradiction. So he asks a new approach to make more effective use of resources.

He found an administrative morass. So he directed internal reorganization.

He found funding inadequate to meet the promise. So he asks a greater commitment consistent with the new priorities.

He found the efforts of Government alone insufficient. So he seeks the involvement of the private sector through mobilization of the agriculture industries.

The President proposes a great crusade to banish hunger from our land and deliver on commitments made decades ago. The Congress should support him gratefully and with pride, for it is here in our Capitol that the groundwork for Mr. Nixon's new food proposals was laid.

In 1967, hunger was no longer a problem in America—at least officially. Free distribution of surplus commodities was being phased out. Replacing the program was the "food stamp system," designed to teach even the poorest the virtues of saving; for under this program, unlike commodity distribution, no food was free.

In 1967, the tragic conditions existing in some areas of this country were forcefully brought to the attention of the Congress by civil rights groups. So dire was the story that Senator STENNIS introduced legislation to provide medical and nutritional support for any citizen found to be suffering from hunger or severe malnutrition. While never enacted as such, this concept was implemented through the Office of Economic Opportunity under amendments to the act offered in the House by Representative QUIE.

Just a year ago, in rare bipartisan concord, Members of this House called for the creation of a Presidential commission to evaluate the problem of hunger and recommend remedial action. On May 8, 1968, in a statement issued jointly by Representatives AYRES, FOLEY, GOODELL, GREEN, MAY, MICHEL, MORTON, PERKINS, QUIE, SMITH OF IOWA, SULLIVAN, TEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA, and UDALL, we called for an emergency study as the basis for a report to be filed on January 1, 1969. We said:

We have formed this coalition of Congressmen to press impatiently and urgently on every front available to us to alleviate this problem immediately, and eliminate it quickly. . . . We pledge ourselves to do all in our power to eliminate these conditions without delay.

Hearings were held; increased authorizations were passed. Limited expansion of funding and administrative improvement literally were wrung from a reluctant executive branch. This progress was the result of an all too unusual display of congressional initiative.

Without Executive support, the Hunger Commission measure failed. Thereupon, a bipartisan bloc in the Senate pushed through the creation of a select committee which has ably carried forward a program designed to place the facts before America.

President Nixon has delivered the action we sought less than a year ago. In 100 days, the great resources of the Federal Government have been mobilized in a comprehensive action program to accomplish the objectives we sought.

Those who lead our Government today know hunger is but one face of poverty. They seek the elimination of the root causes of economic deprivation.

This commitment—and greater understanding of the nature of this complex and interrelated contradiction in our lives—makes realistic the hope that someday no one will be left behind in America's great surge of affluence.

Let none doubt that history will judge the President's actions a monument to his philosophy of the Presidential institution, and a milestone on the march to realization of the American dream.

PAY TV

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which is designed to protect American television viewers from the threat of a financial whirlpool—pay television—which could result in many American families running up bills of \$20, \$30, and \$40 a month to watch television.

Unless Congress acts quickly, there is a real danger that some of the television programs which we have enjoyed without charge will soon cost \$1, \$2, and \$3 each. Those of us who watch college and professional football games on weekend afternoons may have to pay for this entertainment.

Unless pay television is stopped, those television viewers who touch the edge of

the whirlpool by paying for a few television programs, may find themselves drawn into pay television completely, leaving free television showing vacuous soap opera reruns. This will put a heavy burden on low-income groups, especially the elderly who have limited incomes and who rely heavily on free television for their entertainment.

For this reason, I am introducing a bill which will prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from authorizing pay television stations. The Commission decided last December that it will begin granting licenses for pay television stations after June 12. That decision is being appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington. While the appellate court could rule against pay television, prompt action by Congress would be decisive.

I appeal to the Members of Congress to examine closely the threat of pay television. Just one example of one professional football game amply demonstrates the potential economic impact of pay television.

This year, NBC paid \$2.5 million to professional football to carry the Super Bowl Game which was seen on 20.4 million television sets. But NBC and the other networks would be easily outbid if the 20.4 million TV set owners paid \$1 each for the game, bringing in \$20.4 million for the pay television network.

With far greater revenue potential than the commercial networks, the pay television network could easily obtain the television contracts for the majority of college and professional sports and the better TV "specials."

The Commission, in its decision last December, did prohibit pay TV from showing any sports events which have been shown for the previous 2 years. However, it is possible under the Commission's decision for the professional football leagues, for example, to take a financial loss by refusing their games to be shown on television for 2 years. After the 2 years, the pro football leagues could sell their television rights to the highest bidder, which could easily be pay TV.

The 2-year loss then could be quickly recouped in succeeding years by selling the television rights at higher prices.

There is no question that pay television programs would be shown at prime-time viewing, making a deep impact at the same time that the commercial networks obtain their greatest advertising revenues. By showing their best fare at prime time, the pay television stations could gradually draw away the free-TV audiences, leaving the commercial networks with smaller and smaller audiences and less and less advertising dollars to pay for programs now seen free.

The Federal Communications Commission was obviously motivated by a deep concern for greater program diversification on television when it approved the pay television system. However, I believe that pay television will reduce diversification by cornering the best programs on a single station, while free TV deteriorates to programing insignificance. It is certainly hoped that the FCC selects another means to obtain program diversification.

Pay television is certainly one case where the end does not justify the means. If the means—pay television—is allowed to go unchecked, there is still no guarantee that television viewers would have greater diversification. There is only the distinct possibility that we will be paying for the same programs which we are now watching free of charge.

DR. WILLIAM P. TOLLEY HITS THE NAIL RIGHT ON THE HEAD WITH REFERENCE TO TURMOIL ON OUR CAMPUSES

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Dr. William P. Tolley, the distinguished chancellor of Syracuse University, spoke at the university's annual athletic awards dinner. In discussing the turmoil on our campuses, I believe Chancellor Tolley hit the nail right on the head. His remarks, which were both timely and perceptive, should be read by every student, college administrator, faculty member, and every legislator in the country.

They follow herewith:

REMARKS BY CHANCELLOR WILLIAM P. TOLLEY

At a recent meeting in Williamsburg the president of Sheffield University, Dr. H. N. Robson, reminded us that man is a member of the animal kingdom and of all the members of that kingdom he is the most aggressive. He went on to say that this human animal is, of course, most aggressive when it is young. "If you are troubled about student unrest," he said, "perhaps we should give more attention to the primary biological problem." He stopped at this point, but I think each one of us in thinking about it for a moment begins to see the problem in different terms.

Primitive man spent much of his time, as other animals do, in the search for food. He had to struggle to live. Nature showed him no mercy. Neither did his enemies. If he survived it was because he was aggressive.

As a member of the animal kingdom man has not changed. The aggressive impulses that are a part of his nature are as strong as ever and in many parts of the world as necessary as ever. Here in America, however, and in a considerable part of the civilized world children no longer have to forage for food. They don't have to hunt or fish in order to eat. They don't even have to work on a farm.

What does civilization do to this aggressive animal? It keeps him confined in a school. It puts such pressure on the importance of schooling that he is branded a failure if he doesn't continue until he gets a college degree.

What happens to his aggressive impulses? Remember they are as powerful as ever and are going to be expressed in one way or another. Moreover, they are not expressed in the classroom. To me this is the most cogent argument I can think of for a universal program of intramural and intercollegiate athletics in which every student participates and every student works out of his system some of the aggressive impulses he now directs against the university and the other institutions of society.

Ralph Keyes, assistant to the publisher of *Newsday*, in speaking about student disruption remarked that students came to Antioch College at Yellow Springs, Ohio with a very high protest level. When they get there they

find very little to protest against. As a consequence last year they almost hung the barber.

In proposing an expansion of our intra-mural and intercollegiate program, I am not suggesting that this is the only answer. I think we will always have protests and, of course, as a university we flourish when we are a place of dissent and dialogue. With the exception of the playing field, however, the university is totally unprepared for violence and it has been singularly inept in dealing with it.

The truth is that violence will stop on the campuses of our colleges just as soon as students learn that they are no longer protected by *in loco parentis* and that a jail sentence awaits them whenever they break the law. The problem of campus disruption cannot be solved by presidents alone. It can be solved only when the moderate students and the moderates on the faculty agree that rules must be enforced and that all who are guilty will be punished. Administrators have been trapped between arrogant adolescents on the one hand and incredibly naive professors on the other. The professors still plead for amnesty regardless of the offense. Students are not fools. So long as no one is punished why shouldn't the fun and games continue?

What the faculty doesn't appear to recognize is that they are the group who have the most to lose. What is threatened is their academic tenure and their academic freedom. What is at stake is the autonomy of the university—the very idea of the university. There are faculty members at the University of Chicago who understand this. I understand there are a few now at Columbia and Cornell. Our hope is that the members of the faculty will wake up before the battle for autonomy of the university is lost. The public has been warning us now for some time. If we don't learn to govern ourselves they will do it for us. We have no time to lose in doing it for ourselves.

Having gotten this out of my system, I should like to get back to the field of athletics. In doing so let me ask four questions: The first, What is the place of discipline in American education? Second, How important is performance as distinguished from potential? Third, What is the relationship of the individual to the larger units of society? And fourth, Does participation in athletics contribute to the search for courage, endurance, honesty, and self-respect?

Let us turn to the first question. What is the place of discipline in American education? We are free men. We are committed to freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and freedom of the mind. Is there a place for discipline? The answer is to be found in the science laboratory where a universe under law requires hard work, patience and accuracy. It is only the disciplined mind that is equipped to observe, analyze, reflect, and put back together again. The life of the scientist is the life of strict discipline. Only by long and arduous training does anyone contribute to the advancement of science.

Again on the playing field there is no instant knowledge, no instant leadership and influence, no short cuts to success and power. Skill comes only after endless hours of running, push ups, drill and practice. Poise comes with experience. Self-control is the product of effort, leadership is not given, it is earned.

The New Testament reminds us that, "Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." (Matthew VII, v. 14). In a day of affluence and ease to learn this by personal experience is of priceless value.

Our second question is, How important is performance as distinguished from potential? For the moment, American society is preoccupied with the problem of undevel-

oped potential. This is the great problem of both our schools and our colleges. Nature is lavish in its distribution of talents—but poor schools leave talents undeveloped and students seriously disadvantaged.

I agree that this is the current problem in our slums and backward areas. I do not share the feeling that it is our only problem. In education there must always be an emphasis on performance as well as potential. If I were an admissions officer a boy's performance in the high school classroom would tell me far more than his scores in College Boards.

What counts most in life is motivation. This is what makes the difference. Desire, competitive spirit, a willingness to pay the price, habits of work, the refusal to quit, these are the qualities we should look for.

Only performance counts in the classroom. Only performance counts on the playing field. Only performance counts in life after graduation. This is the lesson we must all learn. The earlier it is learned, the better it will be for the learner.

On balance I think our coaches teach this lesson even more effectively than do the other members of the faculty. The New Testament reminds us that, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinedresser. Every branch of mine that bears no fruit, he takes away, and every branch that does bear fruit he prunes, that it may bear more fruit." (John XV, v. 1, 2). Every week the coach judges every boy that plays. Every week he takes away the branch that bears no fruit, prunes the one that does so that it will bear more fruit. He may not realize it, but this hard nosed doctrine comes straight from the Good Book.

My third question is, "What is the relationship of the individual to the larger units of society? In dealing with the current generation of students one cannot help but be impressed by the extent to which they are wrapped up in themselves. Perhaps this has always been true. One has to go back a long way in time, however, to find such a high percentage of egocentric students leaders. What they regard as important appears to be all that counts. They have answers but no questions, voices but no ears. They know more than their teachers, more than the administrators and much more than the trustees.

Fortunately they are brought back to earth on the playing field if nowhere else. The classroom teaches discipline and the place of performance quite as well as the playing field. Nothing, however, teaches teamwork and the importance of the team like athletics. The subordination of the individual to the team is an experience I wish all students could have. The boy who listens and learns, the boy who obeys instructions, who learns to block and tackle as well as run, who gives his best effort in any position to which he is assigned and who hangs in there every day and every week regardless to how much he plays on Saturday, this is the boy who finds out what life is all about.

In the closing years of the twentieth century scientific advance is more and more the result of team effort. Again, every social and economic advance requires cooperative action. It is becoming a day when even the most gifted must function as a member of a team. I am grateful that this all important lesson is taught so well on the playing field.

And finally, Do sports contribute to the search for courage, endurance, honesty and self-respect? Education that is complete must take into account the needs of the whole man. The molding of character, the contagion of ideals, the teaching of values often takes place outside of the classroom but this does not make it any the less important. It comes from the force of example, from the personal influence of those whom

students respect, and from direct personal involvement.

Here again the science laboratory could be cited, for accuracy, truthfulness, and honesty are requirements without excuse or exception. But the playing field teaches these qualities too, and in addition teaches courage, endurance and self-respect.

The lessons of obedience, of loyalty, of courage—all three are learned as well as the value of a total response. To do what you thought couldn't be done, to give that last extra effort that makes so great a difference, to endure without whining or complaint, to practice until perfect, to make the key block that lets your teammate score—these are experiences I wish everyone could have. For each of us there is a desert to travel, a star to discover, and a being within ourselves to bring to life. The boy who gives all that he has, not only brings to life the highest being within him, but gives hope for all humans striving. And as he learns the meaning of honesty and self-respect he is rewarded with pride and dignity and honor.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I spoke on the association of Justice William O. Douglas as being the chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

So that our colleagues will know the nature of this center with which the Justice is so deeply committed, I include the following documents: Church League of America's "Special Report" of October 1965; "Guide to Tumult in America," February 9, 1968; and "Funded Disruption" of January 12, 1968.

The above-mentioned material follows: [From the Special Report, Church League of America, October 1965]

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

The Fund for the Republic was authorized was incorporated with a Board of Directors in October 1951, and a sum of a million dollars was appropriated for it at the time. The Fund was incorporated with a Board of Directors in December 1952. In February 1953, the Ford Foundation appropriated \$14,000,000 for the Fund. At that time, the Fund assumed a completely independent status.¹

Since it was founded, the Fund has sponsored a number of projects. One of these projects was the distribution of 110 copies of a film which portrayed a television interview between atomic scientist, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and Edward R. Murrow, of the Columbia Broadcasting System,² after the former had been found to be a security risk on June 29, 1954.³ The interview was a clear attempt to show Oppenheimer to be a victim of character assassination due to anti-Communist hysteria.⁴

In a speech which he made on July 21, 1955, Congressman B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee stated: "Ignored entirely in this Ed Murrow propaganda film were the details of the charges against Oppenheimer, including his own admission that he had lied repeatedly to security officers of the Manhattan District and the FBI regarding his contacts with the Soviet espionage agent, Haakon

Footnotes at end of article.

Chevalier, as well as other vital security matters."⁵

Dr. Oppenheimer has had a record of affiliation with Communist front organizations, such as the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, American Friends of the Chinese People, and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. In 1953, Oppenheimer himself stated that he was not a Communist, but had probably belonged to every Communist front association on the West Coast and signed many petitions in which Communists were interested. He made periodic contributions through Communist Party functionaries to the Communist Party in the San Francisco area in amounts aggregating not less than \$500 nor more than \$1,000 a year during a period of approximately four years ending in April 1942.⁶

Another project of the Fund was the financing of wide-scale mail distribution of a special issue of the "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists", which was published by an outfit having as chairman of its board of sponsors none other than J. Robert Oppenheimer. This special issue was devoted entirely to the twin objectives of defending Oppenheimer and attacking the security program.⁷

An action by the Fund for the Republic which has aroused much controversy was the \$5,000 award which it made to the Plymouth Quaker Meeting of Plymouth Meeting, a village near Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for its alleged retention of Mrs. Mary Knowles as librarian of the William Jeans Memorial Library, which was owned and operated by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting.

On May 8, 1953, Mr. Herbert Philbrick appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and swore that Mary Knowles was a member of the Communist Party, "in fact a member of my own pro-group underground cell." Philbrick also identified Mary Knowles as the secretary to Harrison Harley, director of the Samuel Adams School for Social Studies, which was placed on the Attorney General's list as subversive and Communist.⁸

On May 21, 1953, Mary Knowles appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and when asked if she was a member of the Communist Party now, she dived behind the Fifth Amendment and refused to answer that question. Following her plea of the Fifth Amendment, she subsequently submitted her resignation as branch librarian to the trustees of the Norwood, Massachusetts, library. Mrs. Knowles then took a similar position with the William Jeans Memorial Library, a library of the Plymouth Monthly Meeting of Friends, a Quaker group at Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania. The actual employment of Mrs. Knowles was done by the Library Committee of Plymouth Meeting.⁹

When Mrs. Knowles went to Plymouth Meeting, veterans organizations and others asked her to take a loyalty oath. She refused. Thereafter, the Plymouth Township School Board, the governing authorities of Plymouth and Whitmarsh Townships, and the Conshohocken Community Chest, withdrew financial support of the library. The Plymouth Township School Board forbade teachers to take children to the library, and three members of the Library Committee itself resigned.¹⁰

Resolutions were passed by local chapters of the American Legion and the DAR, calling for the dismissal of Mrs. Knowles. Some of the Quakers of the community, who disapproved of the hiring of Mary Knowles, got up a petition for the purpose of having Mrs. Knowles discharged. This petition was voted down in a maneuver, although it appears that a majority favored the petition.¹¹ In fact, 61 of the 108 members of the Plymouth Meeting signed a petition for her removal, and only 28

of the 108 are known to have approved her hiring.¹²

Robert Maynard Hutchins, the president of the Fund for the Republic, announced a special \$5,000 award to the Quaker Monthly Meeting, "for courageous and effective defense of Democratic principles, in refusing to fire Mrs. Knowles." He said that "the award was being made because the Fund for the Republic hopes that the example that was set in this case will be followed elsewhere in America—particularly when our libraries, which seem to be a special target of self-appointed censors and amateur loyalty experts, are involved."¹³

Actually, it was not the Quaker Monthly Meeting that hired Mrs. Knowles, and that refused to get rid of her; it was the Library Committee. The employment of Mrs. Knowles by the Library group continued to meet with overwhelming opposition, not only by the members of the Plymouth Quaker Meeting, but also by the vast majority of the residents of the community.¹⁴

Another activity in the Fund for the Republic's propaganda field is the free and unsolicited distribution of books to judges and college presidents throughout the U.S. One of these books is "Grand Inquest", by Telford Taylor, of which the Fund distributed 450 copies to Federal judges.¹⁵ According to Congressman B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee, Taylor "has a red flag on his file at the Civil Service Commission with the warning unresolved question of loyalty."¹⁶

The Fund for the Republic distributed 35,000 copies of a book entitled "The Fifth Amendment Today" by Erwin N. Griswold, primarily to judges and lawyers.¹⁷ In its May 31, 1955, report, the Fund listed Griswold as one of its directors.¹⁸ This book has been described as "a thinly-disguised propaganda argument that any witness is entitled to invoke the Fifth Amendment without having any inference drawn of possible hidden guilt."¹⁹

The Fund for the Republic distributed 25,000 copies of a Harper's magazine article by Richard H. Rovere entitled "The Kept Witnesses", to business executives and labor officials.²⁰ This article, as its name implies, castigates the use of former Communists as witnesses in loyalty-security proceedings.²¹ The Fund also distributed 25,000 copies of "Faceless Informers and Our Schools", a pamphlet by Lawrence Martin, to State School Board associations.²² This pamphlet has been described as "a scarestone piece intended to show that teachers are too intimidated to teach properly; and other items of similar ilk."²³

In November 1954, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York Fund, Inc., received \$100,000 from the Fund for the Republic for "a study and report by the Special Committee on the Federal Loyalty-Security program."²⁴ The Fund for the Republic intimated that this report would be unbiased and objective. However, its liaison man with this Special Committee turned out to be Walter Millis. In a televised debate on September 11, 1955, Millis stated that it was not the procedures of the loyalty-security program to which he objected; it was the entire program.²⁵

The May 31, 1955 report of the Fund for the Republic stated that an advisory committee headed by Adam Yarmolinsky would be set up to obtain records of individual cases involving the loyalty-security program.²⁶ The study, when completed, was used by leftists to attack the program.²⁷

The Fund for the Republic distributed copies of a "See It Now" television program on book censorship in California to Southern California civic groups.²⁸ This program was an attempt to discredit a Mrs. Ann Smart of Marin County, California, for conducting a campaign to eliminate certain nauseatingly

lewd and pornographic books, and others that were little sort of seditious, from the libraries of her community.²⁹

In May 1955, the Fund for the Republic made a \$150,000 grant to the American Friends Service Committee for "a two-year program of support in legal cases to strengthen the right to freedom of conscience."³⁰ It turned out that part of this grant was used in behalf of 28 individuals who were on trial in New York State. The "freedom of conscience"—the "conscientious non-conformism" for which they were on trial—was non-conformism in refusing to obey the civil defense laws of the State of New York—specifically, in refusing to obey police orders to go into an air raid shelter during a practice air raid in New York City on June 15, 1955. The leader of the group of 28 was Dorothy Day, editor of the Catholic Worker, a left-wing periodical which is not a publication of the Catholic Church.³¹

In June 1953, the Fund for the Republic appropriated \$300,000 for "an account of Communist influence in major segments of U.S. Society."³² This project was divided into a number of sub-projects. One of these, entitled "History of the Communist Party in the United States (1919-1945)", was headed by Theodore Draper.³³ Draper began his career some years ago as a reporter for the Daily Worker and from there, after years of service, was graduated to the more erudite New Masses.³⁴ On his payroll was Earl Browder, former American Communist leader.³⁵ Browder had been expelled from the U.S. Communist Party, but is still considered sympathetic to its aims.³⁶

Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, stated that he would hire a Communist "for a job he was qualified to do—provided I was in a position to see that he did it." He admitted that the Fund had hired as a temporary press officer, a man who had previously pleaded the Fifth Amendment when questioned by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee about Communist Party membership. Hutchins alleged that the man, Amos Landman, had "left the (Communist) Party in 1939." Landman was hired by the Fund on July 28, 1955, three weeks after his appearance before the subcommittee, and served until November 1, 1955.³⁷

When asked if the hiring of Landman was "an affront to the American people," Hutchins replied: "Not at all. The Fifth Amendment is part of the Bill of Rights."³⁸

Another study of Communism by the Fund for the Republic was inaugurated in June 1953, when \$64,500 was appropriated for "a study of the Communist Record, including a bibliography digest, and microfilms." The chairman of this project was Arthur E. Sutherland, Professor of Law at Harvard University.³⁹ One of the results of this project was "a digest of the principal judicial and administrative hearings in which the Communist Party has been involved, together with a full bibliography."⁴⁰ However, Frederick Woltman, staff writer for the Scripps Howard newspapers, in his column for October 28, 1955, stated that the work was so ineptly done as to omit a vast collection and assortment of some of the most effective and illuminating books in existence on the anti-Communist side. He quoted Phillip Taft, of the Economics Department at Brown University, as having told Professor Sutherland: "You deserve a vote of thanks from the Communist Party."⁴¹

Some of the individuals who have been connected with the Fund for the Republic have records of affiliations. The May 31, 1955 Report of the Fund for the Republic listed Professor Robert E. Cushman as a consultant to the Fund.⁴² In 1934 Cushman was a contributing editor to the subversive periodical "New Theatre" which was the official organ of the League of Workers Theatres, a Com-

Footnotes at end of article.

munist project. According to the testimony of Walter S. Steele before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1938, Cushman was identified as a member of the Advisory Committee of the Moscow University Summer School.⁴³

Professor Cushman sponsored a reunion dance under the auspices of the new Theatre League on April 18, 1941. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. In 1949, he was listed as a sponsor of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, which was held in New York City under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Both organizations were labeled as subversive by the HCUA in 1951.⁴⁴

According to the Report of the Fund for the Republic, dated May 31, 1955, Walter Gellhorn of the Columbia University School of Law was given a fellowship or grant by the Fund for the Republic for "research assistance in preparing the 1956 Edward Douglass White lectures."⁴⁵ On Dec. 23, 1952, Gellhorn was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Louis F. Budenz, before the Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations.⁴⁶

In December 1954, the Fund for the Republic appropriated \$75,000 for "awards for outstanding original drama and documentary scripts on civil liberties themes."⁴⁷ According to an announcement which appeared in Variety, September 14, 1955, Julien Bryan was selected by the Fund as a script contest judge.⁴⁸

In 1933, Bryan was listed as an endorser of the National Committee of the Friends of the Soviet Union, which was a forerunner of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. In 1936, Bryan gave an illustrated lecture at Washington High School in New York, under the auspices of "Soviet Russia Today", which has been cited as a Communist-controlled publication.⁴⁹

That same year, the Washington Times editorially criticized the production of "Communist approved films" by the March of Time. The pictures were said to have been photographed in Russia by Julien Bryan, a professional lecturer on Soviet Russia, and a member of the National Committee of the Friends of the Soviet Union in 1933. He was an executive director of the International Film Foundation, Inc., which promoted film plays on Russia, and was listed as a "guide or tour conductor to the Soviet Union."⁵⁰ Julien Bryan was listed as a lecturer on behalf of the periodical New Masses, which has been officially cited as a "Communist periodical" by the U.S. Attorney General.⁵¹

In September 1954, the Fund for the Republic appropriated \$150,000 for a project entitled "Fear in Education", which was to be a study of attitudes of college and high school teachers. One of the members of the Advisory Committee which was set up on this project was Helen M. Lynd, Professor of Social Philosophy at Sarah Lawrence College.⁵² Helen Lynd has been affiliated with nine organizations that were cited as subversive.⁵³

The report of the Fund, dated May 31, 1955, stated that, in order to investigate problems concerning housing for minority groups, especially Negroes, the Fund had established a Commission of Race and Housing. Two of the members of this Commission were Gordon W. Allport, Professor of Psychology at Harvard University, and Charles S. Johnson, President of Fisk University.⁵⁴ Both of these men have been affiliated with subversive organizations.⁵⁵

Robert Maynard Hutchins, who became the President of the Fund for the Republic on

June 1, 1954,⁵⁶ had been named as a member of the Commission for Academic Freedom of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions in the September 13, 1948, issue (page 6) of the Communist newspaper, Daily Worker. He was listed as a sponsor of a conference held by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, October 9-10, 1948, in the leaflet "To Safeguard These Rights . . .", which was published by the Bureau on Academic Freedom of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in House Report No. 1954, April 26, 1950.⁵⁷

On April 21, 1949, Dr. Hutchins, testifying before the Broyles Commission, stated that it was not yet established that it was subversive to be a Communist.⁵⁸ He was reported in the Daily Worker for June 25, 1951, page 2, as one of those who opposed the Supreme Court decision affirming the conviction of the 11 Communist leaders in New York Federal Court on October 14, 1949.⁵⁹

In the May 31, 1955, Report of the Fund for the Republic, Hutchins made the following statement: "A political party in this country has been identified with the 'enemy'. Those associated with this party have therefore come under suspicion as an imminent danger to the state . . . The treatment accorded suspected persons in Congressional investigations and administrative hearings has not always been that contemplated by the Sixth Amendment. A kind of continuous propaganda and social pressure has been kept up that has tended to suppress conscientious non-conformity. Political advantage has accrued from claiming that others were indifferent to the threat of Communism."⁶⁰

In September 1954, the Fund for the Republic appropriated \$100,000 for a study of blacklisting in the motion picture, radio, and television industries.⁶¹ It was announced that this report would be published early in 1956.⁶² When the report came out, hundreds of pages of it were filled with material that was supposed to show how people in various fields of entertainment and people and organizations outside the entertainment field have, in effect, conspired to have people fired from their jobs because of Communist or Communist-front affiliations.⁶³

Hearings were held by the HCUA regarding the so-called blacklisting report. Commenting on the report, Francis E. Walter, Chairman of the HCUA, stated: "The facts revealed at the hearings have established that there is not and never has been in the entertainment industry any practice of depriving people of employment because of 'political affiliations or beliefs', but that a number of people who have been identified as hard-core members of the Communist conspiracy have been refused access to mass media of communications."

"This fact was established, not only by the examination in public session of John Cogley, who conducted the bogus investigation for the Fund for the Republic, but also by the testimony of the ablest leaders of nationwide anti-Communist organizations, including the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. These leaders roundly condemned the Fund for the Republic report as a fraud and a tool for use by the Communists in preventing the immunization of Communist agents from the entertainment circles of this Nation."⁶⁴

The "Report on Blacklisting" by the Fund for the Republic was written by John Cogley and Michael Harrington. During the HCUA's 1956 investigation of the Fund's report, Harrington was identified as a member of the Young Socialist League, the apparent youth arm of the Marxist Independent Socialist

League. Harrington has also been listed as National Chairman of the Young Socialist League as of Dec. 1956.⁶⁵

Some of the other activities of the Fund for the Republic were a project involving the study of "extremist groups" and grants to such organizations as the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago, the National Council of Churches, the Southern Regional Council, the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, as well as grants to various church bodies for work in "racial and cultural relations."⁶⁶ The Fund's "Bulletin" for June 1956 stated that almost one-third of the effort of the Fund had gone into "questions of race relations."

Among the organizations that have been concerned about the activities of the Fund for the Republic was the American Legion. On September 12, 1955, Seaborn P. Collins, the National commander of the American Legion, called on Legionnaires to "avoid any identification with activities sponsored by the Fund for the Republic." Collins stated: "I am issuing this alert to our membership because it appears that the Fund for the Republic, headed by Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, is threatening and may succeed in crippling the national security." He said he hoped "that American Legion elements at the State and local levels will have no truck with Fund for the Republic enterprises. If American Legion posts and departments (State organizations) are offered financial aid by the Hutchins group, to carry out the group's programs, I sincerely hope they will decline."⁶⁷

On November 17, 1955, J. Addington Wagner, who had succeeded Seaborn P. Collins as National Commander of the American Legion declared that "The American Legion formally charges that by its action under its current direction, the Fund for the Republic renders comfort to the enemies of America" and that the American Legion is "convinced that the Fund is doing evil work." He also stated that the Legion "believes that the Bureau of Internal Revenue should study the activities of the Fund, and determine whether it qualifies for tax-exempt status."⁶⁸

In its National Convention in Los Angeles, September 3-6, 1956, the American Legion commended the HCUA for its hearings on the Fund for the Republic urged Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for continuing the hearings, and recommended that the tax exemption status of the Fund be revoked.⁶⁹

Senator Joe McCarthy called on President Eisenhower to assume personal leadership in the fight against the destruction of the government security program, which he said was being gravely threatened. McCarthy mentioned, particularly, the Fund for the Republic. He said that the method used by the Fund in "evaluating" the security program was to compile alleged employee grievances collected from the attorneys of the people involved (with no information whatsoever on the government side of the story), and publicize these to prove that the security program is a political witch-hunt.⁷⁰

On November 18, 1955, Senator McCarthy said that he would demand, as soon as Congress convened, a thorough investigation of why the Fund for the Republic was granted the privilege of tax immunity. He stated: "It is unthinkable that the Fund for the Republic—along with other left-wing organizations propagating a soft view of Communism and a hard view of Congressional investigations of subversion—should be exempted from paying taxes on the grounds of educational work."⁷¹

As of 1956, the largest single grant ever awarded by the Fund for the Republic, a sum of \$445,000, was given to the Southern Regional Council, Inc.⁷² On March 8, 1957, speaking before the State of Louisiana Leg-

islative Committee on Segregation, Manning Johnson identified the Southern Regional Council as a "Southern Red front." He revealed that the Council was formed by James E. Jackson, a Southern organizer of the Communist Party.⁷³

In expressing a personal view on March 7, 1957, Meyer Kestnbaum, a Director of the Fund for the Republic, said that the U.S. "should make clear that Red China, under suitable conditions, can look forward to recognition and admittance to the United Nations." He said that he didn't think that there was any hope that the Nationalist leader, Chiang Kai-shek, would ever lead China again, and that "we are going to have to deal with the people who actually run China."⁷⁴

In a report put out by the Fund for the Republic, it was asserted that corporations and other organizations and institutions were a threat to American freedom in this country. The report suggested that a more powerful government was the answer to the threat.⁷⁵

In a speech before the American Friends Service Committee on October 11, 1958, Hallock Hoffman, secretary of the Fund for the Republic, suggested that the U.S. buy the islands of Matsu and Quemoy from the Nationalist Chinese and give them to "the Communist Chinese people." He said that the U.S. could use the money it was spending to maintain the 7th Fleet off the Chinese Coast to buy the islands. "Nobody would lose, everybody would win and we would even save money", he said. He called his suggestion "a fanciful illustration of creative ways to handle big problems."⁷⁶

On page 13 of the December 1957 issue of *The Saturday Review*, there appeared an advertisement entitled "Subversion in Dallas." This insertion was published by the American Traditions project, a "popular education" program of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. This article commented about objections to a picture drawn by artist Ben Shahn, which was included in a traveling exhibition entitled "Sports in Art." Prior to the scheduled showing of the collection at the Dallas (Texas) Museum of Fine Arts on March 25, 1956, the Dallas Patriotic Society demanded that the Dallas Art Association eliminate Shahn's picture and three others "on the ground that the artists who painted them were reported to have Communist or Communist-front records."⁷⁷

The trustees of the Dallas Art Association rejected the demand of the Dallas Patriotic Society. The Fund for the Republic's article commented that "the right to see was not impaired in Dallas" and declared that "the stand of the trustees of the Dallas Art Association is an example of the countless ways in which Americans are strengthening the tradition of fair play in their daily lives . . ."⁷⁸

According to the Fund's "Three-Year Report" dated May 31, 1956, page 62, Michael Harrington was employed as a journalist in connection with their American Traditions Project. According to the *Daily Worker* of May 24, 1957, page 4, Harrington was listed as National Chairman of the Young Socialist League.⁷⁹

After an article attacking the FBI appeared in the October 14, 1958 issue of *The Nation*, the Fund for the Republic requested permission to place in commercial airplanes several hundred copies of this article.⁸⁰

On March 26, 1958, Congressman Francis E. Walter, chairman of the HCUA, sent a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury questioning the tax-exempt status of the Fund for the Republic. This letter was based on a staff study by the HCUA, which stated in part that "while some projects of the Fund appear to

be objectively presented, the majority of its operations are based on biased investigations and result in findings which not only fail to present both sides of a given question, but, even further, actually conceal facts necessary for an honest understanding of the subject matter."⁸⁰

The HCUA report demonstrated that the Fund "engaged in propaganda and attempted to influence legislation in violation of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code." Based upon HCUA findings, an investigation of the Fund was instituted by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) of the Department of the Treasury. At the conclusion of the investigation, IRS agents "recommended that the Fund . . . be denied tax-exempt status" in violation of the aforementioned statute. After the Treasury Department had taken no action in the matter, the HCUA, on September 1, 1959, adopted a resolution urgently requesting the Secretary of the Treasury "to make public the facts developed as a result of the investigation of the Fund . . . as well as the findings and conclusions of the Department of the Treasury on the Fund . . ."⁸¹

Several days prior to the HCUA's action, the 41st National Convention of the American Legion passed a resolution urging the Secretary of the Treasury "to withdraw the tax exemption status" of this foundation.⁸²

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions was established by the Board of Directors of the Fund for the Republic and began operations in Santa Barbara, California, on September 15, 1959. The main headquarters of the Fund was moved from 60 East 42nd Street, New York City, to 2056 Eucalyptus Road, in Santa Barbara, California.⁸³ A pamphlet published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, stated that, although the Fund for the Republic maintained small offices in New York, Chicago, and Berkeley, its main program was now that of the Center, and that most of the members of the staff now lived in Santa Barbara.⁸⁴

This pamphlet also contains a list of various publications of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Among these publications is a book entitled "The Tradition of Freedom" which is advertised as "selections, edited by Milton Mayer, from the writings that shaped the concepts of freedom and justice in America."⁸⁵ According to the *Syracuse Post-Standard*, February 17, 1947, Milton Mayer told his audience: "We must haul down the American flag. And if I wanted to be vulgar and shocking I would go even farther and say haul it down, stomp on it, and spit on it."⁸⁶

In March 1960, a study entitled "The Churches and the Public", which had been conducted by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, was published. It stated that American churches have a responsibility to speak out on political, social and moral issues, but should avoid using coercion to impose their sectarian views on the community.⁸⁷

A pamphlet produced by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, entitled "A Community of Fear", contains (on page 34) the following statement: "There is rather clearly a military elite emerging in the United States which is dedicated to a position of perpetual hostility toward the Soviet Union and which wields enormous political as well as military power . . . Indeed, the military elite is clearly in a position to assume political command over the U.S. striking forces if there are serious signs of 'weakness' in U.S. foreign relations."⁸⁸

In February 1961, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions produced two pamphlets, the titles of which were "A World Without War", and "Permanent Peace", both of which were written by Walter Mills. In "A World Without War", Mills declares: "Many of the anti-Communist measures

taken in the name of 'internal security' during the 'McCarthy era' were really in the nature of tribal rites. If one can discern a purpose in them it was to cement the old social bonds, to organize the group, to re-establish common values in face of the anomie (sic) and atomization of the technological age."⁸⁹

In the introduction to "Permanent Peace", Mills states that "if the price of avoiding all-out thermonuclear war should prove to be acquiescence in the 'Communist domination of the world' or any other of the unpleasant imaginings against which we cling, futilely, to the war system to preserve us, it seems probable that the price will be paid." He also alleged that a notion such as that of "Communist domination of the world" is an elusive notion "inapplicable to the actual power relations which concern us."⁹⁰

On June 1, 1961, a dinner was given for Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black by the Fund for the Republic, Inc. Guest speakers at this dinner were Reinhold Niebuhr, vice-president emeritus of Union Theological Seminary, and Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Dr. Hutchins concluded his talk by saying: "We must revive and reconstruct the political community of the United States because the task before us is nothing less than the organization of the world political community."⁹¹

In January 1962, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions issued a bulletin entitled "Caught on the Horn of Plenty", which was written by W. H. Ferry, Vice-President of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. In this bulletin, Ferry claimed that "the individualism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is a casualty of technology, as are old theories of private property. Government must intervene more and more in the nation's industrial life."⁹² He also alleged that "we shall have to find means, public or private of paying people to do no work."⁹³

On August 6, 1962, Mr. Ferry spoke at a Democratic conference in Seattle. In his speech, he accused J. Edgar Hoover of creating a false picture of Communism's strength, branding the picture "sententious poppycock." He termed Hoover's warnings of Communist subversion "a mischief-making tapestry of legend and illusion, if there ever was one" and referred to Hoover as "our official spy-swatter" and "the indubitable mandarin of anti-communism in the United States."⁹⁴ In this connection, it is interesting to note that in a television interview on May 4, 1958, which was subsidized by the Fund for the Republic as a contribution to "survival and freedom", Cyrus Eaton declared that there were no Communists in the United States "to speak of, except in the mind of those on the payroll of the FBI." Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland industrialist, is a friend of Khrushchev and a winner of the Lenin Peace Prize.⁹⁵

Reliable sources have stated that Scott Buchanan, staff consultant for the Center of Democratic Institutions, has visited Pugwash, Cyrus Eaton's mansion in Nova Scotia, to be entertained by Eaton as a house guest and intellectual companion.⁹⁶

In President Robert M. Hutchins' report on the Fund for the Republic and Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, dated March 31, 1962, is found the following statement:

"In September 1961, the Center was host to five Soviet scientists, following their participation in the twelve-nation Conference on Science and World Affairs at Stowe, Vermont. The Santa Barbara meeting was arranged by Harrison Brown and Amron Katz of RAND corporation. For two days the possibilities and problems of disarmament and scientific cooperation were discussed, mainly

on the basis of papers prepared by Mr. Brown and by Walter Mills, of the staff of the Center . . .⁹⁷

In May 1963, a pamphlet entitled "The Elite and the Electorate" was published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. The pamphlet urged that the President be given expanded powers and that Congress be stripped of its authority to thwart him under the constitutional checks-and-balances system.⁹⁸

In a conference held at the University of Chicago Law School in January 1963, Robert M. Hutchins, President of the Fund for the Republic, Inc., contended that federal aid to education was inevitable and that no concern for religious belief should interfere with this "overriding public interest."⁹⁹

Paul Jacobs, trade union expert for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, was a defense witness in a libel suit for former Washington State Representative John Goldmark. In his testimony, Jacobs stated that a Communist workers school which he and Mrs. Goldmark attended "was more of an adult education center in a way."¹⁰⁰

In May 1964, a conference was held under the auspices of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at the Johnson Foundation Conference Center in Wingspread, Wisconsin. At this conference, influential voices were raised in favor of a world government. Typical of these was that of Professor Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, who stated, "Let's face the issue squarely. Nuclear weapons have made the nation-state obsolete—as obsolete as the steam engine made feudalism."¹⁰¹ It was, in fact, generally agreed by the participants in the conference that "absolute national sovereignty is out of step with the times" and that "there is a need for widened public international authority."¹⁰²

Three individuals from Communist countries participated in the conference. They were Dr. Marian Dobrosielski, Counselor of the Polish Embassy, Washington, D.C.; Georgi Kornienko, Minister Counselor of the Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C.; and Josip Presburger, Counselor of the Yugoslav Embassy, Washington, D.C.¹⁰³

An employee of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (Fund for the Republic) has been whipping up opposition to U.S. efforts to halt Communist aggression in Vietnam. Robert Scheer, who performed similar work on behalf of Castrophiles before and during the Cuban missile crisis, was scheduled to give a talk in Berkeley, California, on June 5, 1964, under sponsorship of the Women for Peace organization. On May 14, 1964, Scheer delivered the introduction to a University of California showing of a Communist film on Vietnam which was seized in New York by Federal authorities. He has also announced plans for a book on Vietnam.¹⁰⁴

A former executive committee member of the University of California Fair Play for Cuba Committee, Scheer paid an unauthorized visit to Cuba in 1960. Along with Ken Cloke, University of California student and son of two identified Communists, Scheer was one of the speakers at an antiblockade rally at the University of California during the Cuban missile threat. With Maurice Zeitlin, a former University of California student and an ardent Castroite, Scheer has written a book entitled "Cuba: Tragedy in our Hemisphere". Its thesis is that "a little U.S. love and understanding would have prevented Castro's growing up to be a Communist bad boy."¹⁰⁵

An article in *TOCSON*, June 8, 1964, stated that Scheer now headed a group called the Opposition, which had recently launched a left-wing institution called the San Francisco New School.¹⁰⁶

At a dinner which was given in Los Angeles on July 25, 1964, by the Center for the

Study of Democratic Institutions, Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas was a speaker. In his speech, he alleged that "the psychology of fear and apprehension produces the radical right . . ."¹⁰⁷

On February 18, 1964, a radio (KPFA, Berkeley, Cal.) broadcast featuring Chicago law professor Harry Kalven, Jr., explored the theory that sit-ins could be legally justified under the First Amendment. The program, which had been produced by Florence Mischel at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, was scheduled to be re-broadcast August 31, 1964.¹⁰⁸

Commenting on this theory, Ben Levine, columnist for the Worker, stated, on June 21, 1964, "such an argument could, given the right circumstances, put a people's revolution under the protection of the First Amendment."¹⁰⁹

A conference entitled the International Convocation to Examine the Requirements of Peace, which was sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, was held in New York City on February 18-20, 1965. The purpose of the meeting was to scrutinize *Pacem in Terris* (Peace on Earth), an encyclical of Pope John XXIII. At this convocation, addresses were given by Vice-President Hubert Humphrey, U.N. Secretary General U Thant, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin, historian Arnold Toynbee, and scientists Linus Pauling. Individuals from the Soviet Union and from Soviet bloc countries were among those attending the convocation.¹¹⁰

Among those invited to take part in panel debates were James Farmer of CORE; Dagmar Wilson, Women Strike for Peace founder, who was under indictment for contempt of Congress; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; H. Stuart Hughes, Harvard professor and "peace" candidate for Congress; Norman Cousins of SANE; Bayard Rustin, executive-secretary of the War Resisters League and organizer of the 1963 March on Washington; and A. J. Muste of the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation.¹¹¹

According to the Worker, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions invited Gus Hall, Communist Party boss "and others prominent in the American Left" in connection with this conference.¹¹²

A campaign to mobilize the American clergy in support of the peace movement will be sponsored by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a radical pacifist organization, in cooperation with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. On August 29, 1965, Frank H. Kelly, a vice-president of the Center, announced that the campaign would include more than 100 conferences in various cities to discuss the moral and technological implications of the requirements of world peace.¹¹³

An advertising leaflet announcing these conferences indicated that they would take place in 1965, 1966, and 1967. The theme of the conference is to be "Peace on Earth: Moral and Technological Implications." The leaflet also stated that a gift of \$100,000 for the convocations would be presented to the Fellowship of Reconciliation upon the contingency of its providing funds to match this amount.¹¹⁴

A bulletin of the Fellowship of Reconciliation announced that the program had been made possible "through the generosity of Irving F. Laucks, Santa Barbara, California."¹¹⁵ An advertising leaflet announcing the "International Convocation on the *Pacem in Terris*," which was held in New York City, February 18-20, 1965, listed Irving F. Laucks as a consultant to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.¹¹⁶

An editorial in the Chicago Tribune, commenting on the program which is to be sponsored by the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, made the following statement:

"Any seminars promoted by these outfits will certainly preach the wickedness of the United States and the nobility of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Communists. The Hutchins group has already distributed a screed entitled 'How the United States Got Involved in Viet Nam,' which says that American anti-communism is just plain fascism and no more respectable than communism itself."¹¹⁷

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, 1955, pp. 9-10.

² "Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, 1955, pp. 21, 41.

³ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955. Statement by Congressman B. Carroll Reece.

⁴ The American Legion Firing Line, November 15, 1955, p. 123.

⁵ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955.

⁶ The American Legion Firing Line, May 1, 1955, p. 47; "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications: 1961", pp. 17, 21, 84.

⁷ Fulton Lewis, Jr., "Washington Report" June 14, 1955, reprinted in the Congressional Record, July 21, 1955. According to the "Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, 1955, p. 41, 25,000 copies of the "Bulletin of Atomic Scientists" were distributed by the Fund.

⁸ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955.

⁹ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955. See also "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic", pp. 46-47.

¹⁰ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955; "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic", p. 47.

¹¹ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic", p. 47; Congressional Record, July 21, 1955.

¹² The Philadelphia Inquirer, July 20, 1956. Reprinted in The American Legion Firing Line, August 15, 1956, p. 67.

¹³ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic", p. 47.

¹⁴ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic", p. 47; Washington Post, August 28, 1956 (letter to the editor by Francis E. Walter, Chairman of the HCUA). In his letter, Congressman Walter stated that the Plymouth Quaker Meeting did not accept the award which was tendered by the Fund for the Republic.

¹⁵ "Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, 1955, p. 41; Congressional Record, July 21, 1955.

¹⁶ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955. Statement by Congressman B. Carroll Reece.

¹⁷ "Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, 1955, p. 41.

¹⁸ "Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, 1955, p. 5.

¹⁹ "Facts Forum News", November 1955, p. 5.

²⁰ "The Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, p. 42.

²¹ "Facts Forum News", November 1955, pp. 5-6.

²² "Report of the Fund for the Republic", May 31, 1955, p. 41.

²³ "Facts Forum News," November 1955, pp. 5-6.

²⁴ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 24.

²⁵ "Facts Forum News," November, 1955, p. 6.

²⁶ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 15.

²⁷ "Communism and Your Child," by Herbert Romerstein, quoted in "The Top of the News with Fulton Lewis Jr.," April 6, 1962.

²⁸ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 41.

²⁹ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic," p. 8.

³⁰ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 24.

³¹ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic," pp. 64-65.

³² "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 28.

³³ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 37.

³⁴ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic," p. 92.

³⁵ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic," pp. 92-93. Also see Chicago American, November 21, 1955, p. 10.

³⁶ Chicago Sun-Times, November 8, 1955, p. 10.

³⁷ Chicago Sun-Times, November 8, 1955, p. 10.

³⁸ Chicago Sun-Times, November 8, 1955, p. 10.

³⁹ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, pp. 12-13, 28, 38.

⁴⁰ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, pp. 12-13.

⁴¹ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic," pp. 106-107.

⁴² "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 36.

⁴³ The American Legion Firing Line, September 15, 1955, p. 92; "Facts Forum News," November 1955, pp. 4-5. Also see "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1961, p. 234.

⁴⁴ The American Legion Firing Line, September 15, 1955, p. 92; "Facts Forum News," November 1955, p. 4; also see "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1961, pp. 65, 118-119, 127.

⁴⁵ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 40.

⁴⁶ The American Legion Firing Line, December 1, 1955, p. 128.

⁴⁷ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 29.

⁴⁸ The American Legion Firing Line, November 15, 1955, p. 124.

⁴⁹ The American Legion Firing Line, November 15, 1955, p. 124. Also see "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1961, p. 201.

⁵⁰ The American Legion Firing Line, November 15, 1955, p. 124.

⁵¹ The American Legion Firing Line, November 15, 1955, p. 124. Also see "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1961, p. 194.

⁵² "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, pp. 29 and 39.

⁵³ The American Legion Firing Line, November 15, 1955, p. 125.

⁵⁴ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 19.

⁵⁵ The American Legion Firing Line, November 15, 1955, p. 125.

⁵⁶ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 10.

⁵⁷ The American Legion Firing Line, September 15, 1955, p. 91. See also "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," 1961, pp. 118-119.

⁵⁸ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955. Statement of B. Carroll Reece.

⁵⁹ Congressional Record, July 21, 1955. Statement of B. Carroll Reece.

⁶⁰ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 11.

⁶¹ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, p. 28.

⁶² "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, pp. 15-16.

⁶³ The American Legion Firing Line, July 15, 1956, p. 59.

⁶⁴ Washington Post, August 28, 1956 (letter to editor by Congressman Francis E. Walter).

⁶⁵ The American Legion Firing Line, January 15, 1957, pp. 6-7.

⁶⁶ "Report of the Fund for the Republic," May 31, 1955, pp. 25-28; "The Fund for the Republic Bulletin," May 1956; "The Fund for the Republic Bulletin," June 1956.

⁶⁷ The American Legion Firing Line, September 15, 1955, pp. 89-90; "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic," pp. 40-42.

⁶⁸ The American Legion Firing Line, November 19, 1955, pp. 122-123; Los Angeles Examiner, November 19, 1955, pp. 1-2.

⁶⁹ The American Legion Firing Line, September 15, 1956, p. 80.

⁷⁰ "The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on the Fund for the Republic," p. 57.

⁷¹ Los Angeles Examiner, November 19, 1955, p. 2.

⁷² The American Legion Firing Line, April 15, 1957, p. 34; The American Legion Firing Line, May 15, 1957, p. 41.

⁷³ The American Legion Firing Line, April 15, 1957, pp. 34-35.

⁷⁴ The American Legion Firing Line, April 15, 1957, p. 35.

⁷⁵ American Legion Magazine, July 1958, pp. 6-7.

⁷⁶ The Sunday Press, Binghamton, N.Y., October 12, 1958.

⁷⁷ The American Legion Firing Line, January 15, 1958, pp. 7-8.

⁷⁸ The American Legion Firing Line, January 15, 1958, p. 8.

⁷⁹ The American Legion Firing Line, December 15, 1958, p. 95.

⁸⁰ The American Legion Firing Line, November 1, 1959, p. 83.

⁸¹ The American Legion Firing Line, November 1, 1959, p. 83.

⁸² The American Legion Firing Line, November 1, 1959, p. 83.

⁸³ The American Legion Firing Line, November 1, 1959, p. 83; "Report of the President, 1959-60: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions," p. 3.

⁸⁴ "Report of the President, 1959-60: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions," p. 3.

⁸⁵ "Report of the President, 1959-60: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions," p. 26.

⁸⁶ Quoted in The Blu-Print, Oakland, California, p. 1.

⁸⁷ The Miami Herald, March 14, 1960, p. 10-A.

⁸⁸ Quoted in Indianapolis Star, March 24, 1961.

⁸⁹ "A World Without War," by Walter Millis, (Santa Barbara, California: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1961), p. 13.

⁹⁰ "Permanent Peace," by Walter Millis, (Santa Barbara, California: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1961), pp. 6-7.

⁹¹ The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., June 2, 1961, p. A-13.

⁹² "Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions Bulletin," January 1962, p. 1.

⁹³ "Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions Bulletin," January 1962, p. 7.

⁹⁴ Chicago Daily Tribune, August 8, 1962.

⁹⁵ U.S.A., August 24-September 6, 1962, pp. 8-9.

⁹⁶ U.S.A., August 24-September 6, 1962, p. 9.

⁹⁷ Quoted in U.S.A., August 24-September 6, 1962, p. 8.

⁹⁸ The Chicago Tribune, May 27, 1963.

⁹⁹ The Chicago Tribune, October 14, 1963.

¹⁰⁰ Tocsin, January 22, 1964, p. 2.

¹⁰¹ Chicago Daily News, May 19, 1964.

¹⁰² "The Center Diary," July 1964, pp. 3-4.

¹⁰³ "The Center Diary," July 1964, p. 5.

¹⁰⁴ Tocsin, June 8, 1964, p. 4.

¹⁰⁵ Tocsin, June 8, 1964, p. 4 (quoted from).

¹⁰⁶ Tocsin, June 8, 1964, p. 4.

¹⁰⁷ Chicago Tribune, July 27, 1964.

¹⁰⁸ Tocsin, August 29, 1964, p. 1.

¹⁰⁹ Tocsin, August 29, 1964, p. 1.

¹¹⁰ "Operation Understanding: Edition of Our Sunday Visitor, February 21, 1965" (reproduced in Lutheran News, February 22, 1965, p. 12); The St. Louis Review, February 26, 1965 (quoted in Lutheran News, March 8, 1965, p. 12); Tocsin, March 11, 1965, p. 4.

¹¹¹ Tocsin, March 11, 1965, p. 4.

¹¹² Tocsin, March 11, 1965, p. 4.

¹¹³ The New York Times, August 30, 1965.

¹¹⁴ "A General Prospectus on the Convocation Series in Major American Cities" (Advertising Leaflet).

¹¹⁵ "Fellowship Peace Information Edition", August 1965, p. 3.

¹¹⁶ "Prospectus for the International Convocation of Pacem in Terris" (Advertising Leaflet).

¹¹⁷ Chicago Tribune, September 29, 1965, p. 22.

[From U.S.A., vol. XIV, No. 26, Feb. 9, 1968]
GUIDE TO TUMULT IN AMERICA: A REVIEW OF "STUDENTS AND SOCIETY"
(By Alice Widener)

(NOTE.—A report by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions on its three day conference "Students and Society" held at the Center, Santa Barbara, California, late in August 1967.)

Are you worried about the violence, tumult, immorality and revolutionary activism on the American campus?

Are you at a loss to understand and explain the link between revolutionary activity on campus and in city streets as demonstrated in riots, illegal civil disobedience, defiance of our laws and disaffection from our way of life?

Do you feel in need of documentation to support your arguments against these activities? Do you want to have black-on-white proof that your concern is well based?

If so, you need look no further for substantiation of your worst fears than the 64-page document "Students and Society" issued December 1967 by the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California. The report carries the major part of discussions that took place at the Center during its three-day conference late last August on "Students and Society." In a foreword to the document, W. H. Ferry, vice president of the Center, says that the discussions might have been called "The Worried Citizen's Guide to Tumult on the Campus."

That would be a most accurate title. But Mr. Ferry's concept of the worried citizen is far different from that of most Americans. The "mood" of the Funded conference, he says, was "hammering discontent." The participants, he explains, "look on the United States and find it abounding in hopeless contradictions, hypocrisy, and wrongdoing. They see no benevolence in the works of the nation outside its borders, only a new imperialism that takes vicious and irrational form in Vietnam and shows itself everywhere else only as the selfish exploitation of human beings."

That is quite an indictment. Our declared enemies could not say worse.

Year after year, it seems the mood of conferences financed and sponsored by the Center at Santa Barbara in hot summertime grows uglier and uglier, more and more threatening. It bodes ill for our country.

It was in August 1965, according to an article by Paul White in the *Houston Post*, that Julian Bond, Simon Casady, Stokely Carmichael and a host of militants assembled "at the facilities of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions" to found the National Conference for New Politics which, in September 1967, held a Communist-Black Power dominated conference in Chicago that made nationwide headlines for its revolutionary radicalism and disgracefully undemocratic procedures.

It was on August 24, 1967, that Tom O'Brien, staff writer for the *Santa Barbara News-Press*, reported under the headline "University Destruction" that "A master plan of how best to destroy the American university system as it is today seemed to be the goal as a conference of militant student leaders and ex-students opened yesterday at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions here. The participants were de-

scribed by the Center as all having been prominent in demonstrations and movements within their own colleges and universities."

Mr. O'Brien further reported, "Devereaux Kennedy, student body president at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., called for outright revolution and the overthrow of the United States Government. He advocated terrorism on such a scale that it would 'demoralize and castrate America.'"

Now in February 1968, we have not yet witnessed the full workings of the master plan. But most of its strategy and tactics can be found in the Center's report on the conference "Students and Society." The Center publishes its documents, described as "occasional papers," with disclaimers of responsibility for the contents. Yet the foreword by W. H. Ferry to the December 1967 report states:

"Themes of the meeting and arrangements for it were the responsibility of four Junior Fellows of the Center, who had spent the summer in residence: Frederick Richman; Jeffrey Elman; Stephen Saltonstall; and Daniel Sisson.

"This is an edited record of the proceedings. It also contains extracts from papers presented by the Junior Fellows that sought to expose the main issues.

"After nine hours of discussion restricted to the young members of the conference, the Center's Senior Fellows—in attendance throughout—joined the conversation for a half-day.

"The unedited transcript, including formal papers, runs to some 75,000 words. This publication contains approximately two-thirds that number. The effort has been to leave substance, tone, and style unimpaired."

Mr. Ferry concludes his foreword with the following acknowledgement: "The conference on Students and Society was made possible by a generous contribution from S. Herbert Meller of New York City." Inquiry at the Fund for the Republic's offices in New York City elicited the information that Mr. Meller is an investment banker with offices at One Chase Manhattan Plaza.

The official Center list of student conference participants, including Junior Fellows identified with an asterisk, is as follows: Jeffrey Alexander, Harvard *Crimson*, Harvard University.

Anthony Andalman, Editor, *The Worrier*, University High School, Los Angeles.

Frank Bardacke, University of California, Berkeley.

John Blood, Student Body President, Indiana University.

Ewart F. Brown, Student Body President, Howard University.

Kristin G. Cleage, Wayne State University.

* Jeffrey Elman, Harvard University.

Michael Goldfield, Radical Education Project, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Michael Higgins, Claremont College.

Devereaux Kennedy, Student Body President, Washington University.

Sheila Langdon, Marlboro College.

Michael Lerner, Executive Committee, Free Speech Movement, University of California, Berkeley.

Bruce Levine, Editor, *Thought*, Valley Stream High School, New York.

Peter Lyman, Student Body President, Stanford University.

Ray Mungo, Boston University.

Robert Pardun, Secretary for Internal Education, Students for a Democratic Society, Chicago, Illinois.

Mary Quinn, Mount Mercy College.

* Frederick Richman, New York University.

* Stephen Saltonstall, Yale University.

David Seeley, University of California, Santa Barbara.

* Daniel Sisson, Claremont College.

Stanley Wise, Executive Secretary, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Atlanta, Georgia.

The "Junior Fellows" also are listed as orga-

nizers of the conference. The Center Senior Fellows who took part in the final discussion were: Robert M. Hutchins; Stringfellow Barr; Scott Buchanan; John R. Seeley; James A. Pike (formerly Bishop Pike); Rexford G. Tugwell; Harvey Wheeler, Hallock Hoffman; W. H. Ferry; and John Wilkinson.

FIRST SESSION

The first session of "Students and Society" opened with presentation of a paper "The Disenfranchised Majority" by Junior Fellow Frederick Richman. He states that "the generation gap" today is such that society ought to adapt itself to youth who are "largely disenfranchised in terms of traditional political power" yet desirous of "social control" over the conditions affecting their lives. "Students today," he writes, "tend to dismiss all people over 30, including the older radicals from the 1930's."

The last part of his statement is not true. Many radical students of today are hand-in-hand with such older members of the Communist Party, U.S.A. as Herbert Aptheker, Arnold Johnson, Claude Lightfoot and Richard Criley. The latter three played key roles in the National Conference for New Politics meeting in Chicago last September.

What Richman wants is the politicalization of the university. "The reform I propose," he writes, "is that the university become a political institution." He wants "political activism" to become "the central educational experience."

Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Center, asked Richman several challenging questions, among which was "How do you keep from growing old?"

Richman replied, "The main contention in my paper is that youth is now in a position to exert considerable power. . . . The police action against the teenyboppers on Sunset Strip in Los Angeles was as significant as the student strikes at Berkeley. Both incidents reflect a society that oppresses its youth. . . . However, if we are going to achieve a revolution consciously carried forth by American youth, that youth will have to be organized as youth and given a new position in America. . . ."

Michael Lerner, of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, said it would be "very dangerous" for students to gain more control over the university without their struggling for control "as part of a larger struggle of people from the ghetto and abroad for control over their institutions." Lerner said he doesn't want to help focus the growing energy of students "into the main stream" of society. He said he doesn't want students' alienation from society to be transformed "into alignment with a lousy, corrupt society." He called for permanent forms of alienation even "after the revolution," and said the student power struggle must be "part of the struggle going on in the ghetto and Vietnam and in Latin America" and that student radicals should try to "bring people to that awareness."

Devereaux Kennedy said that if student power at universities were exerted only for "reformists' reforms" then it could be a reactionary force; he wants student power to demand "revolutionary reforms" that can't be met within the logic of the existing American system.

Jeffrey Elman of Harvard University said students should have the ability "to determine how the university is going to be run."

Daniel Sisson of Claremont College said the real problem is how to "activate" the students.

Michael Lerner declared, "National liberation struggles have become the order of the day."

John Blood, Peter Lyman, and Frank Bardacke have other ideas, arguing for less directly political and perhaps more educational activism in the universities. Devereaux Kennedy argued that politics are implicit "in the way the university is structured. You

can't change, for instance, the fact that Boards of Regents or Boards of Trustees run the universities and that they are all businessmen. As far as I am concerned they have no business at all to do with the universities. . . ."

The discussion bogged down for a while into argument over whether students should revolutionize the university first, or join in the movement to revolutionize all society in general.

Michael Goldfield of the Students for a Democratic Society's Radical Education Project charged that at the University of Chicago things are "tied up to the Daley political machine in the city, to the college structure in Chicago, to the corporate structure, and particularly to the military."

After more debate, Ewart Brown of Howard University said, "I think we agree that the revolution is necessary and that you don't conduct a revolution by attacking the strongest enemy first. You take care of your business at home first, and then you move abroad. Thus, we must make the university the home of the revolution. . . ."

Stanley Wise of Snick said "Youth must view themselves as *being* the government and not as petitioning the government." He defined youth as "anything from twelve up." He then defined present day education as "counter-revolutionary." He charged that educational institutions today are training individuals "in an art called criminology" whose object is to prevent poor people from getting the food and clothing they need.

Stephen Saltonstall called on students to be "the instruments of change." The kind of change he wants is a "strategy of disruption," which he elucidated in a paper presented at the third conference session. After discussion by Cleage, Higgins and Lyman, Robert Pardun of Students for a Democratic Society said, "It is important to understand, if we are going to consider ourselves revolutionaries in any sense of the word, that revolution is never made out of empathy for other people. Revolution comes out of your guts. . . ."

Devereaux Kennedy attacked the whole idea of the "corporate structure" of the university and alleged it is undemocratic. He said that students can, if they work hard enough "get women in their rooms and get control of the regulations over their conduct. . . ."

SECOND SESSION

A paper presented by Jeffrey Elman of Harvard University was discussed at the second session of the Students and Society conference at the Fund for the Republic's Center at Santa Barbara. "The university today is sick," declared Elman. He charged that the position of students is one of "second-class citizenship." He praised past events at Berkeley and said, "Many other campuses are responding positively to the Berkeley example." He too demanded "sole control" by students over their behavior, and he pooch-pooched the university administration's past claim at Berkeley that it acts *in loco parentis*. Students, said Elman, should determine "their own social code."

There was discussion of elite and non-elite universities, of big and small ones, and general agreement that all are undemocratic. Devereaux Kennedy said that David Seeley of the University of California at Santa Barbara and other students had been using the word "revolution" loosely and mumbling it under their breath. "I'm going to say loudly and explicitly what I mean by revolution," said Kennedy. "What I mean by revolution is overthrowing the American government and American imperialism and installing some sort of decentralized power in this country."

The student body president of Washington University at St. Louis, Devereaux Kennedy, went on to say, "I'll tell you the steps that I think will be needed. First of all,

starting up fifty Vietnams in Third World countries. This is going to come about by black rebellions in our cities joined by some white people. People in universities can do a number of things to help it. They have access to money and they can give these people guns, which I think they should do. They can engage in acts of terrorism and sabotage outside the ghetto. Negro people have trouble getting out because they cordoned those areas off, but white activists can go outside, and they can blow things up and I think they should.

"But that's just a minor part of it. The major thing student activists can do while all this is going on—I mean completely demoralizing and castrating America—is to give people a vision of something other than what they have now. They can give them a vision of people living as whole men, not as engineers for Monsanto or McDonnell Aircraft. . . . They can show people what America is capable of if it ends imperialism and installs a different kind of system, where, for example, people only have to work two hours a day and might spend twenty years in and out of the universities learning a few things. . . ."

At this point in the published report on the conference "Students and Society" held at the Center at Santa Barbara, last summer, there is no evidence in the text that any Senior Fellow interrupted Devereaux Kennedy's remarks, or interposed any objection. Nor are there any appended remarks or comments by Senior Fellows at the end of the text on the Second Session. What Devereaux Kennedy said is presented without even a whisper of demurrer by allegedly more mature intellectuals.

The Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions enjoys tax exemption granted by our Federal government. Under the existing Federal terms for tax-exemption, can Devereaux Kennedy's remarks be legitimately regarded as "educational"? Were the plottings of Mafia hoods at the notorious Appalachia meeting in New York any more inimical to our society?

In commenting on Kennedy's outburst, Frank Bardacke talked about "the life of the mind" at universities and said its present function is to teach students how to behave in large organizations. He said, "I think the immediate goal of the student movement on the university campus is to teach people how to *misbehave* in large organizations, how to misbehave creatively. . . . It's no accident that recruits for the New Left always come from the best students on the campus, the ones who are really interested in getting an education. I would like to hear less talk about revolution and more thought about what at the moment we can actually achieve." Bardacke charged that New Left impatience for immediate results led to defections from their group by students who became hippies. "Sure, you want revolution;" he agreed, "sure, you want to change this country fundamentally—absolutely agreed. You have to have that long-range goal, but you also have to think about what actually can be achieved in our own lifetimes. . . ."

Devereaux Kennedy objected that Bardacke's statements about the New Left were inaccurate. He said that Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) started out with three or four thousand members and now has 30,000. He said that when they found out they couldn't stop the Vietnam War and take care of other social problems, they got a thing called the Radical Education Project and the New Left Notes, "which are probably the most sophisticated sociology coming out of the United States today." He said the New Left had not become hippie, that it had become "revolutionary," and that there is now more revolutionary talk and action in SDS than when it was founded in 1962.

Stanley Wise of SNICK said he didn't think revolution would come in our country for at least 75 to 100 years. "I think I'll see controlled, very sophisticated guerrilla activity before I die," he said, "and I will possibly see sophisticated sabotage before I die. But I don't think I'll see revolution."

He advocated "positive non-violent activity, if for no other reason than that it can disrupt the life-line institutions in this country." He announced, "The process has begun."

Jeffrey Alexander of Harvard said that a good way to accomplish students' objectives "is to try to organize a boycott of classes, which is about the only way to bring a university to a halt. And it's the one thing students can do."

There was more talk in the second session of the conference on "Students and Society" at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, talk about who would furnish plans for a new society "once the country is on its knees," and also talk about constructive and destructive revolutionary and social programs. In conclusion, there was present a paper by Michael Lerner which called for student power through students' joining in "radical struggles" and using their intellectual training "as their major weapon in the struggle."

THIRD SESSION

At the outset of the third conference session, Stephen Saltonstall, a Yale student, presented a paper entitled "Toward a Strategy of Disruption." His remarks were so inflammatory that some of them found their way into the press which quoted them in shocked dismay; but few editors expected, one would suspect, that a tax-exempt, allegedly respectable organization would later publish Saltonstall's remarks for widespread distribution.

Saltonstall's thesis is that "students are capable of sabotaging the society with disruption." He says, "Our contemporaries in the ghettos are way ahead of us. They have demonstrated that a small, concentrated minority group can significantly disrupt American society. . . . The universities, populated by a large, exploited, powerless mass, are the middle-class-ghettos. With a little effort, they too can be made to explode."

Stephen Saltonstall went on to say students could "immobilize the R.O.T.C. on the campuses"; could stop defense research from being carried out at universities. "The introduction of a small quantity of LSD in only five or six government department coffee-urns might be a highly effective tactic."

It might be so effective as to be murderous! The Commissioner of Narcotics Control in New York City and also the medical authorities say that if a person suffering from a heart condition, or diabetes, or any one of several other diseases, were to take LSD unknowingly, the effect might be exceedingly harmful and even fatal.

How can any responsible source be a party to publishing such wicked tripe as Stephen Saltonstall's blabbering and then subsidize its distribution to students, educational, church and civic groups? How could any organization pretending to be interested in democracy publish without denunciation such a criminal suggestion as Saltonstall's? Authorities in the Justice Department say there are strict Federal laws against tampering with government property; a government coffee-urn or drinking fountain is protected from willful contamination by those laws. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas is an official consultant to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions which published Saltonstall's LSD suggestion in the Center's document "Students and Society." Does Justice Douglas believe that suggestions for possibly murderous tampering with government property comes under the heading of free speech and is protected by the First Amendment?

There is no limit, it seems to young Salton-

stall's creative imagination for malicious disruption. Nor does it seem, is there any limit to the kind of malice against our nation that the Fund for the Republic's Center at Santa Barbara will give voice to, claiming it belongs under the decent heading of "intellectual dialogue." For example: Stephen Saltonstall suggests that students "overuse the bureaucracy" of the university through making appointments "by the score" with assistants to deans and registrars "just for the hell of it." He suggests that "an inordinate number of library books can be checked out" to disrupt the university. He suggests "IBM cards can be bent so they will be rejected by computers."

To disrupt the economy, Saltonstall suggests that "small bits of sabotage by individuals—the sending of business reply cards through the mails, or overpaying one's phone bill by a penny—would have a decided cumulative effect."

In a final burst of destructiveness, Saltonstall writes the following exhortation which is put into print by the Center at Santa Barbara: "We have the power to bring the American Juggernaut to a halt. Let us paralyze the university; let us ball up the economy. One day soon, Congressmen and Presidents may petition us not we them. Let us therefore disrupt. We have nothing to lose."

In the discussion following presentation of Saltonstall's strategy, several conferees brought up the question of what students would do with power once they achieved it. David Seeley and Devereaux Kennedy were concerned with parietal hours at the university. Seeley objected that due to university regulations "you can't make love when you want—you've got to wait." Kennedy said students should inform university authorities "I ought to have my own say over when I have whom in my dorm."

During the Third Session, Michael Goldfield of the SDS Radical Education Project related in detail how radical anti-draft activity was plotted and carried out at the University of Chicago. What Goldfield said should be studied by every responsible patriotic school and university administrator in our nation for his tale is an extremely concise and clear exposition of revolutionary technique:

"When the decision was made at Chicago that class ranks would be turned in to the draft board, a group of people in the local SDS decided that the undergraduates in the university would be really up tight about the draft. This is a gut issue. So we picked this issue and went to the administration and demanded that ranking be ended."

Goldfield describes how the SDS agitators went "through channels" to the university administration merely as a way of "educating" the student body. Then he describes how the agitators drew up and circulated a petition, got signatures of faculty and students "just dealing with that one issue," and then organized a meeting of the petitioners. "At that point," relates Goldfield, "people demanded that if the administration didn't come through in the next two weeks they would take over the administration building." Goldfield went on to explain, "If you keep as your central demand that students have a right to control everything involving them, that this demand isn't negotiable and you'll disrupt until they give in, then you have a certain amount of leverage. What's important however small the issue you start with, is to keep everything centered on the question of control. That's the way you educate people as to how the university works and to how power reacts to demands which are central to the vested interests in the university. If you are dealing with a very reactionary institution, you have to plan your dealings with it very strategically."

At the end of the Center's edited report on the third session of the conference "Students and Society," there are four brief com-

ments by Senior Fellows of the Center. Among them is one by Hallock Hoffman who was its Secretary and Treasurer for many years and is now listed as chairman of the board of the tax-exempt Pacifica Foundation which subsidizes the very controversial radio station WBAI in San Francisco and New York. (The radical Students for a Democratic Society announced this month that its New York City regional group will be given a 15-minute weekly program by WBAI-FM on Wednesday evenings at seven o'clock. This is not surprising in view of Senior Fellow Hallock Hoffman's comments on Junior Fellow Stephen Saltonstall's paper and the ensuing discussion that took place at the Center last August.) Mr. Hoffman said:

"You have to make some reasonable connection between the means you have chosen and the ends you seek. Suppose you and a variety of other oppressed [sic] minorities succeed in causing coercion and sabotage against property of the kind you describe. Don't you have to show how this will forward your interest in stopping the war or bringing about a more just, more humane society?"

Mr. Hoffman's acceptance of Mr. Stephen Saltonstall of Yale and Mr. Jeffrey Alexander of Harvard as members of an "oppressed minority" has to be seen in print to be believed. What adult sycophancy for juvenile intellectual delinquency!

FOURTH SESSION

A paper entitled "The Dialogue: Youth and Society" was presented by Daniel Sisson of Claremont College as opener for the fourth session of the Center conference at Santa Barbara. Its tenor may be judged by this Sissonism: "Youth everywhere are rejecting the institutions that have dominated their lives, while the adults are demanding ever more loudly that they had better 'come around.' Simply taking one example—the adults' attitude toward drugs—it is not implausible to estimate that by 1980, 85 per cent of the young will be felons while the other 15 per cent will be Fascists, trained to keep them under control."

Sisson is against violence and for "dialogue." He wants peaceful dialogue to lay the groundwork for peaceful revolution. He was a "soft" socialist among the hard-nosed activists at the Center conference.

An accurate summary of the differences in revolutionary opinion among the Junior Fellows and "student" participants in the Center conference of last August appears in the foreword by W. H. Ferry. He writes:

"Two divisions appear early in the proceedings, never to be reconciled. The first is between the radicals—those prescribing a clean sweep of corrupt American institutions and their replacement by others formed on democratic and compassionate lines—and the reformists—those believing that all needed improvements, however imperative, can be made from within society's present structures."

There is nothing at all new in this difference of opinion, which is as old as socialism itself, as old as the split early in our century between the Second and Third International, as old as the split between the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks, as old as the split between Kerensky and Lenin, as old as the split between Norman Thomas and the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Only the split isn't a lasting or effective or irrevocable one, because the fundamental objective of the Leftists is the same—the destruction of capitalism and the middle class—and whenever it is expedient for them to do so, the reformist socialists and the revolutionary socialists join forces. Historically, the reformists and violent revolutionaries have worked together toward one goal; it is only when they approach its final achievement that reformists and revolutionaries disagree on how to deliver the death blow. At that moment, the reformists shrink

away from use of unlimited violence. But it is too late for them to oppose the violent revolutionaries, so the reformists are thrust aside or liquidated and the merciless "gut fighters" take over.

In reply to Daniel Sisson's paper, Michael Lerner of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement said:

"Nobody here with any sort of sanity is claiming that the revolution that will change this country is a student revolution. What we are claiming is that students have a role to play in that revolution. . . . Nobody is saying that the students themselves or the radical parts of the student body are going to make a revolution, but they can add something to a revolution of oppressed people in this country, which is part of the revolution of people over the world."

Devereaux Kennedy said: "What we have to do, first of all, is to define what we think the enemy is. There's no doubt in my mind about the enemy. It's monopoly capitalism and imperialism. . . ."

That monopoly capitalism and imperialism are "the enemy" is what Karl Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Kossygin, Mao Tse Tung, Fidel Castro, Gus Hall and every other Communist has said. Communism is the theory that capitalism is by nature monopolistic and that the most advanced stage of capitalism is imperialism.

Devereaux Kennedy explained:

"When I talk about revolution, that's what I mean. I'm not talking about eliminating dialogue; I'm saying that you have to place your dialogue within this context of events. I see this process coming a lot quicker than our friend from SNCC see it. I don't think it's going to take seventy-five years. I think you are going to see chaos in the United States and in the world within our lifetime, in the next twenty-five years."

The discussion of the fourth session of the Students and Society conference at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions last August is followed in the Center's report by a paper on the student press by Raymond Mungo of Boston University. He accuses the American press of perpetuating myths—"The Great Myth, the Camelot legend of America," and secondary myths, "such as God, the Flag, family, the Pot Menace, the Unpunctured Hymen, the Value of the American Dollar, and the Importance of an Ordered Life." Mungo says that "working with an established framework of student newspaper and radio stations. . . the radical on campus has more power than in an SDS office or student-government sham post." He calls for assumption of "international responsibilities" by the student press and radio "far beyond merely relating to the war in Vietnam" and he says the student media must be prepared to send its representatives around the world to produce an international journalism that is "removed from ties with the American economic system. Students must come to view their relationship with what is happening in Cuba, in China, in North Vietnam, and in the fascist and racist-by-policy states—South Africa, Greece, Spain. The effective way to overcome their national consciousness and loyalties is to replace it with an international one. . . ."

A footnote to the Mungo paper states that the author was unable, at the last moment, to take part in the conference at Santa Barbara.

FIFTH SESSION

After hours of listening to the Junior Fellows and their age-and-ideological brothers, the Senior Fellows of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions got their chance to speak up at the fifth and final session of the conference "Students and Society." The first to take the floor was President Robert M. Hutchins. His main criticism of the students' moral and intellectual position was, "I didn't hear anyone give an intelligible idea of what he thought the uni-

versity ought to be, or what he thought education was. One of the things I expected to learn from the conference was what kind of university, what kind of education, you wanted."

Mr. Hutchins certainly seems to know what kind of university and what kind of education he himself doesn't want. "During the years that I have lived in California," he said, "nobody has said anything about the University of California in its behalf except that it has a great deal of money, a great deal of acreage, a great many students, a lot of Nobel Prize winners, and sometimes some good football players."

Mr. Hutchins went on:

"The question about your rhetorical position and your strategy runs something like this. A real crime has been committed against the younger generation and that is that it can't get educated. And this is something that you know something about. You don't know any more about monopoly capitalism or the war in Vietnam than your elders, but you do know something about the difficulties of getting educated in the United States. If I were seeking to bring the university to a halt, I would try to bring it to a halt on educational grounds. . . . If you change the university you change society."

In his commentary, President Hutchins said not a single word in defense or praise of our country, its economic system, its way of life. He let stand uncorrected every libel against the American people and their government.

So did Stringfellow Barr. His concern was that the students didn't express what they would like to have happen to their minds. "I was a little shocked at this excitement about power without any clear idea that I was able to apprehend of your purpose in getting power," he said. "We have been treated to a pretty heavy dose in the last few years of the uses of power; and I get the impression from the White House and the military that early in the Vietnamese engagement, for instance, we were going to give the world an example of how power can conclusively solve problems. . . ."

Scott Buchanan said the students were talking about power "in ways that make me want to spank you. . . . The only purpose that I can see that you connect to this power, and which might make it substantial, is a form of socialism, a very primitive form of socialism. All your Marxian talk about it is superficial and comes to one sharp point—and that is that you are very sure that the people who now have the power that you are going to take will not give it up unless you hit them over the head. This is a Marxian theme that has shifted a good deal in the last few years. It seems to me that you ought to revise some of your thoughts accordingly."

Mr. Buchanan continued, "The thing that makes me weep, almost literally, is the impression I get that you, as a generation, have never had any good teaching." Mr. Buchanan's main concern was with the quality of teaching, which he wants to see regenerated. "This is what's missing; and you have confirmed this loss beyond all my expectations here this week."

John R. Seeley, Dean and Director of Program at the Center, put forth what he described as "liberal" objections to what the students advocated because they had not described "a going model of how it might be when all tyrannies are finally relegated to the dustbin of history." He said, "What can I recommend? Not that you abate your revolutionary fervor or extend your revolutionary timetable. Not even that this revolution be carried forward in the spirit of the original Free Speech Movement. . . ."

Praising the original movement, Mr. Seeley described it as "a strange mix of near hippyism, good humor, and standard high-mindedness and revolutionary fervor." Evi-

dently, he is enamored of the hippies. He asked Junior Fellows and fellow conferees, "Should you turn so lightly away from an alternative way? One that could also bring down the managed, exploitative, imperialist society by withdrawal of what it depends upon: brains, bodies, and the willingness to manipulate things and people?" Mr. Seeley said it is not yet clear that the radicals can attract greater numbers to their cause than the hippies can, and he suggested to the radicals "that at least, while the warring armies march and countermarch, lay waste the world they cannot otherwise save, they reserve a special place (like the medieval monasteries) for the hippies—a special place not just geographic but honorific."

James Pike, formerly Bishop Pike, said not a single word of reproach concerning the conferees' remarks. His only point was how does one keep a continuity of values between that which is to come and that which most people would agree ought to come "and at the same time get things the way they ought to be?"

Rexford Tugwell said "I have some news for my younger colleagues here—there isn't going to be any revolution. I don't think any of you really expect that there will be one. There will be a kind of revolution, but it won't be one you are talking about." He said he had seen many changes in his lifetime and that American history would change "even more fundamentally" in the next two decades. He said Americans will get mastery of the technology "that at the moment seems to have got the best of us" and that, "One of you may become President of the United States some day, and then, I assure you, you will take a very different view of revolution."

Mr. Tugwell's statement provoked an outburst from the next speaker, Senior Fellow Harvey Wheeler, co-author of the novel "Fall-Safe." "I think it is inexcusable for us to berate these students in this way. We have almost with one voice expected them somehow to produce some kind of idea of a university and put it into practice. . . . This avuncular stance is not the proper one for us to take in this kind of meeting." Mr. Wheeler called for "enclaves of radicalism" inside the university and said, "The most that you can do in the short years of passage is to provide some kind of cauldron that can be kept burning."

Hallock Hoffman, former Secretary and Treasurer of the Center and present board chairman of the Pacifica Foundation said, "I wish to dissociate myself from the general weight of the comments of my colleagues. My response to you is one of excitement, enjoyment, and enthusiasm about the way you are challenging everything." He went on to make a strong plea for young people to be "CO's," conscientious objectors to military service.

W. H. Ferry said, "I agree with everybody." He advised the radical students to "get out of the ghettos and into the suburbs. There's no Negro problem but there is an enormous white problem." He said that in the suburbs, which are full of the middle class, the students "might be able to do a good deal more than you can in ghettos or other places where things are already popping like hell."

Senior Fellow John R. Seeley called for re-examination of a proposal he made several years ago—a suggestion that "we try to institute a university in which activism—at every level that people are willing to commit themselves to—will be a requirement and a core of the university apart from its own self-government." He said he further suggested that all education be organized around that activism in terms of a form that would release "the full moral force and full energy of students at the same time that they were acquiring an education relevant to what they were doing."

Mr. Seeley's advocacy of activism is paradoxical for a self-professed Center Senior Fel-

low admirer of the hippies. His remarks are illustrative of the dangerous intellectual confusion, plain muddleheadedness, and utter nonsense of what passes for "intellectual dialogue" at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

If it were not that the Center is subsidizing and giving logistic support to violent radicals with whom some Senior Fellows are afraid to go along but are willing to promote and foist upon the American people, the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions would not be worth an iota of serious attention. But the Center—in August 1965 and August 1967—was a womb for monstrous activism such as that which took place at the National Conference for New Politics meeting in Chicago last Labor Day weekend, and the demonstration at the Pentagon last October.

Evidently, what goes on at Center conferences in August does indeed furnish worried American citizens with exactly what W. H. Ferry, vice president of the Center, says it does—a "guide to tumult" in America, on and off campus.

[From U.S.A. magazine]

FUNDED DISRUPTION

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK CITY, January 12, 1968.—Each dollar of income received by a tax-exempt foundation is a dollar that did not furnish revenue to the U.S. Government. All money received by foundations is granted exemption from taxation by the U.S. Treasury, meaning by grace of all Americans. Is it to our national interest, I should like to ask, for the Treasury to grant tax-exemption to the Fund for the Republic?

The Fund subsidizes a think-tank, The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, at Santa Barbara, California. Currently, it is distributing widely a document, "Students and Society" which is a report on a student conference held at the Center last summer. In the report is a paper presented to the conference by student Stephen Saltonstall of Yale University, who entitled his work "Toward a Strategy of Disruption." What Mr. Saltonstall wishes to disrupt is our society and he calls for small, disciplined groups of student "shock troops" to achieve his aims. In print, at U.S. taxpayers' surference, the Fund for the Republic's Center permits Stephen Saltonstall to call for the "intimidation and humiliation" of public figures such as Vice President Humphrey and Defense Secretary McNamara.

What has "intimidation" to do with democratic procedures and institutions? Intimidation is the weapon of autocracy or tyranny. Mr. Saltonstall calls on students to harry university professors and researchers "at their homes." Is invasion of privacy a part of "democratic" procedure? Stephen Saltonstall also suggests—in funded black-on-white, believe it or not—"The introduction of a small quantity of LSD in only five or six government department coffeurns might be a highly effective tactic."

It could be a lethal one. State and federal narcotics control officials have informed me that a dose of LSD administered in coffee to a person suffering from an undetected physical ailment, such as a heart condition or diabetes, could be extremely harmful physically and perhaps fatal. From state and federal legal authorities, I learned that tampering with government property—such as a coffee urn or drinking fountain—is illegal.

How does it further the general welfare or "democratic institutions" for the Fund for the Republic to subsidize Saltonstall's suggestions for illegal student activity in a strategy of disruption?

A foreword to "Students and Society" by W. H. Ferry, vice president of the Fund's Center, states, "This is an edited record of the conference proceedings. Therefore Sal-

tonstall's suggestions were printed with malice aforethought." Mr. Ferry also states, "The conference on Students and Society was made possible by a generous contribution from S. Herbert Meller of New York City." Mr. Meller is an investment banker with Meller & Co., One Chase Manhattan Plaza.

He and the Fund for the Republic helped finance the following printed statement in "Students and Society" by Devereaux Kennedy, student body president, Washington University: "I'm going to say loudly and clearly what I mean by revolution. What I mean by revolution is overthrowing the American government and American imperialism and installing some sort of decentralized power in this country." As steps to accomplish his purpose, Devereaux Kennedy proposes "starting up fifty Vietnams in Third World countries . . . acts of terrorism and sabotage outside the ghetto . . . I mean completely demoralizing and castrating America . . ."

Mr. W. H. Ferry says "the mood" of Students and Society is "hammering discontent, combined with impatience for action." The Fund for the Republic and Mr. Meller are subsidizing that mood. It bodes ill for all of us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL, for Wednesday, May 12 and Thursday, May 22, on account of official business—to address graduating classes at commencement.

Mr. McCLOSKEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of May 19, on account of official business.

Mr. WIGGINS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 20 through June 3, on account of official business.

Mr. RAILSBACK (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of May 19, 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. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland), for 30 minutes, on May 21, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PODELL for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARSH) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. CORMAN, for 60 minutes, on June 10.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEALL of Maryland) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. MINSHALL in three instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. WOLD in two instances.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. COLLINS in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. LIPSCOMB in three instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in four instances.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of California in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. HAGAN in four instances.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6269. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of South Carolina.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to authorize the President to reappoint as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for an additional term of 1 year, the officer serving in that position on April 1, 1969.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6269. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of South Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 21, 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:

787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the requests for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91-117); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

788. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the activities of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

789. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract providing for the operation of facilities and services for the public at the North Beach development (Malaquite Beach), Padre Island National Seashore, Tex., for a term of approximately 20 years, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC 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. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 10791. A bill to amend the budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to direct the Comptroller General to establish information and data processing systems, and for other purposes (Rep. No. 91-258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 413. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11271, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes (Rep. No. 91-259). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 414. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11400, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes (Rep. No. 91-260). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8261. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rep. No. 91-261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 11102. A bill to amend the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical

facilities by providing separate authorizations of appropriations for new construction and for modernization of facilities, authorizing Federal guarantees of loans for such construction and modernization and Federal payment of part of the interest thereon, authorizing grants for modernization of emergency rooms of general hospitals, and extending and making other improvements in the program authorized by these provisions; with amendment (Rep. No. 91-262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 11440. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11441. 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. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11442. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11443. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of certain former alien employees of the United States who have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11444. 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.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 11445. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 11446. 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. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 11447. 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. CORBETT:

H.R. 11448. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the making of guaranteed loans for the modernization of hospitals and other health facilities and otherwise to facilitate the modernization and improvement of hospitals and other health facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11449. 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.

H.R. 11450. A bill to amend section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, relating to representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11451. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to disability insurance benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act or to child's or widow's insurance benefits on the basis of disability under section 202 of such act, and individuals in the corresponding categories under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 11452. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 11453. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the inclusion of certain cost estimates of certain measures reported by the standing committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 11454. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11455. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to eliminate the provisions of section 9 thereof concerning two or more members of a family in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11456. A bill to modify the regulatory requirement that the son or daughter of an employee of the postal field service may be appointed to summer employment in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11457. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase OASDI benefits and raise the earnings base, with subsequent adjustments as the cost of living rises, to increase widows' and widowers' benefits, and to liberalize eligibility for disability benefits; to make disabled beneficiaries eligible for medicare without regard to age, to finance the medical insurance program entirely from general revenues, and to cover prescription drugs; and to provide for a study of child health care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11458. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has enough quarters of coverage to be fully insured for old-age benefit purposes, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11459. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 11460. A bill to aid the U.S. Postal Establishment in providing for the accumulation, analysis, and dissemination of reliable and meaningful financial, statistical, and accounting information in regard to all third-class mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11461. 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. PERKINS:

H.R. 11462. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the voluntary program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11463. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that extended-care services follow hospitalization in order to qualify for payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11464. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 11465. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the mailing of mail matter by relatives to members of the Armed Forces overseas at no cost to such relatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11466. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt wages of certain seasonal employees from withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 11467. 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. TAFT:

H.R. 11468. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to increase the penalties for wrongful disclosure of information by employees of the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. OLSEN, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 11469. 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. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. YATES, Mr. VANIK, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MARSH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 11470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. Diggs, Mr. FRASER, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 11471. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself and Mr. REES):

H.R. 11472. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 11473. A bill to promote the advancement of biological research in aging through a comprehensive and intensive 5-year program for the systematic study of the basic origins of the aging process in human beings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 11474. A bill to reclassify certain key positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (for himself, Mr. REES, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RUMSFELD, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 11475. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H.R. 11476. A bill to encourage the States to improve their workmen's compensation laws to assure adequate coverage and benefits to employees injured in the mining industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11477. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, to authorize restrictions and prohibitions on the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides which pollute the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11478. A bill 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.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11479. A bill to establish the Inter-agency Committee on Spanish-American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 11480. A bill providing for Federal railroad safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11481. A bill to provide for financial disclosure by members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11482. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to authorize certain agreements relating to withholding of State income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11483. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has enough quarters of coverage to be fully insured for old-age benefit purposes, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H.R. 11484. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the sale or delivery of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 11485. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit the granting of authority to broadcast pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 11486. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a higher-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 11487. A bill to require the Federal Aviation Administrator to prescribe a minimum altitude of flight for aircraft in the airspace over Mount Vernon estate, the home of George Washington, in Fairfax County, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 11488. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the granting of authority by the Federal Communications Commission for the broadcast of pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 11489. A bill to designate the Lincoln back-country wilderness "Helena National Forest," "Lewis and Clark National Forest," and "Lolo National Forest" in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11490. A bill to expedite the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Lewis and Clark Trail Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11491. A bill to provide for the withholding of Federal assistance from colleges and universities found to be negligent in maintaining order on their campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11492. 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 of 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. PODELL:

H.R. 11493. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General concerning certain price increases in Government contracts and certain failures to meet Government contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 11494. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments and annuity and pension payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 11495. A bill to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act; to fix minimum primary benefits at \$80 per month; and to require automatic adjustments in benefits to reflect cost-of-living increases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 11496. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HALEY, Mr. CHAP-

PELL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FREY, and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 11497. A bill to rename a pool of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal "Lake Oklawaha"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 11498. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (commonly known as the Fisherman's Protective Act), to strengthen the provisions therein relating to the protection of U.S. vessels on the high seas; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.J. Res. 729. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including December 15 as "National Bill of Rights Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.J. Res. 730. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H.J. Res. 731. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 732. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period September 15 through October 15 of each year as "Youth Activities Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.J. Res. 733. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the production and distribution in interstate and foreign commerce of motion pictures and television programs which degrade or demean racial, religious, or ethnic groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee of Congress to investigate the production, distribution, and exhibition of movies that criticize or degrade ethnic, racial, or religious groups; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the production and distribution in interstate and foreign commerce of motion pictures and television programs which degrade or demean racial, religious, or ethnic groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Res. 416. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Physical and Mental Health; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 417. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Com-

mittee on Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 418. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Consumer Protection; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Res. 419. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 420. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11499. A bill for the relief of Kyoungho Metardus Cynn, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11500. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 11501. A bill for the relief of Maria Luisa Gorostegui deDourron, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 11502. A bill for the relief of Bruno and Sylvia Burruto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 11503. A bill for the relief of Mr. Wyló Pleasant, doing business as Pleasant Western Lumber Co. (now known as Pleasant's Logging & Milling, Inc.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 11504. A bill for the relief of Roberto Valenzuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 11505. A bill for the relief of Herman Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 11506. A bill for the relief of Gloria R. Harkness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11507. A bill for the relief of Frank Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 415. Resolution authorizing the payment of a gratuity from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on behalf of a deceased former employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

115. By Mr. ROBISON: Petition of the Broome County Legislature, Binghamton, N.Y., memorializing opposition to the inclusion of local bonding in tax-preference regulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

116. Also, petition of the employees of Susquehanna Valley High School, Conklin, N.Y., relative to increasing the individual tax exemption from \$600 to \$1,200 per dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Betty Sue Crigger, Johnson City, Tenn., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

118. Also, petition of the City Council, Elizabeth, N.J., relative to the tax exemption on municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.