GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Melvin H. Evans, of the Virgin Islands, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

John R. Petty, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

K. Martin Worthy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Donald E. Johnson, of Iowa, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

William Henry Harrison, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

William Scholl Whitehead, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

George Harrold Carswell, of Florida, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fifth circuit.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

David W. Williams, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California.

U.S. COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Donald E. Lane, of the District of Columbia, to be Associate judge, U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Anthony J. P. Farris, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas for the term of 4 years.

Thomas F. Turley, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

Lincoln C. Almond, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island for the term of 4 years.

David J. Cannon, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

Dean C. Smith, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years.

Seagal V. Wheatley, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Texas for the term of 4 years.

John L. Bowers, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

Otis L. Packwood, of Montana, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Montana for the term of 4 years.

Charles E. Robinson, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Washington for the term of 4 years.

Gaetano A. Russo, Jr., of Connecticut, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Connecticut for the term of 4 years.

Doroteo R. Baca, of New Mexico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Mexico for the term of 4 years.

Royal K. Buttars, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years.

J. Pat Madrid, of Arizona, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years.

John C. Meiszner, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years.

George L. Tennyson, of South Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

Edward J. Michaels, of Delaware, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Delaware for the term of 4 years.

Christian Hansen, Jr., of Vermont, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, June 19, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Vincent F. Hart, National Chaplain, Catholic War Veterans of America, offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, with full realization that humility is the virtue of the realist, for humility is truth, and pride, the vice of the unrealist, the self-deceiver, we the people of these United States of America beseech You to lavish at all times the salutary grace of realistic truth upon this House of Representatives. Wisdom is the final fruit of humility and truth, for wisdom is the awareness of the realities of existence.

Wisdom is the inexhaustible treasure to men, and those who acquire it win God's friendship, commended as they are to Him by the benefits of her teaching.—Wisdom 7: 14. *For wisdom is quicker to move than any motion; she is so pure, she pervades and permeates all things.*—Wisdom 7: 24.

Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 856. An act to provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions proposed to be held in the United States, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold a diplomatic conference in the United States in fiscal year 1970 to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty and authorize an appropriation therefor.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; which was read and referred to the Committee on House Administration:

JUNE 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On September 27, 1968 you referred to this Committee a letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives reporting on his investigation of recording irregularities in roll calls taken on September 9, 10, and 16, 1968. You stated, "It seems to me that the allegations set forth in the Clerk's (the Clerk of the House) letter are matters that may come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct." The Committee interpreted this referral as a request for it to move on its own initiative as provided in the Rules of the House. Accordingly on October 1, 1968, the Committee directed its staff to inquire into these irregularities.

The first phase of the inquiry sought to fix the responsibility for the specific irregularities referred to in the letter from the Clerk of the House. In pursuing this, the need became apparent for an examination of roll call mechanics in general. The Committee now has drawn certain conclusions with respect to the specific irregularities but feels that until the institution of improved recording procedures, which it previously has recommended, it should continue to observe the working of the present system.

With respect to the responsibility for the irregularities referred, the Committee was satisfied that the Clerk of the House accurately reported the information he received. But, after deeper scrutiny of all facets of the situation, the Committee became convinced that the tally clerk's explanation, that he had made the specific erroneous entries "at the request of" another employee was not accurate. The Committee verified that the errors did, in fact, occur, but the most probable explanation is that the tally clerk's response to the Clerk of the House was an instinctively defensive reaction stemming from the complete state of exhaustion which he was experiencing at the time.

In the Committee's belief, several factors contributed to this condition in the tally clerk. At a point when legislative activity in the House was unusually high and with his assistant physically incapacitated and off the job, the tally clerk assumed the full burden of both positions. In the Committee's opinion, this burden was beyond his physical capacity to perform with accuracy, and led to impairment of his efficiency, culminating in the errors referred to as well as several others which were disclosed at about that time.

The Committee therefore reaffirms its earlier interim finding that neither the Member nor employees named in the original referral, nor any names subsequently disclosed, were parties to any complicity in these errors.

It may be argued that the tally clerk should have sought assistance during this period. Undoubtedly he would have done so had he recognized the effect the increasing work load was producing in his performance.

Addressing the larger matter of the entire system of tallying, the Committee has made what it feels is the most detailed analysis of the subject ever undertaken and has arrived at numerous statistical conclusions. All of these support the conviction that an unacceptably small percentage of the random error inherent in the present system is subsequently corrected by the Members. While these errors have had absolutely no effect on legislative results, they should be eliminated to the greatest extent possible. Early indications are that there has been some improvement in the 91st Congress to date in the correction of errors but not enough to obviate the need for a modernized system of roll call recording.

In view of the foregoing, the Committee renews its earlier recommendation for installation of a modernized voting system at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman.
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Ranking Minority Member.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for fiscal 1970.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

ESCALATING U.S. TROOP WITHDRAWALS FROM VIETNAM

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, I called to the attention of this House the significant statement of our former representative at the Paris peace talks, Cyrus R. Vance, who now calls for a "standstill cease-fire" in Vietnam. Today we have the statement of former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford who now proposes that there be a withdrawal this year of at least 100,000 combat soldiers and that those withdrawals escalate so that next year a comparable or even larger number would leave. The escalation to bring our soldiers home is the kind of escalation we can and should endorse.

Again, I would like to invite my colleagues to join with the seven Members of Congress who introduced House Concurrent Resolution 256 on May 15, 1969, calling upon the President to direct the immediate withdrawal of 100,000 U.S. troops and to propose an immediate cease-fire. In view of the recent statements of those who just a short time ago were responsible for our Vietnam policy, I hope many more will support our resolution.

GAO REPORT TO CONGRESS ON CONTRACTS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, just this morning I received my 185th cosponsor to a bill I have introduced which requires the GAO to report to Congress on all contracts which run more than 10 percent above the original contract price. In light of current revelations, I think this is most significant. Members of the House of all political persuasions and every area of our country have joined me in sponsoring this essential measure. It will once and for all restore fiscal responsibility, strengthening the legislative branch of the Government so Congress may be apprised of exactly what is going on. I would like to commend those who have joined with me in this measure and urge those who have not to please do so.

RESOLUTION RESTORING TO ADAM CLAYTON POWELL CERTAIN RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution rescinding the provisions of House Resolution 2—91st Congress, first session; January 3, 1969—relating to the seniority of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., and restoring him to the seniority which he acquired by reason of his election to the 79th Congress on November 7, 1944, and succeeding congresses from the 18th District of New York. The resolution also directs the Clerk of the House to pay all the salary and allowances withheld from him as a result of his unconstitutional exclusion from the 90th Congress on March 1, 1967, as determined by the U.S. Supreme Court June 16, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who reacted in fear, anger, and frustration when this decision was announced. Some so reacted because of their personal antagonism toward Mr. POWELL; others so reacted because of the larger issue: the limitations imposed upon the House's capacity as a judge of its Members. These critics are entitled to their opinions. However, the highest court of our land has spoken decisively and in my view correctly. The integrity of this body is now spotlighted. If the House follows the suggestions of those who would defy this edict, its reputation as the citadel of law and order and justice will be sorely tarnished. I trust we will act accordingly.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 12290 RELATING TO SURCHARGE AND REPEAL OF INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, June 20, 1969, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 12290, relating to the surcharge and the repeal of the investment credit, along with separate views, if any.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VIETNAM POLICY

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have been noticing that we have been getting a lot of advice from some former architects of our Vietnam policy whose voices a year ago were strongly silent.

Mr. Harriman, who was a negotiator in Paris, and now the former Secretary of Defense Clifford are all giving their advice as to how to handle the Vietnam war. They were the architects of the policy that has been inherited by this administration.

I happen to be one who believed, and do believe, that former President Johnson was dedicated to trying to reach an honorable solution for Vietnam.

I also know that President Nixon is dedicated to trying to reach an honorable settlement in Vietnam.

As I read of the proposals by our negotiators in Paris asking for a free and open election under international supervision, I ask you what can be more fair than that?

The Communists are not interested in open and free elections because they cannot win in an open and free election. They are interested in a coalition, and if we have not had enough experience with coalitions and if we fail to recognize that for every coalition with the Communists they have ultimately taken over, and if we have refused to learn any lessons from history, then we do it at our peril.

As I read some of the statements from these former architects of this policy, I believe they are doing a disservice—and a disservice to the men who are serving there—and a disservice to the administration that is trying in as honorable way as we possibly can to get an honorable solution in this Vietnam.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman speaking of the statement that the former Secretary of Defense Mr. Clifford made last night?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am speaking exactly of that.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to say about Mr. Clifford that he had one great virtue as Secretary of Defense—he was able to make failure sound a lot more plausible than the previous Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not impugning anyone's motives at all.

I would just like to make the statement that in my opinion it is simply not in the best interest of our country that these former policy advisers make these statements at this time. I just do not think they are helpful.

VIETNAM POLICY

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

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his very timely and extemporaneous remarks. I think this is something that needed to be said, and he said it very well.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS NEXT WEEK

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order any day next week to consider a joint resolution making continuing appropriations.

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this would be a con-

tinuing resolution to what date? Could the gentleman give us that information?

Mr. MAHON. The date to which appropriations would be continued has not been worked out. The gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, and myself, with permission of the Appropriations Committee, are working with the leadership on both sides of the House to determine a date that might be suitable.

Mr. GROSS. We seem to be engaging in the old Army game of "Hurry up to wait." Would it not be wise, in the case of this continuing resolution, to date it to December 19, which is the Thursday before Christmas?

Mr. MAHON. It could be dated the 23d of December, just 1 day before Christmas Eve.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps it would be better to add the 4 days that my friend from Texas suggests.

Mr. MAHON. It is imposible to know, but I do not think it would be practicable to set a date so far in advance. We need a target. We need to move forward with these bills. Of course, we have not had authorization on major bills which must be considered by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. How about a termination date during the week between Christmas and New Year's Day. Would that be a good week to wind up this session of the House?

Mr. MAHON. When the resolution is before us, the gentleman's suggestion might be offered as an amendment. I realize there is a problem. We just have to do the best we can.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I shall await with bated breath to note the date you put on it.

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

There was no objection.

KENNEWICK DIVISION EXTENSION, YAKIMA PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 440 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 440

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 742) to amend the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 440 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 742 to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The purpose of S. 742 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Kennewick division extension on the Yakima project, Benton County, Wash. The Kennewick division extension will provide irrigation service to 6,300 acres of land now having only marginal utility and will enhance the upland game resources of the area.

The plan of development for the Kennewick division extension involves the use of existing capacity in the Chandler pumping plant discharge line and the 500-cubic-feet-per-second Kennewick main canal of the Kennewick division. Under the plan of works that is authorized by the bill an additional pumping unit will be installed in the existing Chandler pumping plant where structural provisions were made at the time of initial construction. This unit will be hydraulic turbine driven unless advance planning studies indicate that an electrically driven pumping unit will be more economical and advantageous. Water delivered by the enlarged pumping plant will be conveyed through the Kennewick main canal a distance of 6.7 miles. At that point the Kiona siphon will be constructed through which the water will be diverted and conveyed to the vicinity of the irrigable lands. A system of lined laterals, closed pipe laterals, and necessary relift pumping plants will be installed for delivery to the individual tracts in the service area. The construction of drainage works and operation and maintenance facilities as required will also be elements of the authorized plan.

Water supply for the extension will be derived from the natural flows of the Yakima River as augmented by return flows from upstream irrigation development. An average annual delivery requirement of 31,500 acre-feet is available and permits for its use have been obtained from the State of Washington.

The construction cost of the extension is estimated to be $6,735,000 based on January 1969 price levels. This cost also reflects the cost of lining or enclosing in pipe the distribution system. The investment cost, which is the basis for project evaluation, is $7,554,000, reflecting the inclusion of assigned costs in existing facilities. This amount is allocated to irrigation and fish and wildlife in the respective amounts of $7,421,900 and $132,800. The fish and wildlife allocation consists entirely of joint cost allocated to upland game enhancement and is, therefore, nonreimbursable as provided by the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act. During the 50-year repayment period following a 10-year development period, the water users repayment is estimated at $1,766,800. The remainder of the irrigation investment—$5,655,100—will be returned from surplus revenues of the Federal Columbia River power system. Studies of the financial position of that system indicate that revenues in this amount are in prospect for meeting this obligation concurrently with the end of the irrigator's 50-year repayment period.

Operation and maintenance charges which will be borne by the water users are estimated at $51,600 annually. The benefit-cost ratio, based on 3¼ percent interest and a 100-year period of analysis, is 2.8. If direct benefits only are utilized, the benefit-cost ratio would be 1.6.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 440 in order that S. 742 may be considered.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the construction and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project.

This project will provide irrigation service to 6,300 acres of land now only marginally used. Upland game resources will also be enhanced. The benefit ratio, both direct and indirect is 2.8. When considering the direct benefit ratio only, the figure is 1.6.

The Kennewick division was envisioned when the total Yakima project was first begun over 60 years ago. A feasibility study in support of construction was submitted to the Secretary of the Interior in 1964; hearings were held during the 90th Congress. No organized testimony in opposition has developed; all local interests support the measure.

Construction will permit the use, through irrigation, of marginally useful sagebrush pasture to feed livestock and grow vegetable and fruit crops. The wildlife in the area should also increase.

Existing facilities, the Chandler pumping station and the Kennewick main canal will be utilized. An additional pumping unit will be constructed as well as the Kiana siphon to divert the water to the land to be irrigated. Water sources—the Yakima River, are sufficient for this additional use.

Electrical power for operating the pumping units will be obtained from the Federal Columbia River power system, available at a cost determined by the Secretary of the Interior under criteria applicable to other similar projects.

Estimated construction costs, at January 1969 price levels are $6,735,000; this amount is authorized by the bill. A 50-year repayment period, a standard feature, is included in the bill. Operation and maintenance charges will be borne by the water users; they are estimated at $51,600 annually; again this provision is a standard one.

There are no minority views. The Department of the Interior supports the construction of the project.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for

time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. 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 (S. 742) to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

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 S. 742, with Mr. ANNUNZIO 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 rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), the chairman of the full committee, such time as he may consume.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the Kennewick division extensions that will be authorized by enactment of S. 742 will complete the development contemplated by Congress when it passed the act of June 12, 1948, authorizing the Kennewick division of the Yakima project. In this sense, the program we are considering today is not a new project. It is actually the completion of an undertaking that has been underway for more than 20 years. The record will show that Congress provided for this development when it authorized the Kennewick division in 1948, by including capacity in the canals and pumping installations that were then being constructed.

This bill will authorize the hardware for serving 6,300 acres of land that is now essentially useless, and to all intents and purposes, will complete the foreseeable irrigation development in the main Yakima Valley of Washington. While it is not a major development in terms of cost or acres served, it is no less vital to the continuing economic growth and development of this part of the State of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, any Member who will visit this valley would never again doubt the value of the Federal contribution to land and water resource development. On the lands where water has been supplied, one sees prosperous farms and homes, making possible related business and industry that in large measure support the fine cities of Yakima, Pasco, Kennewick, Richland, and numerous smaller communities. On immediately adjoining lands, where water has not been supplied, there is no significant use being made of the land and no wealth of any consequence comes from it.

Two days of hearings were held on this measure by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation under the chairmanship of our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON). He will set forth for the Members some of the details of the physical plan, its costs and benefits. There are, however, some policy considerations, concerning which the Members should be advised, and I would like to mention them during the balance of my time.

The attention of the Members is drawn to the proposed committee amendment which will reduce the repayment period for the Kennewick division extensions from 56 years plus a development period to 50 years plus a development period. We are told that the administration recommended 56 years for this project because that was the term provided in the existing contract with the irrigation district covering the adjacent lands of the Kennewick division. The committee, in proposing to amend this term to 50 years, is simply being consistent with the practices followed by Congress exclusively and without exception since 1956; that is, to limit the payout period for reclamation projects to 50 years. The testimony shows that this does not work any hardship on anyone and that financial feasibility is assured from the surplus power revenues of the Federal power system. The use of such revenues for underwriting irrigation repayment has previously been authorized by Congress by the act of June 14, 1966, as amended.

As far as our committee can determine, there is no opposition to the enactment of this bill. The local people have indicated their willingness to meet the cost-sharing requirements to the limit of their ability in keeping with general law and policy laid down by the Congress. They have filed for and received appropriations from the State of Washington for the water rights that are necessary to assure proper functioning of the project. The program is completely nonpartisan in character and has been unequivocably endorsed by the Governor of Washington, as being one of the most favorable project opportunities in that State.

It should be noted again that this is not considered a major program, in the sense that it would offer serious competition for funds to those activities already authorized by the Congress. Accordingly, it might well be fitted into the construction programs without extreme budgetary stress or undue influence on the rate of progress on ongoing work. Be that as it may, the sponsors and supporters of this legislation are on notice from my committee that enactment of S. 742 does not imply that immediate funding will be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, the Members can be assured that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has taken full notice of the backlog of water and land resource development projects that have been authorized but not funded for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation as well as the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service. This is a matter of deep concern to all of us who are interested in building our national economy through more enlightened resource utilization. I believe that the time will shortly come when we shall see a realization by the executive branch that its present attitude toward the funding of growth programs such as this we are discussing today is self-defeating and shortsighted.

It is from this conviction, that I continue to support this and other well-designed and carefully evaluated water programs of the Federal agencies and which leads me to urge favorable consideration of S. 742 as proposed to be amended by the committee.

May I say that it will be my responsibility as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to see to it in this session of Congress and in the next session of Congress that any authorizations we bring before the House of Representatives shall not go above that sum of money which is appropriated for this kind of work during the 91st Congress. By so doing we keep the balance that we have at the present time. This program can fit in very nicely to that sort of a program.

Mr. Chairman, in closing may I make this remark: The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY) has been very patient and very helpful in the consideration of this legislation. It has been before our committee for at least 4 years and maybe as long as 5. This is a project that is good, as will be shown by those who follow me. Mrs. MAY had every right to expect the project would be considered as soon as possible. However, she let other projects which the chairman of the committee considered to have priority come first and she did it uncomplainingly. To me this is one of the fine examples of cooperation from a colleague in Congress, and I commend her once again for consideration.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 742, as amended, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Kennewick division extension of the Yakima irrigation project in the State of Washington.

In 1948, Congress authorized the Kennewick division of the Yakima project and at such time Congress also authorized the construction of extra capacity in the division's main canal to provide future irrigation of additional lands. The main canal was so constructed and has since carried as a deferred obligation extra capacity.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the utilization of the extra capacity initially contemplated by authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of an additional pumping plant, construction of the Kiona siphon and a system of lined laterals, pipe laterals, the necessary relift pumping units to deliver an average annual requirement of 31,500 acre-feet of water and drainage facilities.

The total Federal investment in the

Kennewick division extension will amount to $7,554,700. Allocation of this Federal investment among the project purposes is divided as follows: $7,421,900 of the costs are allocated to irrigation purposes, and $132,800 of the costs are allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement. The costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement are nonreimbursable costs under the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act, while the costs allocated to irrigation are reimbursable without interest.

The repayment features of this project focus upon one of the disturbing and objectionable repayment policies we have established in the reclamation law as it is applied in this project. In this project, of the $7,421,900 allocated as irrigation costs, the water users will repay without interest during the 50-year repayment period the sum of $1,766,800 or only about 24 percent of the irrigation costs. The amount which the water users cannot pay, which is $5,655,100 will be repaid in the form of financial assistance from surplus power revenues of the Federal Columbia River power system. The objectionable and disturbing fact is, that this financial assistance is provided the water users without the payment of interest.

It has always been my basic understanding that a person or entity obtaining financial assistance incurred the obligation of repaying the principal plus interest. This is not what we are permitting in this legislation. In this case, the water users are repaying a portion of the irrigation costs without interest in accordance with basic reclamation law and the balance is to be repaid from surplus power revenues also without interest. Unfortunately, this type of financial assistance was specifically provided for in the act of June 14, 1966, as amended by the act of September 7, 1966.

This situation points up the need for legislation to establish a uniform Federal policy for the repayment of costs of Federal electric power projects and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with the authority to carry out such a policy. Mr. Chairman, I have sponsored such legislation in this Congress in the form of H.R. 661, which specifically prohibits the allocation or dedication of surplus revenues of Federal electric power projects without specific authorization of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, despite the objection which I have raised concerning this legislation, I intend to support the passage of S. 742, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly deeply appreciate the courtesy of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), in extending to me this time and I might also express my appreciation for the very bipartisan way in which this bill has been approached. I have had excellent cooperation from all members of the committee in passing this bill out of the committee to authorize a project which is so important to my district, and for which we have waited many years.

Mr. Chairman, as a House sponsor of the proposed Kennewick division extension of the Yakima project in the State of Washington, I rise in support of S. 742.

This project, which is located in my congressional district, will bring irrigation water to 6,300 acres of land south of the Yakima River near its confluence with the Columbia River between Benton City and Richland.

The present marginal lands will produce fruit and general row crops. Enhancement of wildlife resources will be substantial.

This project has an impressive benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.8 to 1.

It should be emphasized, I believe, that the Kennewick division was authorized in 1948. Capacity for an additional 7,000 acres of irrigation was originally built into the Kennewick division's main canal, and the authorization act of 1948 recognized the cost of the construction of such additional capacity as a deferred obligation. The total investment in the Kennewick division extension will be about $6.7 million.

May I also say, Mr. Chairman, that I am exceedingly gratified that today, at long last, this legislation has finally reached the floor of the House. The feasibility report was written in 1962. Authorizing legislation was introduced in both House and Senate in 1964, 1965, 1967, and 1969. The bill passed the Senate several times. Today it is before us in this Chamber for the first time, and I urge its approval.

All departmental reports are, as they were previously, favorable. The project has wide support throughout the area, and authorization has been urged by the Governor of my State, the Washington State Legislature, the Washington State Reclamation Association, and other organizations and individuals.

I also wish to express my deepest appreciation to the most distinguished chairman of the full committee, and to the equally distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and to all other committee members, for their favorable action on this small, but very desirable irrigation project.

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

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Washington that normally I do not support these kinds of bills. However, I do want to say this: that the gentlewoman from Washington made a very fine presentation before the committee, and in doing so justified this project. I am just sorry that she does not have her own bill before us at this moment, but I understand that her bill is a similar bill to the bill before us.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlewoman for the fine presentation she made before our committee on this project.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida very much for his remarks.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Washington yield?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I will be delighted to yield to our minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I also wish to lend my full support and endorsement to this legislation.

As the gentlewoman from Washington knows, I have talked with the gentlewoman about this project, and I have told the gentlewoman that I fully support it. Subsequently, I will help at the proper time on an appropriation bill.

I am certain the House, as well as the other body, will take affirmative action. I hope that as quickly as possible we can also fund this project.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished minority leader very much for his statement.

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

Mrs. MAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out to the House that I believe here is one of the places where we are most inconsistent. I have said this over and over again—and I know the gentlewoman from Washington will not agree with me, and that a lot of the other Members will not agree with me—but the Department of Agriculture at the present time, as it has been doing for some years, is paying out huge sums of money to take land out of production because we already have too much land in production; yet, here we are putting 6,300 acres of land into production to produce more surplus crops and more problems.

I believe, as I said previously, that this is very, very inconsistent.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman on that statement. If we were talking about land to produce surplus problem crops the gentleman certainly would have an excellent point. However, Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with this part of our country, of course, and this, as I pointed out in my statement, will be rowcrops and fruit trees, which of course are not a surplus commodity and are not included in the agricultural production control program.

I might point out also that dryland farming in my part of the country, as well as in other parts of the country, does produce crops that are under the direct payment program, for instance, wheat and grain crops.

When you put water on the land, you automatically then almost always rule out large production of surplus crops because it is frankly just not economical to raise wheat and feed grains on irrigated acreage.

So I would point out that the essential difference is in the commodity to which the land will be devoted.

Mr. GOODLING. I want to point out to you that I am not opposing your project. But I have an obligation to point out to Congress that at times we are very inconsistent and I am not so sure that this is not one of those cases.

Mrs. MAY. I will assure the gentleman on that. When water comes to the Ken-

newick extension land I hope to be able to give the gentleman the absolute proof then.

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

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to compliment her on her presentation, and the committee on its action. I have been in this area and have boated and have hunted and fished and toured it. I have been impressed with the area in connection with the tricity area and the valley of fruit trees. With this great economical feasibility that has been demonstrated, I think all are to be complimented.

Particularly do I appreciate the distinguished lady for yielding for another reason. I would like to compliment the committee for including in its very excellent report the requirements as to funding and additional personnel requirement under Public Law 84–801, 70 Stat. 652.

This is over the signature of the present Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Train, submitting the departmental report for the Secretary of the Interior.

To my knowledge, this is one of the few times that this has been set out in tabular form. I think just as including ways and means and a termination date in all legislation would be beneficial if this were included in all legislation that comes before the House it would cut down on debate and it would enhance the consideration, to say nothing of the open rule under which we are operating.

I congratulate all hands on this approach to the matter.

Mrs. MAY. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri, I think the committee does deserve special praise for having presented the legislation in this excellent form for the full information of all Members of the House. I, too, congratulate them.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Washington has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER).

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in weak support of S. 742, as amended, a bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension of the Yakima project in the Pacific Northwest. The persuasive gentlelady from Washington has managed to overcome my original opposition to the project, but just barely.

The Kennewick division extension, as proposed in this legislation, will place in irrigation some 6,300 acres of the State of Washington at a Federal investment of $7,554,700. The project will call for the construction of an additional pumping plant, a syphon, a system of laterals, closed-pipe laterals, relift pumping plants and drainage works to deliver 31,500 acre-feet of water. The Federal investment in this extension of the Kennewick division is allocated $7,421,900 to irrigation and $132,800 to fish and wildlife enhancement. The costs allocated to the irrigation features of the extension are reimbursable without interest and the costs allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement are nonreimbursable. The committee has amended to provide that the reimbursable costs shall be returned to the Federal Government within the standard term of 50 years plus a development period rather than the 56-year period as initially sought in the bill. The benefit-cost ratio for the project is 2.8 to 1 for all benefits.

The interesting fact about this legislation is that one of the justifications advanced for its passage is that this is merely an extension of an existing project. Well, I just want to say this, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that the Northwest has been treated very generously by Uncle Sam ever since Franklin Delano Roosevelt, while on the campaign trail in the Pacific Northwest, pointed his finger in the general direction of nowhere and said there ought to be a dam there, and that was more than three decades ago.

I have the slight feeling, Mr. Chairman, that the Pacific Northwest does not really appreciate the kindness and generosity with which it has been regarded by the balance of the Nation, and perhaps for that reason, has no feeling of reciprocity when it concerns the problems of either the rest of the Nation or some of its nearby neighbors. Perhaps some resistance, or a slight slowdown to the continuation of these developments in the Pacific Northwest, might be helpful in creating a mood of reciprocity and recognition of the fact that the Pacific Northwest, after all, is part and parcel of the whole country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the passage of S. 742, as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In so doing, I too wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that this measure does nothing more than complete the commitments to the people of the Yakima River Valley in the State of Washington that Congress first made in 1948 when the Kennewick extension was initially authorized.

As pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, this project we are talking about today is not a major one in terms of dollars and cents. Although the estimated construction cost is only $6,735,000, the irrigation of 6,300 acres of land presently devoted to sagebrush and a very marginal winter wheat farming operation will result in important economic gain to the farms, towns, and cities of the adjacent region.

The works to be constructed, pursuant to the authorization contained in S. 742, consist of an additional pumping unit of 167 cubic feet per second in the existing Chandler pumping plant, and the canals, laterals, pipelines, drains, and relift pumping plants for delivery of the water from the Kennewick main canal to the individual farm units in the irrigable area. No new construction is authorized in connection with the main canal since capacity for handling the water supply for the Kennewick extensions was provided in this facility when it was first constructed. Similarly, there is no additional reservoir storage contemplated by S. 742 since an adequate water supply, for which an appropriation was granted by the State of Washington in 1931, is available from return flows and from the natrual flows of the Yakima River.

The costs of storage regulation and capacity in existing works constructed under prior authorizations, when added to the construction costs, results in an investment cost for economic and financial analysis of $7,554,700. This cost has been tentatively allocated to irrigation and fish and wildlife enhancement in the respective amounts of $7,421,900 and $132,800. The cost allocated to fish and wildlife is as a result of upland game benefits and is nonreimbursable in keeping with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965.

Irrigation water users will repay the operation and maintenance costs of $50,960 annually and will contribute to the return of allocated investment cost in accordance with a repayment contract with the Secretary of the Interior. This contract will supplement the contract now in force with the Kennewick Irrigation District to which the newly irrigated lands will be added. This contract will provide for capital repayment for a term of 50 years after a 10-year development period in which no construction charges will be levied. During this period, the irrigators will return $1,766,800, amounting to 24 percent of the irrigation investment. The remainder, amounting to $5,655,100, will be defrayed by the available revenues of the Federal Columbia River power system which is operated and administered by the Bonneville Power Administration. As previously pointed out by our colleague, the chairman of the full committee, these revenues are clearly in prospect and their use has been sanctioned by the act of June 14, 1966, as amended.

Economically, the Kennewick division extension is well justified, having a ratio of benefits to costs of 2.8 based on total benefits and costs as of January 1969.

Mr. Chairman, my Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation has considered the Kennewick division extensions at length. We have brought out a bill, S. 742, that embraces all of the policy precepts which have been set down by Congress for Federal reclamation projects. We have determined that there will be no conflict with the acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law, that there will be no production of crops which contribute to our surplus commodities problems, that power and energy for pumping are available from the Federal system, and that there is no objection to the development of the project of record.

For these reasons, I urge a favorable vote on S. 742 as a well qualified, carefully evaluated water and land resource development project that will be in the best interests of the national and regional economy.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 742

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Insert the words "and Kennewick division extension", after the words "Kennewick division" in section 1 and add the following items to the principal units listed in said section: "Kiona siphon" and "Relift pumping plants".

(b) Insert at the end of section 3 the following: "Costs of the Kennewick division extension allocated to irrigation which are determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the water users' ability to repay within a fifty-six-year repayment period following a ten-year development period, shall be charged to and returned to the reclamation fund in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 200), as amended by section 6 of the Act of September 7, 1966 (80 Stat. 707): *Provided,* That section 5 of this Act shall not be applicable to the revenues derived from the Federal Columbia River power system. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Kennewick extension shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him."

SEC. 2. No water shall be delivered to any water user on the Kennewick division extension for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this authorizing Act for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the new works associated with the Kennewick division extension $6,735,000 (January 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein, as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in addition, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the extension.

Mr. ASPINALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, strike out "fifty-six-year" and insert "fifty-year".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 742) to amend the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 382), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 440, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JUNE 23, 1969

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority whip the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

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

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority leader's inquiry, there is no further program for the balance of this week. I expect to ask to go over until Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, and there are no District bills.

We have scheduled on Monday H.R. 12167, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

On Tuesday we will consider a House joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970. The gentleman understands the import of that.

Also, on Tuesday, the Independent Offices-Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1970 will be considered.

On Wednesday and for the balance of the week, we will consider H.R. 12290, relating to the surcharge extension and investment credit repeal, and other amendments to the Internal Revenue Code, which is subject to a rule being granted. We expect however to have the tax bill on the floor on Wednesday under a rule providing 4 hours of general debate, if it is granted.

For the balance of the week we will consider H.R. 7906, the Interstate Taxation Act, under an open rule, 2 hours of debate, making H.R. 906 in order as an amendment.

It is a pretty heavy program.

This program is announced subject to the usual reservation that conference reports of course may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the acting majority leader if under Monday's consideration of H.R. 12167, when the gentleman refers to an open rule and 2 hours of debate, does he mean it is open all the way or just the amendatory process is open and there are waivers of points of order in that rule?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the rule has not been reported. The chairman of the distinguished Committee on Rules is on the floor and a member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

I am advised that there were no waivers requested.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate that. As other Members have stated, we appreciate the Committee on Rules maintaining their prerogatives under the procedures of the House. If I recall correctly, this is the fourth really and truly open rule in a row we have had reported out. In my opinion that is commendatory.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the distinguished acting majority leader, what about the independent offices appropriation bill? Will that come in under a rule? If so, will it be a closed rule? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield, I will defer to the gentleman from Missouri to answer that.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the bill will be coming in under a special rule, and it will have waivers. There will be three. They are occasioned by the fact that the three particular provisions on which points of order are waived are not yet authorized. The major one is the question of the appropriation for the space agency. The second one—I do not know whether it is of any magnitude or not—is the appropriation for the National Science Foundation. The third one is the appropriation for a portion—I understand approximately one-half—of the so-called Appalachian program. If the gentleman wishes me to describe the status of each, I will attempt to do so.

Mr. GROSS. No. If the gentleman will yield further, the question I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Rules Committee, is, Who is making this request for waivers of points of order?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the chairmen of the respective legislative committees make the request.

Mr. GROSS. All right.

Now, about the surcharge extension and other involvements, including the welfare provision in the tax extension

bill—will that come in under a closed rule? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would first deal with the gentleman's categorization of one provision of that bill, because I happen to know something about it. If the gentleman wants to call it a welfare provision, that is his business. I think it is something quite different from that.

My answer to the gentleman's question is that if the Committee on Rules in its judgment grants a rule that the chairman of the committee will request, it will come in as all tax bills have come in since the gentleman has been here, under a closed rule.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I will say to the gentleman I have protested them too, and I will say this one ought to come in under some kind of modified closed rule, so that Members can offer amendments to the various portions of the bill to which amendments would be germane.

Mr. BOGGS. I have no authority to speak for the distinguished members on the great Committee on Rules, but I can say this to the gentleman: I shall request a closed rule, and I would hope it would be granted.

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt of that. The gentleman from Louisiana always has in the past, and I am sure undoubtedly will in the interminable future.

Mr. BOGGS. It will prevail as it has in the past.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

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.

AID FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two legislative proposals intended to aid our senior citizens, particularly those who are in the greatest need of financial assistance. Their plight is in need of immediate attention and action by Congress.

One bill is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that the first $5,000 of the income of an individual who is over 65 years of age shall be exempt from Federal income tax.

The other bill is to amend the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits with subsequent cost-of-living increases and a minimum primary benefit of $100.

As a Member of Congress, I have long been aware of and often voiced my concern over the needs of our senior citizens. As you know, it is estimated that there are over 20 million people over the age of 65 in the United States. Of these, about 5 million pay Federal income tax and far too many of these can ill afford to do so. The fact is that the present tax relief and exemptions, for the aged particularly, are completely inadequate.

The Treasury Department has admitted that the present income tax system applicable to the elderly is made exceedingly complex by the detailed and complicated rules involved in computing the retirement income credit. This computation requires an extra page on the tax return, and experience indicates that it is so complicated that many of the elderly do not understand it and therefore lose the benefits to which they are entitled.

Our tax laws are supposed to be, and should be, based on the ability to pay. Unfortunately, our lower- and middle-income taxpayers bear too much of the tax burden—at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local. In the past I have sponsored legislation to make adjustments in our tax laws. On February 17, 1969, I introduced H.R. 6721, a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a number of reforms in our tax laws. The measure I introduce today, to exempt the first $5,000 of income of those over 65 years of age from income tax, is in furtherance of that goal.

Of the more than 15 million adult Americans living in poverty approximately 6 million are over 65 years of age. Many of these people are having to exist on low fixed incomes. As a result of this situation many of our senior citizens, who should be enjoying the so-called golden years, are having to continue to work, to keep body and soul together, long past the age of retirement. The fact is, they just cannot afford to retire.

Those elderly who may have saved a little money through the many years of working and raising a family have seen their savings eaten into and wiped out by the continuous increases in cost of living. A wage earner in 1939 who was earning $100 per month and who has since retired would find that this same $100 would only have the purchasing power of $40 when compared to 1939. There are also a great many, who unable to work, must rely on welfare, their children, or charity to survive. And the situation is no better for many living on social security or some other form of retirement income.

While Congress properly increased social security benefits in 1965 and 1968, those benefits have been virtually wiped-out by the continuous rise in cost of living. There is an urgent need for Congress to adjust the social security benefits to bring them in line with the present cost of living and to provide for the future increases thereof.

It is unconscionable for this Nation to allow its retired workers to fall deeper and deeper into poverty, while the rest of the country—using what the retired generation has built—moves into greater and greater prosperity. The two legislative proposals I have introduced are designed to meet head on the financial problems of our senior citizens.

It is my fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that these two legislative proposals will receive prompt consideration along with general tax reform. This legislation, tax reform, and an increase in social security benefits, is a must for this session of the 91st Congress.

REPRESSION IN SAIGON

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the claims of two administrations that the United States is fighting to defend democracy in South Vietnam, true political freedom still does not exist for the people of that country. Numerous reports by journalists and private citizens who have visited South Vietnam continue to relate violations of the most basic civil liberties and freedoms, and the Saigon government of President Thieu continues to suppress non-Communist groups anxious to obtain a peaceful settlement of the war.

Most recently a report was issued by a private study team which visited South Vietnam in order to determine the extent of political freedom under President Thieu. The team was composed of many distinguished members, including our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). The report, which has been printed in full on page 16259 of the June 17 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, documents numerous instances of limitations on political and religious freedoms, the detention and interrogation of thousands of South Vietnamese suspected of being "sympathetic" to the National Liberation Front, and the denial of due process which has characterized the Saigon government's treatment of its non-Communist opponents.

Since the study team returned, other instances of denial of civil liberties and suppression of political freedom have been reported. The June 18 New York Times reported that four members of a liberal opposition group that had called for the formation of a non-Communist "government of reconciliation" to negotiate with the NLF had been ordered to report to the Saigon police for "questioning" on June 17. This action followed

President Thieu's angry warning upon his return from the Midway Island Conference with President Nixon that—

From now on those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country, whoever they be, whether in the executive or the legislature, will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the army and the people.

But, as Averell Harriman—our chief negotiator at Paris under President Johnson—said during the course of an interview with me last week:

President Nixon has never said that he's opposed to a coalition. He's said that he's against the imposition of a coalition government, and, therefore, a discussion of a coalition government seems to be a perfectly normal thing to have go on.

Governor Harriman went on to express his disappointment at the fact that freedom of speech and press does not exist in South Vietnam, noting in particular his dismay at the closing of the 37th newspaper since President Thieu announced a little over a year ago that his government was going to cease censorship.

If the goal of the administration is, as President Nixon has said, to secure free elections in South Vietnam, we must as Governor Harriman has urged, insist that President Thieu "create a climate of freedom in order to let those elections be held." Governor Harriman pointed out that—

We have got a very good method of talking to him and that is: unless you do this we're not going to continue a line of trying to support this government. Even after the 25,000 troops are out, there will be well over 500,000 Americans there. He won't last very long if we pull out our troops.

Perhaps the most eloquent statement of the importance of political freedom in South Vietnam came from the leader of the liberal opposition group which has been called in for "questioning," Tran Ngoc Lieng, who defended Truong Dinh Dzu, former presidential candidate, who has been imprisoned.

Mr. Lieng said:

If the Government means to repress the genuinely nationalist organizations by this technique, the Communist will reap the benefits. The whole national movement will suffer as a result.

The contrast between this statement and the repressive promise of President Thieu that he will punish all who advocate a political settlement with the NLF indicates the imperative need for reform of the Saigon government.

U.S. SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE OFFICIAL QUESTIONS BANKS SINCERITY IN FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate aspects of our current inflationary period is that funds are not available for home mortgages, thus denying the opportunity to millions of Americans to own their own homes.

The savings and loan industry of our country has been one of the reasons that we have such a high standard of housing in this country. However, savings and loans, which are extremely limited in investment opportunities, have been hit so hard by inflation that they do not have adequate funds for housing loans.

One of the major reasons that the savings and loans are in this bind is that the large banks in the country have pushed interest to record levels while at the same time attracting capital from various sources not available to the savings and loan associations.

Recently, Mr. Norman Strunk, executive vice president of the U.S. Savings and Loan League, speaking before the Virginia Savings and Loan League, charged that the commercial banks have not gone all out in the fight against inflation. I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Strunk's position.

This afternoon the Banking and Currency Committee begins hearings on the latest increase in the prime interest rate by many of our largest banks. These will be extremely important hearings for something must be done to stem the inflationary spiral that takes money out of every pocketbook in America.

It is my hope that banking officials who will testify before the committee, as well as representatives of the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board, will assure the committee that they will take all necessary actions to prevent further increases in lending rates.

Banking officials, as well as the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board representatives, have stated time and again that the purpose in raising interest rates is to place a damper on lending activities and to control the money supply.

In theory, this may have some merit.

However, the big banks of our country are using the increase in interest rates to pad their own pocketbooks at the expense of the American people. Although the Federal Reserve Board has tightened credit expansion, thus giving banks an excuse to raise interest rates, the banks, as Mr. Strunk so correctly pointed out in his speech to the Virginia Savings and Loan League, have gone after funds from other sources. In actuality, it is most convenient for the big banks to have the Federal Reserve Board to tighten credit for this shuts off the money supply to many small banks which do not have the resources to compete for funds in other areas that are possessed by the big banks. Thus, the big banks are able to monopolize the lending field and use the interest rate hike as a sword over the head of borrowers.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a copy of a press release on Mr. Strunk's speech because it so vividly describes the back-door methods that big banks are using to feed the fires of inflation while through the front door, they are constantly moaning about the effects of inflation:

NEWS RELEASE OF U.S. SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE

A major upswing in business loans by the nation's big banks since the start of 1969 has helped to undercut the efforts of the Nixon Administration and the Federal Reserve Board to curb inflation, a savings and loan official declared today.

Norman Strunk, executive vice president of the United Savings and Loan League, said business loans by large commercial banks have been increasing at an annual rate of 14 per cent—"at a time when it was obviously in the interest of the fight against inflation and obviously the intended result of the Federal Reserve's tight money policy to have the banks cut down on credit expansion.

"In the four weeks ending May 28—just before the change in the prime rate—the large banks reporting weekly to the Federal Reserve increased their business loans outstanding by $1.1 billion—seasonally adjusted—or at an annual rate of 17 per cent. No wonder they ran out of money and had to raise their rate.

"The Federal Reserve exercises monetary policy largely through the commercial banking system. Since late December, it has been limiting the funds available to the banks and permitting an attrition in large denomination certificates of deposit on the premise that the big commercial banks would in turn limit loans to various borrowers. But the big banks have shown a casual disregard for the Federal Reserve objective by raising funds through unorthodox methods and boosting bank loans."

Strunk said, in a speech to the Virginia Savings and Loan League at The Homestead in Hot Springs, Va., that this sharp upsurge in lending has taken place among the large weekly reporting member banks of the Federal Reserve System. "The data do not reflect the activities of the smaller banks in the big cities or the banks in the smaller towns and cities," said Strunk.

"The small banks don't have access to Eurodollars, black market time deposits obtained by selling commercial paper by the parent holding company to get money into the banks or access to 'Virgin' dollars." The latter was a reference to dollars imported from the Virgin Islands branches of American banks at interest rates above legal ceilings in the United States.

Strunk said largely as a result of a deliberate Federal Reserve decision to curb bank lending and the resulting level of market interest rates that the large weekly reporting member banks had suffered a time deposit loss of about $6 billion since the first of the year with this run-off principally in the so-called large negotiable CDs. In the same period these banks had an increase in business loans of $2.6 billion.

"No wonder they are so short of funds they had to—or more accurately, perhaps—were able to raise the prime rate to 8½ per cent," said Strunk. "It appears to me, considering the inflation danger in this country and the need to cut back on business expansion—particularly that fed by borrowed money—that the large commercial banks are pretty much an undisciplined group.

"At a time when the presidents of the big banks have been wringing their hands publicly about the spread of inflationary psychology, bank lending officers have been pouring gas on the inflation bonfire. The lending policies of the big commercial banks thus have contributed to the worsening inflation spiral of recent months, and have increased the vulnerability of the economy to the threat of a serious recession."

Strunk warned that the present situation is repetitious of that which occurred in the last week of 1965. He recalled that the Federal Reserve Board then "bailed out" the bankers with an increase in interest ceilings on time and savings deposits.

"Now we seem to find the big city banks in the same situation: substantially overloaned, resisting the pressures of the Fed and the Treasury to cut down on loan expansion, suffering a big roll-out of funds from the time deposits and facing a greater drain, getting money to lend by pulling it in from Europe and other parts of the world. If the Federal Reserve bails out the bankers again it will be disastrous to home buyers

and home builders and a major setback to the fight against inflation.

"You would think the big banks—of all our institutions—would have an understanding of the importance of the fight against inflation—that the big banks, of all institutions, would want to see the Nixon Administration succeed and would want to help his Administration win this war against inflation.

"But they seem to be hindering the Nixon Administration's anti-inflation program.

"Maybe the bankers don't know how to say 'No.' That's a switch from the classical stereotype of a banker. But they ought to say 'No' to some of these requests for credit. We in the savings and loan business had many loan officers that learned how to saw 'No' during 1966."

WHAT TO DO UNTIL THE POLICE COME

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden are gentlemen who write a column which is normally carried in the Washington Post. They wrote a column that was published in certain other papers yesterday, but for some unknown reason this column did not appear in the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place the column in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT TO DO UNTIL THE POLICE COME

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

WASHINGTON.—Edith Green, Oregon's liberal congresswoman, is currently suffering the slings and arrows of liberal outrage for introducing a bill to quiet our campuses. College presidents, most of whom would support Mrs. Green on other issues, are attacking her bill as "unwarranted federal interference in university administration." They also believe that Congress ought not—indeed cannot—act against a generational revolt. In Mrs. Green's view, however, it is not a question of what Congress can do—it is a question of what it must do.

Members from both parties are trying to erect a rude shelter against the winds from back home. Every congressman is being told he must "do something about these kids." Mrs. Green's bill will permit him to point with pride without doing much to appease the hard-liners.

In fact, the Green bill would actually lessen the penalty now imposed by law against students involved in disorders. The present law revokes their federal scholarships (if they have them) for two years if they are convicted of a crime in the course of a "serious disruption." The new bill would permit the university to decide the length of the revocation—from one day to five years.

Otherwise, the Green bill permits universities to retain their autonomy. It provides that they must file a riot plan with the commissioner of education, but it does not require that the government must approve it. Wisely, it does require that the plan must be first considered by faculty, administration and students, but not that the university follow the plan if and when a riot occurs.

In short, Mrs. Green's forces have produced a bill which requires chiefly that universities take thought about the disorders they may be facing. Surely, the taking of thought is one of the things for which universities exist.

The reaction to the Green bill is, to say the least, mixed. HEW Secretary Robert Finch has no problem with the penalty provisions, which only ease slightly the existing law, but he is opposed to the requirement for filing a plan. He feels that plans have a way of becoming guidelines and that it is not reasonable to expect a plan to just lie around without some bureaucrat refining it or some congressman insisting on penalties for its violation.

Under the Green proposal, Finch would be in the position of denying federal funds to elementary and secondary school districts which do not meet their own racial desegregation plans but continuing to disburse funds to universities which bypass their own antiriot rules. His political instincts tell him this is not a happy prospect.

He would rather see these matters in the federal courts, if some way can be devised to create a federal jurisdiction, since the use of the injunction (with penalties for contempt for violation) against occupation of university buildings has proved an effective device this semester for quelling disturbances and at the same time taking the heat off the university administration.

The reaction of university administrators may show how little they read the public mind. They seem unaware, for example, of how easy it is today to make political points by attacking students—and college presidents. Congressional polls of constituents, even from districts which show heavy opposition, for example, to the ABM system or to the Vietnamese war, show a large majority anxious to crack down on the campus.

The college presidents also overlook the fact that universities, like farmers, missilemakers and those in other segments of the economy, are now heavy feeders at the public trough. Within the past few years the privately funded institution has become a thing of the past. There is only one college (Wabash, in Indiana) which is not receiving federal funds.

Meanwhile, at the Department of Justice, Atty. Gen. John Mitchell is prepared to move into the student protest arena with a special task force which the department says will use "military-type intelligence" to get at the leaders. If they are serious, that's the best news SDS has had in years.

A BILL TO ENCOURAGE HIGHER EDUCATION TO ADOPT GOVERNING RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker it seemed to me it would be in the interest of the Members of this House, and to the constituents whom they represent, to have in this public document a copy of the legislation which is now under consideration by the House Education and Labor Committee. The welfare and well-being of colleges and universities is of vital national interest. The uproar about the uproar on the campuses is itself an indication of this fact, for it is only those issues regarded as crucial to a people which can so deeply stir emotion—as this one has. In the hope of clearing the air somewhat, I ask therefore that the proposed legislation itself be printed in the RECORD at this point so that each may read for himself the actual language of the proposal:

H.R. —

A bill to encourage institutions of higher education to adopt rules and regulations to govern the conduct of students and faculty, to assure the right to free expression, to assist such institutions in their efforts to prevent and control campus disorders, and to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Protection and Freedom of Expression Act of 1969."

TITLE I—PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF DISRUPTIVE ACTS

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the primary responsibility for maintaining freedom of expression, public order, and the effective functioning of the educational process at American institutions of higher education rests with the trustees, administrators, and other duly-appointed collegiate officials.

(b) In light of the finding set forth in subsection (a), it is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to maintain within the scholarly community the basic American concepts of freedom of thought, inquiry, expression, and orderly assembly,

(2) to assist those who wish to pursue their education in a campus atmosphere free of disruption and violence,

(3) to afford encouragement and opportunity to administrators, faculty and students in working for orderly progress,

(4) to assist the academic community in maintaining institutions of higher education as centers for the free interchange of ideas, and

(5) to assure reasonable protection of the Federal investment in higher educational programs.

INSTITUTIONAL ACTION REQUIRED TO PREVENT AND CONTROL HIGHER EDUCATIONAL CONFLICTS AND DISRUPTIVE ACTS

SEC. 102. (a) Each institution of higher education (as defined in the first sentence of section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965) which participates or proposes to participate in a program or activity receiving financial support, as set forth in section 104, from any department or agency of the United States shall file with the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") within sixty days following the enactment of this Act, or by January 1, 1970, whichever is later, or in the case of a new institution or one which has not previously applied for federal funds, at the time of filing its initial application for participation in such program or actvity, a certfication which affirms—

(1) the intention of the institution to take all appropriate actions to attain the purposes set forth in section 101(b) to prevent at such institution the occurrence, or to assure the timely termination, of actions which tend to defeat such purposes, and

(2) that rules and regulations have been or are being prepared which

(A) provide for an effective means to assure adequate opportunity for free expression, consultation and orderly discussion of educational and associated problems which affect and are of concern to trustees, administrators, faculty, and students of the institution; and

(B) set standards of conduct for students, faculty, other staff, and visitors on such property and facilities intended to accomplish the purposes of section 101(b) together with appropriate internal disciplinary procedures and sanctions to enforce such standards; and

(3) that such rules and regulations have been or will be published within the University and are or will be made available to the Commissioner upon request.

(b) If the Commissioner determines that an institution of higher education has failed to file the certification required by subsection (a), he shall immediately give notice to all Federal departments and agencies providing financial assistance for programs and activities at the institution. Thereafter, such institution shall not be eligible for the award of any Federal financial support as set forth in section 104, until such time as

the Commissioner shall determine that such failure to file has been corrected.

(c) When the Commissioner determines that special circumstances exist which would make the application of the preceding subsection inequitable, unjust or not in the public interest, he may waive its application to the institution, in whole or in part.

(d) Any institution of higher education which is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to any matters arising out of this section shall have the same right of appeal under the same conditions as a State under section 608 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

ASSISTANCE BY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

SEC. 103. The Commissioner is authorized to provide, only upon request, appropriate technical and other assistance to institutions of higher education in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS COVERED BY ACT

SEC. 104. For the purposes of this Title, financial support includes all forms of Federal financial assistance including but not limited to research grants and contracts, fellowship grants, loans and grants for construction of facilities, grants for library resources and instructional equipment, grants for teacher training, and grants for curriculum improvement.

SEC. 105. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer or employee of the United States to issue any rule, regulation, guideline or other published interpretations or orders with respect to the content of the rules and regulations referred to in Sec. 102 of this Act.

TITLE II—HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

SEC. 201 (a) Section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 504. (a) Whenever an institution of higher education has been subject to a substantial disruption and there are reasonable grounds to believe (1) that an individual attending, employed by, or teaching or doing research at such institution, who is receiving federal assistance under any of the programs specified in subsection (c), has engaged in conduct, after the date of enactment of this section (as amended), which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under control of such institution to prevent faculty, administrative officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and (2) that such conduct was of a serious nature and contributed to such disruption, then such institution shall give notice to such individual and initiate proceedings to determine whether he engaged in such conduct. If the institution of higher education determines, after hearing, that such individual did engage in such conduct and that such conduct was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny for a period up to five years any further payment to, or for direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c). If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of that period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c).

"(b) No individual shall accept any payment described in subsection (c) during any period for which an institution has denied him such payments pursuant to a finding under subsection (a), and whoever knowingly violates this subsection shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both, and shall be liable to the United States for the amount so accepted.

"(c) The payments referred to in the preceding subsections of this section are the following:

"(1) payments to students under a student loan program carried on by an institution of higher education under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958,

"(2) payments to students under a student loan program carried on by an institution of higher education under part C of title VII or part B of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act,

"(3) payments under the student loan insurance program under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

"(4) payments under a college work-study program carried on under part C of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

"(5) payments of salary to teachers and other employees of institutions of higher education who are employed in connection with the training of volunteers for the Peace Corps or for service in domestic volunteer service programs carried on under Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,

"(6) payments of salary to teachers and other employees of institutions of higher education who receive their salaries from funds made available under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965,

"(7) other payments to students or faculty members at institutions of higher education under fellowships, scholarships, traineeships, or research grants carried on with Federal funds.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be deemed to affect the applicability of Section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, as in effect on the date of enactment of this act, with respects to acts committed prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. (a) Section 427(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating subparagraph (G) as (H) and by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following new subparagraph:

"(G) provides that, contingent upon certification by the institution at which the borrower is enrolled that he is in good standing, the loan will be paid in periodic installments (as prescribed by the Commissioner) which are geared to the borrower's rate of necessary expenditure, and"

(b) Effective July 1, 1970, Section 428 (b)(1) of such Act is amended by redesignating subparagraph (K) as (L) and by inserting after Subparagraph (J) the following new subparagraph:

"(K) requires that, contingent upon certification by the institution at which the borrower is enrolled that he is in good standing, the loan be paid in periodic installments (as prescribed by the Commissioner) which are geared to the borrower's rate of necessary expenditure; and"

You will note that the legislation is divided into two titles, the latter one of which is a revision of present law: section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. The present law requires a mandatory 2-year suspension of Federal aid to any student or employee of the university convicted by any court of record of a crime "which involved the use of—or assistance to others in the use of—force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education" if the university also held a hearing and determines that "such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed."

The proposed gives far greater discretion to university authorities by eliminating the automatic 2-year suspension of Federal aid and permitting instead such suspension to range anywhere from 3 weeks up to 5 years. The proposed bill also differs from current law in covering Federal funds available not only under the Higher Education Act and NDEA, but those provided under such other acts as, for example, the Public Health Service Act.

Under title I of the proposed bill, an institution of higher education can be denied funds only when it has failed to file a certification affirming that a plan is on hand and would be available to the Commissioner upon his request. This means, in effect, that the college administrator makes the determination as to whether the institution is to be eligible for Federal funds. No militant group, by their riotous action, can penalize others and have the university funds cut off.

I have stated on many occasions my opposition to some legislation which has been put before the subcommittee calling for a cut-off of all Federal assistance from an institution experiencing a disruption which it is not able to bring under control, and when such institution does not act in a manner which the Commissioner of Education finds appropriate to deal with the disruption. This in effect puts in the hands of revolutionary students, seeking to destroy an institution, the power to make this determination by simply causing and/or prolonging a major disruption. Under such legislation, this entire institution could lose its funds because of the militants within SDS.

Under the bill cosponsored by 16 of us, the college president would have to elect not to file any certification in order for the institution to be ineligible for further funds. There is no other way. Once that certification has been filed, the plan must be available, upon request, but no one makes any determination as to the adequacy of its content; no Federal approval is required. In each of 50 different laws now on the books, a college or university is required to file a plan in order to be eligible for funds. The revised title I conforms to this precedent and is far simpler than most—the certification must be filed if the institution is to be eligible for any further funds. I repeat—it is not a cut-off of any existing funds.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we would be acting extremely irresponsibly both to the general public and the university community if we did not take those constructive steps which are within our power. I believe this bill which I and several of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee have proposed is temperate and responsible. It is the minimum we can do. It is obvious that public concern about campus violence is at an apex. As evidence of this concern I would like to place in the RECORD at this point just a few of the hundreds of letters I have

received from all over the United States. I know these are representative of those being received by my colleagues. While I do not agree with every view expressed in every letter, I agree with the view that it is high time something was done. We have passed the threshold of tolerance in being patient with those out to destroy our universities. I think it appropriate to point out again that this represents only a small fraction of the mail I have received and, of that mail it represents the most moderate viewpoint.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
March 20, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Special Education Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: It is my understanding that your subcommittee is studying the disruptions by *some* students on our college campuses.

I earnestly hope that your efforts, and those of your committee, will result in some positive and prompt action by Congress to put an end to this destructive behavior.

As a taxpaying citizen, I am in favor of cutting off federal grants to those students involved in these disturbances.

The average citizen is burdened with heavy taxes, at a great personal discomfort in many instances, and I feel that it is outrageous that we must continue to support such un-American disorders.

With my appreciation and best wishes for your success, I am

Very truly yours,

VIRGINIA V. MELTON.

HINSDALE, ILL.,
March 31, 1969.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: Congratulations on your announced intention to investigate student anarchists who are receiving federal loans! What they are doing to our campuses is deplorable; but to think we, as taxpayers, are *paying* them to do it is incredible! Please follow through.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. W. W. HARDY.

R. S. BACON VENEER CO.,
Chicago, April 3, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Higher Education, Rayburn House Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: We understand you have announced intention to investigate student anarchists who are receiving federal loans, and we write to strongly urge hot pursuit of such policy.

It is one thing to consider that tax money is being wasted, but much worse to know that any small amount is going for the support of such people. If we are indeed going to allow such activities, we certainly should not at the same time finance them.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

GEORGE F. WILHELM,
President.

WINCHESTER, MASS.,
June 12, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

MADAM: The situation on many university campuses in the United States today is, to me, most distressing. The lack of appropriate response and, in many cases, the taking of positions by university administrations which in effect condone violence and lawlessness has exceeded, in my opinion, all reasonable bounds.

I agree with and support the general principle that Government should not interfere with or dictate to educational institutions. On the other hand, I feel very strongly that public tax money should not be invested in any organization which condones, permits without punishment, or could be construed to support in any way, violence, lawlessness, or mob rule.

Therefore, I urge and respectfully request your support of legislation which would deny Federal funds of any sort to educational institutions which do not take action to assure without question the nonviolent, lawful conduct of all persons when at the educational institution. Further, I believe such legislation should withhold Federal scholarship funds from those individuals who willfully violate the laws of our free society.

All those with whom I have discussed this issue (made up largely of college alumni) agree, not only on the basic premise of the use of public tax money, but also on the need for such legislation. However, this letter can, of course, represent only my own personal opinion.

Very truly yours,

R. W. DETRA.

JUNE 18.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Education Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: The best thing for the federal government to do is to close the U.S. Office of Education and withdraw all federal funds of all kinds from colleges and universities.

Respectfully,

Prof. HARRY WILLIAMS.

GRAND CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL CENTRE,
March 10, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: Your announced intention to investigate student anarchists receiving Federal loans deserves the highest commendation. It is only by courageous action such as this that the current deplorable situation in our colleges and universities can be corrected.

Sincerely,

C. C. MOSELEY, *President.*

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
April 30, 1969.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I am glad that you are upset too over the appalling campus riots, and that your Committee will hold hearings with regard to them.

If the Government's withholding of Federal funds to the various universities is not a good idea, then why cannot the funds be stopped to those individual students who participate in disruptions on campus? This would hurt only those who take part in the riots, sit-ins, lock-outs, etc., and the funds to others in the school (the innocent ones) and to the schools themselves would not be affected. Couldn't *this* be done?

I just cannot believe that there is nothing the Government can do to clear up the campus riots and allow professors who want to teach and students who want to attend classes to do so, free from threats of violence. If there is nothing that our Government can do to remedy the present horrifying situation, then we are indeed in a hopeless mess.

I am sure that if any other group of citizens behaved as have the militants on campus—brandishing highpowered rifles and knives, threatening violence, causing thousands of dollars of damage to tax-supported institutions or to any building, for that matter—they would have been relieved of their weapons and thrown into jail forthwith. No one I know can understand why universities are above the law of the land. We think it is high time the Justice Department took care of the criminal aspect of the situation, and that HEW cut off all funds to those who are taking part in these disgusting activities.

I am certainly glad that someone is investigating SDS. That has been put off far too long; I hope it can be ascertained where this well-heeled group is obtaining its "traveling" money, who is back of them and their subversive activities. Please don't let up until all the facts are known about them and about the Black Panthers. They pose a grave danger to our universities and to all the decent young people.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. CHARLOTTE C. HAYNES.

AMARILLO, TEX.,
May 7, 1969.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I just heard you on our Channel 10 TV regarding Federal Aid to University students and the bill to eliminate the Federal help.

I agree! Why not all Federal aid to those not worthy. Keep it for the indigents of old age.

If the bill was passed and enforced, more of these people would search for work.

Why deduct it out of my paycheck and millions of others to encourage riots and "walks."

Also, if they want to fight load them all up and send them to Vietnam, and return the boys who have families and live by principles.

Mrs. Green, I hope you can get the job done. I'm behind you, and millions of others. We need women like you to speak up for the preservation of our country.

Respectfully,

PARONIE GAITHER.

GRAND CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL CENTER,
Glendale, Calif., March 21, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR MRS. GREEN: Almost everyone in the U.S.A. is fed up with campus anarchy! Why isn't the U.S. Office of Education enforcing the new law requiring colleges and universities to cut off Federal aid to students convicted of taking part in disruptive activities?

When is Congress going to decide to call a halt to financing campus revolution with taxpayers' money? Timid University and College administrators and trustees must apparently be forced to take effective action to protect the rights of the majority of law-abiding students.

Positive action is overdue!

C. C. MOSELEY, *President.*

MISSION, KANS., *March 17, 1969.*

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I am concerned (no, agitated)!! at my tax money being used for students who are only interested in keeping others from an education.

There is not a college in this country, I'll send my five sons to when they are of age to go until the faculty starts running the schools again. Meanwhile, don't use my money in the schools.

Mrs. WM. R. HILL.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
March 5, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: We who are interested in Higher Education certainly applaud wholeheartedly your intention to investigate student anarchists and particularly those receiving funds from the federal government.

Certainly it is time to cease underwriting the riots on the campuses, and what more effective treatment could be administered than to show people that if they receive scholarship funds or other aid, they must at least attend classes and show some signs of effort expended for education.

Blessings on you,

R. J. STOCKMAN.

GARDNER MANUFACTURING CO.,
Horicon, Wis., March 7, 1969.

Representative EDITH GREEN
House Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I understand you announced your intention to investigate Student trouble makers in our colleges and universities throughout the country, to see if they are receiving Federal loans.

I sincerely hope you investigate these students and cut out Federal loans to these hard-core rebels. The majority of our students are good honest American boys and girls and are entitled to receive an education and should not be interrupted by hard-core revolutionarys who possibly get their orders from Moscow. I sincerely hope you get the support from our Representative Kastenmeier from our District here in Wisconsin and also our two Senators.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. GARDNER.

LAWRENCE D. RUTTLE, M.D.,
Joliet, Ill., February 17, 1969

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: In the Sunday, February 16, Tribune there was a reprint of an editorial from the Washington Evening Star which outlined your position on the present problem of college students. As a father of three students presently in various universities and colleges around the country, I certainly agree with you wholeheartedly. I think that something must be done to give some backbone to the individuals who are responsible for governing our big universities such as Columbia and the University of Chicago. I do not think that they should take tax money, which all of them do to maintain themselves, and yet ignore the vast majority of the students whose lives are being disrupted by the relatively few, well organized, anarchists.

Fortunately, none of my children have been in schools where this type of problem occurred. If their studies were being disrupted, I certainly would feel called upon to attempt to recover something from the individuals who are supposed to be seeing to it that they get an education. It seems to me that we have gone so far with the idea of individual liberty that we have come to the point of individual license and this will eventually lead to complete disruption of our democratic society as we know it.

You who are leaders in our government have a duty to make it plain to our weak-kneed leaders in the universities that this kind of activity will not be tolerated. Keep up the good work.

Yours sincerely,

LAWRENCE D. RUTTLE.

DALLAS, TEX., *May 12, 1969.*

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I have been told that you are a very shrewd and influential woman with good honest judgment and the ability to get things done in the educational department of our Government.

As you know, people throughout the United States are becoming more and more disturbed and worried about the riots in our universities and colleges; they are probably more concerned about this issue than any which has faced our nation in recent years. If this situation is allowed to further develop, there is a great danger that it will spread and that we will have riots in all walks of life.

There is an urgent need for a Federal law, to be effective 30 days after passage, that will impose stiff sentences on the leaders of organized riots. A ten year sentence at hard labor and a $25,000 fine should be imposed on all individuals unlawfully carrying destructive weapons such as bombs, guns, ammunition, knives, etc. This law should have teeth in it and be written so that the judges of the Supreme Court cannot find loopholes to let the Communist Black Panthers, criminals, killers and such receive light or suspended sentences.

Your powerful assistance in seeing that such a bill is put before Congress as soon as possible shall be deeply appreciated by the citizens of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. CLARK.

MARSEILLES, ILL.,
March 12, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: It is a pleasure to hear that at last some one in a position to be heard in Washington has taken a stand against the harrassment of an overwhelming majority of the students in many of our schools of higher learning by a few, many of whom are getting a free ride on scholarships or grants. From conversations with our two sons and their college friends and from listening to conversations between them and other students it appears there is always a group that is ready to use any excuse to make trouble.

Our youngest son worked part time and attended Southern Illinois University for four years whereas the older son worked full time while attending classes at junior college part time in Chicago and later in San Francisco signing up last semester to attend San Francisco State full time carrying a heavy load so that he might finish his education. He has been harrassed repeatedly and many times threatened, as he has gone to school when it was open so he could.

We commend you on your stand and only wish some of our own state representatives had the fortitude to back you on your stand.

Sincerely yours,

EVELYN YOUMANS,
CHARLES E. YOUMANS.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES,
Chicago, Ill., April 23, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. GREEN: Someone in this country must take a firm stand against these over-strident university student demands. And that should be someone at the highest possible government level.

University officials have shown they are incapable of handling the problem—with few marked exceptions. They have been far too consistently permissive, which has led to nothing but further "non-negotiable" student demands.

Top government officials have been equally and inexcusably delinquent in taking a firm and uncompromising stand against student violence. We hope your Subcommittee study may put a halt to all this "wishy-washiness."

Attached are several letters on this subject—representing a citizen's viewpoint—which may be of interest to the Committee.

Sincerely,

ED C. JOHNSON, Jr.

RIEGELSVILLE, PA.,
March 8, 1969.

U.S. Representative EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Higher Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAME: We would like to urge you to follow through on your announced intention to investigate student anarchists who are receiving federal loans.

While we are in favor of higher education for all and help for needy students, it is against everything we believe to allow anyone being given federal aid in the name of Education to demonstrate and bring havoc to a college campus.

Sincerely,

DALE WOOD,
VIRGINIA WOOD.

SPOKANE, WASH.,
March 10, 1969.

Re Investigation of student anarchists.
Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I understand that you are Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Higher Education and that you have indicated that you intend to investigate student anarchists who are receiving federal loans.

I want to give you my support on this matter and encourage you to follow through on this statement that you intend to so investigate and we hope that as a result thereof that there will be no further subsidization of student anarchists.

May God bless you and continue on with your work.

Yours very truly,

FRED E. WOEPPEL.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
February 28, 1969.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: I read with interest what you had to say about campus disorders, and I agree with you wholeheartedly. I am sure many millions of American tax payers are getting sick and tried of these disruptive students. Freedom of speech should end when it infringes on the rights of others. I believe I speak for many others. When I say I certainly don't want my tax dollars spent in financing their education whether as a loan or outright gift. Neither do I want my tax dollars paying the salaries of faculty members who are behind these students. I certainly don't intend to vote for any more education bonds until these students prove they are really interested in gaining a college education.

I am enclosing a newspaper account of what went on at San Francisco. It appeared in the Washington Post last Thursday, February the twenty-seventh. It just enraged me! It is high time that college and university administrators stop being so permissive and adopt a tough policy. Expell these students and faculty members who are hell bent on destruction, class disruption and closing down our schools. If a student doesn't want to go to school to learn, he should be expelled to make room for the earnest student who really seeks a higher education. It is time the constitutional rights of the majority of our students be considered. They have a right to attend classes without them being disrupted by radical students who evidently have no interest in learning. How can they? Their time is spent in disrupting, burning, destroying, breaking windows and demonstrating. They should be made to pay for these damages instead of

the over burdened taxpayer. One wonders what kind of parents these students have!

I really didn't mean to write such a long letter, but I'm so angry, and hope that something will be done. Good luck to you in your hearings.

Sincerely,

MRS. ELLEN MUMFORD.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
May 15, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Representative Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The majority of the citizens of this country are aroused, deeply concerned and even frightened about our educational chaos in this country. The states have traditionally been responsible for the governing policies of our schools, as they should be. In the past several years, the Federal government has through various paths obtained access to ways of more and more influence on the schools, removing them from state control. We believe these various ingredients that the federal government has added are the flamable materials that are exploding in our schools today. That is why we are seeking help on the federal level.

A national campaign extolling the virtues and financial gains made by an education has made it "the thing" to get everyone in college. There has been so much overlooked in this campaign.

(a) Motivation is necessary to learn and apply this knowledge usefully for the person learning and his country.

(b) Work skills must be learned also.

(c) An educated fool is really worse for himself and society than an uneducated one.

(d) A background of knowledge, self-discipline and ability to use your time and learning capacity constructively are prerequisites.

(e) The ability to live and work in close proximity to others, yet each remain on his individual level of seeking and learning.

Through vast federal programs, the aim has been to grab every body possible and stick them in college. These colleges and universities were not there to take the malcontents, the leaches of society; they were established to train in technical skills, badly needed in our society, or scientific knowledge and methods of investigation and knowledge of skills in communicating this knowledge to others.

Those who enter colleges and universities with a desire only to live easy and have fun; then someone will reward them handsomely for their effort by a large salaried job, are being so cruelly deceived. This is not life and it cannot be lived in this way.

We favor the following actions in the federal area concerning education:

1. Reduction of federal grants and tightening up on those eligible to receive federal aid for education. The proven willingness to study and work in a self-disciplined way. The willingness to perform work in some way while receiving help. The immediate stop to any aid and forfeiture of any future right to receive aid for anyone taking part in any type of campus disorder. This is insurrection and destruction of the liberties and properties of others.

2. Prosecution of all leaders of militant groups, under present laws or by passing new laws if needed. The cut off of assistant monies to schools who refuse to prosecute.

3. The removal of the research centers from university control. They may be next to universities (buildings etc. that have financed from federal grants made to construct them should be deeded to the federal government). These centers should be administered by businesses. Grants for study and research could be given to them and professors and students would be able to work in them but not control them. All university hangers-on would be barred and activity detrimental (demonstrations etc. by those so inclined) strictly and enforceably forbidden. Oak Ridge, Tennessee is a good example of a research institution.

4. There should be schools to teach the work habits, technical skills and develop the underpriveleged to be able to work in society but they should be geared to this level. Those graduates might be able to qualify for college or university training later.

5. To the extent that federal aid is used in providing teacher training, there should be the strictest controls and selection. The teachers of our young hold the future of our country in their hands. We have allowed the misfits, the drifters and malcontents to become teachers. Those who have just gone to college for three and a half years and suddenly realized they haven't really learned or accomplished anything of worth then decide, "I'll teach". The teaching profession should be upgraded. Tenure should be removed. Teachers who cannot prove their worth as teachers each year should be removed.

6. Whatever changes that are necessary should be made to stop this mad scramble to have the proper proportion of black and white in each school. Each child should have the best education for living and working in this society in a productive and useful way. Each taught and inspired and assisted in becoming men and women responsible for their own activities and using their own abilities and skills usefully for the community and nation. This is best done in some situations in integrated schools, sometimes in all white and sometimes in all black. Let us not lose the primary objectives of education.

We have too long followed the Pied Pipers who have played weird tunes for our people to dance to. It didn't take the black Americans long to learn—after they had gotten a segment of the population so committed to integration that even stretching the constitution was used—this was not workable or desirable. Now they want integration when it pleases and segregation when it pleases. Our nation cannot survive the continual Pied Piper approach. Our universities and colleges cannot exist and would have no reason to exist if students are to dictate the policies, studies and living arrangements.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our concerns. We remain,

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT L. DOWELL.

SEASIDE, OREG.,
May 10, 1969.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I admire your firm stand on student anarchy and hope you do initiate legislation that will penalize these young radicals, many of them are in school using govt. funds—take that away and put them behind bars if they advocate overthrow of present governing school administrators. This is a wonderful country that is not perfect but it is the best one in the world today.

S. S. WILCOX.

LINCOLN CITY, OREG.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am a Republican but I have always admired your stand on many issues—especially in the realm of education and what is best for the young. So being a woman I am sending you these issues of Avant Guard that came to a young man here at Lincoln City. What has happened to our country? Have we all gone stark mad? Is filth of mind becoming daily fare—over the radio, magazines on the news stands, etc? Especially I am aghast to see what is happening at our universities. The radical speakers they permit there, the laxness in rules in the universities. It seems anything goes. Permissiveness seems to be the rule. They say it is only a small minority causing all the trouble. If so why will the rest—the majority of teachers and students—permit such things to happen? Are the faculty so spineless or do they secretly condone such happenings? I think it is high time we come to our senses and become aware of the direction in which we are so inexorably being carried, and clamp down on the senseless rioting etc. I saw the chaos caused by the students in Guatemala—the riots caused by perpetual students. I saw how they operate and believe me when I say the tactics are being used here. Ex-President Idigoras' book tells how they got control, how they thwart any Governor who tries to rule Guatemala. They can paralyze a country. I think any student who riots, burns and destroys should be arrested and expelled. Why should we pay for the education of the rebels who are bent on overthrowing our government by violence? I thought there was a law that punishes anyone who preaches overthrow of our country by violence. Yet the students are preaching such sedition.

Believe me when I tell you all of us are getting fed to the gills with what is happening and is the topic of conversation when we get together. We deplore it and resent paying taxes to educate the young and then to be daily reminded of the product being turned out by our schools. It makes one sick.

Sincerely yours,

INEZ MAKIN.

W. BIDDLE COMBS & CO., INC.,
Portland, Oreg., March 18, 1969.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: We all realize that you are mighty busy with governmental problems but we certainly hope you'll take time to *do* something about these Student Demonstrations.

There is so much "wishy-washy" attitude among our College Presidents and Government Officials that the Poor Tax Payer doesn't get a Break.

We do hope you'll take a real Firm and Realistic Stand against these vandals and law breakers.

Thank you & good luck.

W. BIDDLE COMBS.

HILLSBORO, OREG.,
May 27, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Representative from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am enclosing a copy of an article taken from the magazine U.S. News and World Report dated May 26, 1969 for your review. My reason for writing you relative to this article is to ask you and all of the other members of Congress "What do you intend to do about a situation that is reportedly developing in the United States?"

I know *exactly* what I would do were I representing the people of Oregon. I would immediately press for legislation that would curb the activities of every individual that advocated what Michael Klonsky is suggesting the S.D.S. do. I cannot believe that if we ignore this kind of threat that it will eventually "wash" itself out—or that these young people must have an opportunity to "express" themselves. To me—this is a grave threat to my Constitutional rights of life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness—and I, for one, am asking you to help me and my family, and all others who believe in these United States of America and for what our country stands—to pass legislation outlawing and removing from our midst this type of organization and individual.

So now—what are you going to do? Just where do you stand? Do you need more signatures and letters of individuals to let you know how we feel? Or, shall we all sit back and let the Michael Klonskys take over our country?

I would be most pleased to hear from you directly.

Yours for a continued strong U.S. Government,

E. D. BITTNER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
June 17, 1969.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Good for you!

All this chaos and destruction on campus has made the average taxpayer feel like having a revolt too.

Although unmarried and childless, I have always voted for educational bills—guess I had to struggle much too hard for my own education. However, I, and many others, have now developed such antipathy to the situations on campuses that I will not again contribute willingly until a change has been made.

Too many serious students and conscientious faculty members have been harassed and discommoded beyond all reason.

I very much resent such waste of taxpayers money.

I sincerely hope for the success of your timely and badly-needed bill.

A Republican admirer,

WELTHIA MOORE.

GREENWOOD, IND.,
February 28, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I hope you will continue to investigate student anarchists and all students who take part in a disruptive manner in the strife, turmoil and riots so common place now on college and university campuses.

Is the U.S. Office of Education doing anything about cutting off Federal aid to such students? *If not why not?*

Yours truly,

B. F. BARNARD.

P.S.—This letter needs no acknowledgment.

B. F. B.

NORBERT E. SCHMID INSURANCE AGENCY,
Cincinnati, Ohio, March 6, 1969.

EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: I understand you are considering undertaking an investigation into these student anarchists receiving federal loans who are disrupting our universities. I just wanted to encourage you to follow through on such actions. The general public should be informed on this matter, and I urge you to act quickly so we may stop financing our own destruction. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

NORBERT E. SCHMID.

GEORGE S. RICHARDSON, M.D., F.A.C.S.,
Roswell, N. Mex., March 6, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Subcommittee on Higher Education,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: I have been acquainted with the fact that you have stated that you will investigate student anarchists who are receiving student loans.

I say, more power to you!

What can I do to help you?

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE S. RICHARDSON, M.D.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 7, 1969.

The CHAIRMAN,
House Committee on Higher Education,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a student at Queens College in New York City. This may come as a surprise but I am not a radical, an Ad Hoc supporter, or a member of any type of SDS group. I do belong to a moderate group called Students for Queen College. I believe that a university has no place for radicals trying to impose their views in any way over the student body. I believe that no group has the authority to seize a building, nor to imprison anyone from the administration. I believe that police should be used to prevent and to keep order on a college campus when the administration fails by its efforts to control or police itself. I simply want the administration to administer, professors to teach, and students to go back to their primary reason for attendance . . . to study.

I recognize the need for change as well as the radicals. I do not however like nor recognize the way in which they go about trying to achieve their goals. Any victory gained when the administration is under pressure is no victory at all. When I should ever be in a position to propose change, it will be a peaceful solution acceptable to all parties involved. Students cannot change the world by these actions. They fail to realize that they are offering nothing to replace the very society that they are ripping apart.

Why does Congress put up with all this? Why should I feel like I am in a "war-zone" when I go to college? Why does my college president sit around and worry about making excuses to those politicians who appointed him? What is so difficult about meeting force with force. It is the only method left when presented with these so-called "non-negotiable demands".

As a regular student, I implore your committee to do something. Its silly to have a college administration that is not able to run a college. Rather than political appointees, let's have some able administrators.

JACK GILEAD.

JACKSON, MICH.,
March 12, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am pleased to hear that you are investigating student anarchists who are receiving Federal loans. I know that all taxpayers are very upset at the way the leftist students are disturbing the orderly process of education for those who want to go to college, and are actually destroying the school property.

If there is any way that Congress can control this Communistic movement I feel that it should. Those of us who pay tuition and room and board to send our children to college, and our children who have worked hard and studied to have this opportunity for higher education should not be denied it by a small hard core group who have decided to overthrow the institutions because their communist-trained leaders have told them to.

They can be controlled thru scholarships and thru demanding that the colleges raise their entrance standards to where they used to be, so that students who really want an education can go, and those who just want to use the college as a rehearsal revolution before stepping out to destroy the cities can be kept out. Good luck to you and your subcommittee.

Sincerely,

PHYLLIS KORTEN.

WESTFIELD, N.J.,
March 13, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Chairman, Committee on Higher Education,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: I am writing to commend you for your announcement that your Subcommittee on Higher Education will investigate student anarchists who are receiving federal loans.

I hope this investigation will be made promptly and before much more of the taxpayers' money is ladled out to these youthful trouble-makers. As a taxpayer, I resent having what I manage to save taxed away from me for the benefit of this unpatriotic, lawless crew.

In my opinion, once these disrupters have been duly identified and given their day of self-justification they should be expelled from the universities which they have been attending and made 1–A with their local draft boards. Surely a student who seeks to destroy a university has less right to continue his enrollment there than does some earnest student who is too stupid or lazy to make the grade.

Be assured that there are many others who feel as I do. No loans—and, I would add, no gifts—for the revolutionaries.

Sincerely,

EVELYN S. WACHTER
Mrs. John H. Wachter.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
June 4, 1969.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol.

DEAR MRS GREEN: I don't understand how college presidents and students can consider themselves outside the law that everyone else is supposed to obey. I don't understand why the law shouldn't apply on the campus the same as everywhere else. I don't understand how Congress can contemplate granting any exception to the general body of law without destroying its own dignity and authority.

It seems to me that setting universities off as above the law is bound to create in young people contempt for all law. Their contempt could have unimaginable consequences.

It has often been said that if a college president brings in the police to enforce the law the students are made more dangerously militant. This excites their anger against the college.

Once in a while a simple solution is the best. May I suggest that Congress pass a law making a college president liable to a fine, perhaps jail, if he fails to report a law violation to the local authorities?

With such a law, the students couldn't get angry at him or the college, only the government.

Yours sincerely,

KENNETH DOLE.

MORRISON, ILL.,
May 14, 1969.

Re Student disorders and federal aid to disrupted colleges.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: Please keep up the good work. We must stop giving federal aid to colleges who keep on permitting students to disrupt, or damage property, also stop giving aid to students who are causing troubles in the colleges.

Get rid of the SDS leaders and others who riot.

Thank you.

LAURA K. WAGENECHT,
EDW. J. WAGENECHT.

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Normal, Ill., May 11, 1969.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: Although I teach at a university that remains relatively unaffected by the illegal disruptions of radical student and faculty protests, I wish to commend your decision to investigate, and possibly to propose legislation, to preserve and protect the integrity and the actual property of American colleges and universities, threatened by *illegal* demonstration of *political* unrest.

Sincerely yours,

RAY L. WHITE.

MAY 2, 1969.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I liked your remarks quoted in the Boston Herald today.

I strenuously object to the subsidizing of campus riots or trespasses or disruptions. It would be wrong to take money from taxpayers and throw it in the ocean, but it is even worse to use it to support young people on campus who are more interested in interfer-

ing with the educational process than with getting the education that they are supposed to be seeking.

I am also disturbed about reports that there are radicals on some college faculties. I wish they could be fired!

Sincerely,

KENNETH B. BOND.

P.S. Howard ought to get rid of S.D.S. if they are going to get rid of R.O.T.C.

BROOKINGS, OREG., *February 9, 1969.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: After viewing the riots on various campuses it makes my blood boil to see the huge sums of money that is appropriated to these colleges that harbor known rioters. All faculty members that condone this sort of revolutionary activities should be replaced immediately.

Most of these riots are caused by Communist-oriented revolutionaries.

I hope you see fit to curb such activity.

I think Dr. S. I. Hayakawa should be highly considered for UO or OSU.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. HALE.

THE 205TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARTIGAS' BIRTHDAY JUNE 19, 1969

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Uruguayan people celebrate the 205th anniversary of the birth of their great patriot and liberator, José Artigas. At a time when we and our Latin American neighbors are devoting so much of our attention and energies to the need for orderly but rapid economic and social development in our hemisphere, it is appropriate and proper for us to pause and salute a man who not only fought for the independence of his own country but also dedicated his life to the freedom and well-being of people in all the Americas.

For nearly a decade until 1820, José Artigas fought against enormous odds to free his native Uruguay. But he always retained the vision and ideal of a free association of American nations working together toward the common goals of social justice and liberty. Early in the Revolution of the River Plate Provinces against Spanish rule, he declared:

The liberty of America forms my system and to create it my only desire.

Even at the height of the Latin American struggle for independence, Artigas never wavered in his faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves, declaring in 1819:

Let free peoples decide their own destiny.

Although this great soldier held almost absolute power in his own country and could easily have become dictator of much of the River Plate area, he refused to abuse the trust given him. His words are now engraved in the walls of the Legislative Palace in Montevideo:

My authority emanates from you and it ceases in your sovereign presence.

Indeed, Artigas made the will of the people the basis of his leadership. Many years after the Revolution, he wrote:

Taking the United States for a model, I sought autonomy for the Provinces, giving each State its own government, its own Constitution and flag, and the right to elect its representatives, judges and government from the citizens of each State."

In a letter of greeting to President Monroe in 1817, Artigas again referred to the public good and the advancement of freedom, saying:

To their support, all my efforts are directed, aided by the sacrifices of thousands of my fellow citizens. Heaven grant our wishes.

José Artigas and the Uruguayan people endured great sacrifices to win their freedom. At a crucial moment in their struggle, thousands of his followers burned their homes and property and followed Artigas in a dramatic "exodus" into the rude interior of the country where they maintained their heroic resistance against foreign rule.

After a bitter 9-year struggle, José Artigas was defeated by an overwhelming combination of enemies and lived the remainder of his life in exile. However, through his inspiration, the Uruguayan people went on to win their independence and his ideas have endured and shaped the Uruguayan nation, with its proud tradition of democracy and justice.

The influence of José Artigas transcends Uruguay. His example and ideals, like those of Bolívar and San Martín, have become an integral part of Pan-Americanism—the fundamental belief that we in this hemisphere, citizens of free and independent nations, are nevertheless interdependent; that although we cherish our individual sovereignty, we also freely choose to work together in peace toward our common goals.

It is this belief that animates our joint efforts to achieve a better life for all our peoples. It is this sense of common purpose and tradition which leads us to band together in the defense of our freedom against foreign domination and alien ideologies.

Mr. Speaker, let us join today with the people of Uruguay in honoring one of the great American heroes—José Artigas.

CLARK CLIFFORD ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the proposal that U.S. ground combat forces be withdrawn from Vietnam by the end of 1970 made in an article in the current issue of Foreign Affairs Journal by Clark Clifford, President Johnson's Secretary of Defense, is another example of the courageous level-headed public service the American people have come to expect from Mr. Clifford.

It was the influence of Mr. Clifford, more than that of anyone else, which led to President Johnson's momentous decision of last March 31, and which earlier had led to the rejection of General Wheeler's request for 200,000 additional U.S. troops for Vietnam.

Mr. Clifford returned to public life as Secretary of Defense from private law practice, having earlier rendered long and distinguished service under President Truman.

His metamorphosis last year from hawk to dove on Vietnam was an experience undoubtedly shared by many others—myself, most certainly—but in his case the experience had tremendous impact upon the course of national policy.

What might have developed had he not succeeded Robert S. McNamara as Secretary of Defense? It is my belief the United States would have sunk even deeper into the Asian quagmire, perhaps even being pulled into an agonizing engagement with Communist China.

Clearly, Mr. Clifford's first assignment by President Johnson was to chair a task force that, in Mr. Clifford's own words was not instructed to assess the need for substantial increases in men and material; we were to devise the means by which they could be provided."

In any event, Mr. Clifford rendered great service in causing a halt to the U.S. combat buildup in Vietnam. He adds significantly to it by encouraging President Nixon to withdraw promptly and unconditionally not just 25,000 but all U.S. ground combat forces.

Just as Mr. Clifford exerted powerful and constructive influence as a chief officer of the Democratic administration of Mr. Johnson, he now exerts powerful and constructive influence on the Republican administration of Mr. Nixon. Although his influence now necessarily comes from outside the official circle, it is my hope that it will have the same profound effect as his earlier initiatives, reinforcing a decision Mr. Nixon hopefully has already made.

The text of Mr. Clifford's article as it appears in the July issue of Foreign Affairs follows:

A VIETNAM REAPPRAISAL: THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF ONE MAN'S VIEW AND HOW IT EVOLVED

(By Clark M. Clifford)

Viet Nam remains unquestionably the transcendent problem that confronts our nation. Though the escalation has ceased, we seem to be no closer to finding our way out of this infinitely complex difficulty. The confidence of the past has become the frustration of the present. Predictions of progress and of military success, made so often by so many, have proved to be illusory as the fighting and the dying continue at a tragic rate. Within our country, the dialogue quickens and the debate sharpens. There is a growing impatience among our people, and questions regarding the war and our participation in it are being asked with increasing vehemence.

Many individuals these past years have sought to make some contribution toward finding the answers that have been so elusive. It is with this hope in mind that I present herewith the case history of one man's attitude toward Viet Nam, and the various stages of thought he experienced as he plodded painfully from one point of view to another, and another, until he arrived at the unshakable opinion he possesses today.

Views on Viet Nam have become increasingly polarized as the war has gone on without visible progress toward the traditional American military triumph. There remain some who insist that we were right to intervene militarily and, because we were right, we have no choice but to press on until the enemy knuckles under and concedes defeat. At the other extreme, and in increasing numbers, there are those who maintain that the present unsatisfactory situation proves that our Viet Nam policy has been wrong from the very beginning. There are even those who suggest that our problems in Viet Nam cast doubt on the entire course of American foreign policy since World War II. Both schools

share a common and, as I see it, an erroneous concept. They both would make military victory the ultimate test of the propriety of our participation in the conflict in Southeast Asia.

I find myself unable to agree with either extreme. At the time of our original involvement in Viet Nam, I considered it to be based upon sound and unassailable premises, thoroughly consistent with our self-interest and our responsibilities. There has been no change in the exemplary character of our intentions in Viet Nam. We intervened to help a new and small nation resist subjugation by a neighboring country—a neighboring country, incidentally, which was being assisted by the resources of the world's two largest communist powers.

I see no profit and no purpose in any divisive national debate about whether we were right or wrong initially to become involved in the struggle in Vietnam. Such debate at the present time clouds the issue and obscures the pressing need for a clear and logical evaluation of our present predicament, and how we can extricate ourselves from it.

Only history will be able to tell whether or not our military presence in Southeast Asia was warranted. Certainly the decisions that brought it about were based upon a reasonable reading of the past three decades. We had seen the calamitous consequences of standing aside while totalitarian and expansionist nations moved successively against their weaker neighbors and accumulated a military might which left even the stronger nations uneasy and insecure. We had seen in the period immediately after World War II the seemingly insatiable urge of the Soviet Union to secure satellite states on its western periphery. We had seen in Asia itself the attempt by open invasion to extend communist control into the independent South of the Korean Peninsula. We had reason to feel that the fate averted in Korea through American and United Nations military force would overtake the independent countries of Asia, albeit in somewhat subtler form, were we to stand aside while the communist North sponsored subversion and terrorism in South Viet Nam.

The transformation that has taken place in my thinking has been brought about, however, by the conclusion that the world situation has changed dramatically, and that American involvement in Viet Nam can and must change with it. Important ingredients of this present situation include the manner in which South Viet Nam and its Asian neighbors have responded to the threat and to our own massive intervention. They also include internal developments both in Asian nations and elsewhere, and the changing relations among world powers.

The decisions which our nation faces today in Viet Nam should not be made on interpretations of the facts as they were perceived four or five or fifteen years ago, even if, through compromise, a consensus could be reached on these interpretations. They must instead be based upon our present view of our obligations as a world power; upon our current concept of our national security; upon our conclusions regarding our commitments as they exist today; upon our fervent desire to contribute to peace throughout the world; and, hopefully, upon our acceptance of the principle of enlightened self-interest.

But these are broad and general guidelines, subject to many constructions and misconstructions. They also have the obvious drawback of being remote and impersonal.

The purpose of this article is to present to the reader the intimate and highly personal experience of one man, in the hope that by so doing there will be a simpler and clearer understanding of where we are in Viet Nam today, and what we must do about it. I shall go back to the beginning and identify, as well as I can, the origins of my consciousness of the problem, the opportunities I had to obtain the facts, and the resulting evolution of what I shall guardedly refer to as my thought processes.

II

Although I had served President Truman in the White House from May 1945 until February 1950, I do not recall ever having had to focus on Southeast Asia. Indochina, as it was then universally known, was regarded by our government as a French problem. President Truman was prompted from time to time by the State Department to approve statements that seemed to me to be little more than reiterations of the long-standing American attitude against "colonialism." If any of those provoked extensive discussion at the White House, I cannot recall. For the next decade, I watched foreign affairs and the growing turbulence of Asia from the sidelines as a private citizen, increasingly concerned but not directly involved.

In the summer of 1960, Senator John Kennedy invited me to act as his transition planner, and later as liaison with the Eisenhower Administration in the interval between the election and January 20, 1961. Among the foreign policy problems that I encountered at once was a deteriorating situation in Southeast Asia. Major-General Wilton B. Persons, whom President Eisenhower had designated to work with me, explained the gravity of the situation as viewed by the outgoing Administration. I suggested to the President-elect that it would be well for him to hear President Eisenhower personally on the subject. He agreed, and accordingly General Persons and I placed Southeast Asia as the first item on the agenda of the final meeting between the outgoing and the incoming Presidents. This meeting, held on the morning of January 19, 1961, in the Cabinet Room, was attended by President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Christian Herter, Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson and General Persons. President-elect Kennedy had his counterparts present: Secretary of State-designate Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense-designate Robert McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury-designate Douglas Dillon, and me.

At President-elect Kennedy's suggestion, I took notes of the important subjects discussed. Most of the time, the discussion centered on Southeast Asia, with emphasis upon Laos. At that particular time, January 1961, Laos had come sharply into focus and appeared to constitute the major danger in the area.

My notes disclose the following comments by the President:

"At this point, President Eisenhower said, with considerable emotion, that Laos was the key to the entire area of Southeast Asia.

"He said that if we permitted Laos to fall, then we would have to write off all the area. He stated we must not permit a Communist take-over. He reiterated that we should make every effort to persuade member nations of SEATO or the International Control Commission to accept the burden with us to defend the freedom of Laos.

"As he concluded these remarks, President Eisenhower stated it was imperative that Laos be defended. He said that the United States should accept this task with our allies, if we could persuade them and alone if we could not. He added, 'Our unilateral intervention would be our last desperate hope in the event we were unable to prevail upon the other signatories to join us.' "

That morning's discussion, and the gravity with which President Eisenhower addressed the problem, had a substantial impact on me. He and his advisers were finishing eight years of responsible service to the nation. I had neither facts nor personal experience to challenge their assessment of the situation, even if I had had the inclination to do so. The thrust of the presentation was the great importance to the United States of taking a firm stand in Southeast Asia, and I accepted that judgment.

On an earlier occasion, in speaking of Southeast Asia, President Eisenhower had said that South Viet Nam's capture by the communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The freedom of 12 million people would be lost immediately, and that of 150 million in adjacent lands would be seriously endangered. The loss of South Viet Nam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom.

As I listened to him in the Cabinet Room that January morning, I recalled that it was President Eisenhower who had acquainted the public with the phrase "domino theory" by using it to describe how one country after another could be expected to fall under communist control once the process started in Southeast Asia.

In the spring of 1961, I was appointed to membership on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. In this capacity, I received briefings from time to time on affairs in Asia. The information provided the Board supported the assessment of the previous Administration, with which President Kennedy concurred. "Withdrawal in the case of Viet Nam," President Kennedy said in 1961, "and in the case of Thailand could mean the collapse of the whole area." He never wavered. A year later, he said of Viet Nam: "We are not going to withdraw from that effort. In my opinion, for us to withdraw from that effort would mean a collapse not only of South Viet Nam but Southeast Asia. So we are going to stay there." I had no occasion to question the collective opinion of our duly chosen officials.

After President Johnson took office, our involvement became greater, but so did most public and private assessments of the correctness of our course. The Tonkin Gulf resolution was adopted by the Congress in 1964 by a vote of 504 to 2. The language was stern: "The United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

When decisions were made in 1965 to increase, in very substantial fashion, the American commitment in Viet Nam, I accepted the judgment that such actions were necessary. That fall, I made a trip to Southeast Asia in my capacity as Chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. The optimism of our military and Vietnamese officials on the conduct of the war, together with the encouragement of our Asian allies, confirmed my belief in the correctness of our policy. In the absence at the time of indications that Hanoi had any interest in peace negotiations, I did not favor the 37-day bombing halt over the Christmas 1965-New Year 1966 holiday season. I felt such a halt could be construed by Hanoi as a sign of weakness on our part.

In 1966, I served as an adviser to President Johnson at the Manila Conference. It was an impressive gathering of the Chiefs of State and Heads of Government of the allied nations; it reassured me that we were on the right road and that our military progress was bringing us closer to the resolution of the conflict.

In the late summer of 1967, President Johnson asked me to go with his Special Assistant, General Maxwell Taylor, to review the situation in South Viet Nam, and then to visit some of our Pacific allies. We were to brief them on the war and to discuss with them the possibility of their increasing their troop commitments. Our briefings in South Viet Nam were extensive and encouraging.

There were suggestions that the enemy was being hurt badly and that our bombing and superior firepower were beginning to achieve the expected results.

Our visits to the allied capitals, however, produced results that I had not foreseen. It was strikingly apparent to me that the other troop-contributing countries no longer shared our degree of concern about the war in South Viet Nam. General Taylor and I urged them to increase their participation. In the main, our plea fell on deaf ears.

Thailand, a near neighbor to South Viet Nam, with a population of some 30 million, had assigned only 2,500 men to South Viet Nam, and was in no hurry to allocate more.

The President of the Philippines advised President Johnson that he preferred we not stop there because of possible adverse public reaction. The Philippines, so close and ostensibly so vulnerable if they accepted the domino theory, had sent a hospital corps and an engineer battalion to Viet Nam, but no combat troops. It was also made clear to President Johnson that they had no intention of sending any combat personnel.

South Korea had the only sizable contingent of Asian troops assisting South Viet Nam, but officials argued that a higher level of activity on the part of the North Koreans prevented their increasing their support.

Disappointing though these visits were, I had high hopes for the success of our mission in Australia and New Zealand. I recalled that Australia, then with a much smaller population, had been able to maintain well over 300,000 troops overseas in World War II. They had sent only 7,000 to Vietnam. Surely there was hope here. But Prime Minister Holt, who had been fully briefed, presented a long list of reasons why Australia was already close to its maximum effort.

In New Zealand, we spent the better part of a day conferring with the Prime Minister and his cabinet, while hundreds of students picketed the Parliament Building carrying signs bearing peace slogans. These officials were courteous and sympathetic, as all the others had been, but they made it clear that any appreciable increase was out of the question. New Zealand at one time had 70,000 troops overseas in the various theaters of World War II. They had 500 men in Vietnam. I naturally wondered if this was their evaluation of the respective dangers of the two conflicts.

I returned home puzzled, troubled, concerned. Was it possible that our assessment of the danger to the stability of Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific was exaggerated? Was it possible that those nations which were neighbors of Vietnam had a clearer perception of the tides of world events in 1967 than we? Was it possible that we were continuing to be guided by judgments that might once have had validity but were now obsolete? In short, although I still counted myself a staunch supporter of our policies, there were nagging, not-to-be-suppressed doubts in my mind.

These doubts were dramatized a short time later back in the United States when I attended a dinner at the White House for Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore. His country, which knew the bitterness of defeat and occupation in World War II, had declined to send any men at all to Viet Nam. In answer to my question as to when he thought troops might be sent, he stated he saw no possibility of that taking place because of the adverse political effect in Singapore.

Accordingly, I welcomed President Johnson's San Antonio speech of September 30, 1967, with far greater enthusiasm than I would have had I not so recently returned from the Pacific. I felt it marked a substantial step in the right direction because it offered an alternative to a military solution of the lengthy and costly conflict. Allied bombing of North Viet Nam had by now assumed a symbolic significance of enormous proportions and the President focused his attention on this. The essence of his proposal was an offer to stop the bombing of North Viet Nam if prompt and productive peace discussions with the other side would ensue. We would assume that the other side would "not take advantage" of the bombing cessation. By this formula, the President made an imaginative move to end the deadlock over the bombing and get negotiations started.

I, of course, shared the universal disappointment that the San Antonio offer evoked no favorable response from Hanoi, but my feelings were more complex than those of mere disappointment. As I listened to the official discussion in Washington, my feelings turned from disappointment to dismay. I found it was being quietly asserted that, in return for a bombing cessation in the North, the North Vietnamese must stop sending men and materiel into South Viet Nam. On the surface, this might have seemed a fair exchange. To me, it was an unfortunate interpretation that—intentionally or not—rendered the San Antonio formula virtually meaningless. The North Vietnamese had more than 100,000 men in the South. It was totally unrealistic to expect them to abandon their men by not replacing casualties, and by failing to provide them with clothing, food, munitions and other supplies. We could never expect them to accept an offer to negotiate on those conditions.

III

In mid-January 1968, President Johnson asked me to serve as Secretary of Defense, succeeding Secretary McNamara, who was leaving to become President of the World Bank. In the confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 25, I was asked about the San Antonio formula. The interpretation I gave was in accord with President Johnson's intense desire to start negotiations, and it offered a possibility of acceptance which I was convinced did not exist with the extreme and rigid interpretations that so concerned me. I said that I assumed that the North Vietnamese would "continue to transport the normal amount of goods, munitions and men to South Viet Nam" at the levels that had prevailed prior to our bombing cessation. This was my understanding of what the President meant by "not take advantage."

The varying interpretations of the San Antonio formula raised in my mind the question as to whether all of us had the same objective in view. Some, it seemed, could envision as satisfactory no solution short of the complete military defeat of the enemy. I did not count myself in this group. Although I still accepted as valid the premises of our Viet Nam involvement, I was dissatisfied with the rigidities that so limited our course of action and our alternatives.

I took office on March 1, 1968. The enemy's Tet offensive of late January and early February had been beaten back at great cost. The confidence of the American people had been badly shaken. The ability of the South Vietnamese Government to restore order and morale in the populace, and discipline and esprit in the armed forces, was being questioned. At the President's direction, General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had flown to Viet Nam in late February for an on-the-spot conference with General Westmoreland. He had just returned and presented the military's request that over 200,000 troops be prepared for deployment to Viet Nam. These troops would be in addition to the 525,000 previously authorized. I was directed, as my first assignment, to chair a task force named by the President to determine how this new requirement could be met. We were not instructed to assess the need for substantial increases in men and materiel; we were to devise the means by which they could be provided.

My work was cut out. The task force included Secretary Rusk, Secretary Henry Fowler, Under Secretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze, General Wheeler, CIA Director Richard Helms, the President's Special Assistant, Walt Rostow, General Maxwell Taylor and other skilled and highly capable officials. All of them had had long and direct experience with Vietnamese problems. I had not. I had attended various meetings in the past several years and I had been to Vietnam three times, but it was quickly apparent to me how little one knows if he has been on the periphery of a problem and not truly in it. Until the day-long sessions of early March, I had never had the opportunity of intensive analysis and fact-finding. Now I was thrust into a vigorous, ruthlessly frank assessment of our situation by the men who knew the most about it. Try though we would to stay with the assignment of devising means to meet the military's requests, fundamental questions began to recur over and over.

It is, of course, not possible to recall all the questions that were asked nor all of the answers that were given. Had a transcript of our discussions been made—one was not—it would have run to hundreds of closely printed pages. The documents brought to the table by participants would have totalled, if collected in one place—which they were not—many hundreds more. All that is pertinent to this essay are the impressions I formed, and the conclusions I ultimately reached in those days of exhausting scrutiny. In the colloquial style of those meetings, here are some of the principal issues raised and some of the answers as I understood them:

"Will 200,000 more men do the job?" I found no assurance that they would.

"If not, how many more might be needed—and when?" There was no way of knowing.

"What would be involved in committing 200,000 more men to Viet Nam?" A reserve call-up of approximately 280,000, an increased draft call and an extension of tours of duty of most men then in service.

"Can the enemy respond with a build-up of his own?" He could and he probably would.

"What are the estimated costs of the latest requests?" First calculations were on the order of $2 billion for the remaining four months of that fiscal year, and an increase of $10 to $12 billion for the year beginning July 1, 1968.

"What will be the impact on the economy?" So great that we would face the possibility of credit restrictions, a tax increase and even wage and price controls. The balance of payments would be worsened by at least half a billion dollars a year.

"Can bombing stop the war?" Never by itself. It was inflicting heavy personnel and matériel losses, but bombing by itself would not stop the war.

"Will stepping up the bombing decrease American casualties?" Very little, if at all. Our casualties were due to the intensity of the ground fighting in the South. We had already dropped a heavier tonnage of bombs than in all the theaters of World War II. During 1967, an estimated 90,000 North Vietnamese had infiltrated into South Viet Nam. In the opening weeks of 1968, infiltrators were coming in at three to four times the rate of a year earlier, despite the ferocity and intensity of our campaign of aerial interdiction.

"How long must we keep on sending our men and carrying the main burden of combat?" The South Vietnamese were doing better, but they were not ready yet to replace our troops and we did not know when they would be.

When I asked for a presentation of the military plan for attaining victory in Viet Nam, I was told that there was no plan for victory in the historic American sense. Why not? Because our forces were operating under three major political restrictions: The Presi-

dent had forbidden the invasion of North Viet Nam because this could trigger the mutual assistance pact between North Viet Nam and China; the President had forbidden the mining of the harbor at Haiphong, the principal port through which the North received military supplies, because a Soviet vessel might be sunk; the President had forbidden our forces to pursue the enemy into Laos and Cambodia, for to do so would spread the war, politically and geographically, with no discernible advantage. These and other restrictions which precluded an all-out, no-holds-barred military effort were wisely designed to prevent our being drawn into a larger war. We had no inclination to recommend to the President their cancellation.

"Given these circumstances, how can we win?" We would, I was told, continue to evidence our superiority over the enemy; we would continue to attack in the belief that he would reach the stage where he would find it inadvisable to go on with the war. He could not afford the attrition we were inflicting on him. And we were improving our posture all the time.

I then asked, "What is the best estimate as to how long this course of action will take? Six months? One year? Two years?" There was no agreement on an answer. Not only was there no agreement, I could find no one willing to express any confidence in his guesses. Certainly, none of us was willing to assert that he could see "light at the end of the tunnel" or that American troops would be coming home by the end of the year.

After days of this type of analysis, my concern had greatly deepened. I could not find out when the war was going to end; I could not find out the manner in which it was going to end; I could not find out whether the new requests for men and equipment were going to be enough, or whether it would take more and, if more, when and how much; I could not find out how soon the South Vietnamese forces would be ready to take over. All I had was the statement, given with too little self-assurance to be comforting, that if we persisted for an indeterminate length of time, the enemy would choose not to go on.

And so I asked, "Does anyone see any diminution in the will of the enemy after four years of our having been there, after enormous casualties and after massive destruction from our bombing?"

The answer was that there appeared to be no diminution in the will of the enemy. This reply was doubly impressive, because I was more conscious each day of domestic unrest in our own country. Draft card burnings, marches in the streets, problems on school campuses, bitterness and divisiveness were rampant. Just as disturbing to me were the economic implications of a struggle to be indefinitely continued at ever-increasing cost. The dollar was already in trouble, prices were escalating far too fast and emergency controls on foreign investment imposed on New Year's Day would be only a prelude to more stringent controls, if we were to add another $12 billion to Viet Nam spending—with perhaps still more to follow.

I was also conscious of our obligations and involvements elsewhere in the world. There were certain hopeful signs in our relations with the Soviet Union, but both nations were hampered in moving toward vitally important talks on the limitation of strategic weapons so long as the United States was committed to a military solution in Viet Nam. We could not afford to disregard our interests in the Middle East, South Asia, Africa, Western Europe and elsewhere. Even accepting the validity of our objective in Viet Nam, that objective had to be viewed in the context of our overall national interest, and could not sensibly be pursued at a price so high as to impair our ability to achieve other, and perhaps even more important, foreign policy objectives.

Also, I could not free myself from the continuing nagging doubt left over from that August trip, that if the nations living in the shadow of Viet Nam were not now persuaded by the domino theory, perhaps it was time for us to take another look. Our efforts had given the nations in that area a number of years following independence to organize and build their security. I could see no reason at this time for us to continue to add to our commitment. Finally, there was no assurance that a 40 percent increase in American troops would place us within the next few weeks, months or even years in any substantially better military position than we were in then. All that could be predicted accurately was that more troops would raise the level of combat and automatically raise the level of casualties on both sides.

And so, after these exhausting days, I was convinced that the military course we were pursuing was not only endless, but hopeless. A further substantial increase in American forces could only increase the devastation and the Americanization of the war, and thus leave us even further from our goal of a peace that would permit the people of South Viet Nam to fashion their own political and economic institutions. Henceforth, I was also convinced, our primary goal should be to level off our involvement, and to work toward gradual disengagement.

IV

To reach a conclusion and to implement it are not the same, especially when one does not have the ultimate power of decision. It now became my purpose to emphasize to my colleagues and to the President, that the United States had entered Viet Nam with a limited aim—to prevent its subjugation by the North and to enable the people of South Viet Nam to determine their own future. I also argued that we had largely accomplished that objective. Nothing required us to remain until the North had been ejected from the South, and the Saigon government had been established in complete military control of all South Viet Nam. An increase of over 200,000 in troop strength would mean that American forces would be twice the size of the regular South Vietnamese Army at that time. Our goal of building a stronger South Vietnamese Government, and an effective military force capable of ultimately taking over from us, would be frustrated rather than furthered. The more we continue to do in South Viet Nam, the less likely the South Vietnamese were to shoulder their own burden.

The debate continued at the White House for days. President Johnson encouraged me to report my findings and my views with total candor, but he was equally insistent on hearing the views of others. Finally, the President, in the closing hours of March, made his decisions and reported them to the people on the evening of the 31st. Three related directly to the month's review of the war. First, the President announced he was establishing a ceiling of 549,500 in the American commitment to Viet Nam; the only new troops going out would be support troops previously promised. Second, we would speed up our aid to the South Vietnamese armed forces. We would equip and train them to take over major combat responsibilities from us on a much accelerated schedule. Third, speaking to Hanoi, the President stated he was greatly restricting American Bombing of the North as an invitation and an inducement to begin peace talks. We would no longer bomb north of the Twentieth Parallel. By this act of unilateral restraint, nearly 80 percent of the territory of North Viet Nam would no longer subjected to our bombing.

I had taken office at the beginning of the month with one overriding immediate assignment—responding to the military request to strengthen our forces in Viet Nam so that we might prosecute the war more forcefully. Now my colleagues and I had two different and longer-range tasks—developing a plan for shifting the burden to the South Vietnamese as rapidly as they could be made ready, and supporting our government's diplomatic efforts to engage in peace talks.

To assess the range of progress in the first task, I went to Viet Nam in July. I was heartened by the excellent spirit and the condition of our forces, but found distressingly little evidence that the other troop-contributing countries, or the South Vienamese, were straining to relieve us of our burdens. Although there had been nominal increases in troop contributions from Australia and Thailand since the preceding summer, the Philippines had actually withdrawn several hundred men. The troop-contributing countries were bearing no more of the combat burden; their casualty rates were actually falling.

As for South Vietnamese officials, in discussion after discussion, I found them professing unawareness of shortcomings in such matters as troop training, junior officer strength and rate of desertions. They were, I felt, too complacent when the facts were laid before them. I asked Vice President Ky, for example, about the gross desertion rate of South Vietnamese combat personnel that was running at 30 percent a year. He responded that it was so large, in part, because their men were not paid enough. I asked what his government intended to do. He suggested that we could cut back our bombing, give the money thus saved to the Saigon government, and it would be used for troop pay. He was not jesting; his suggestion was a serious one. I returned home oppressed by the pervasive Americanization of the war: we were still giving the military instructions, still doing most of the fighting, still providing all the matériel, still paying most of the bills. Worst of all, I concluded that the South Vietnamese leaders seemed content to have it that way.

The North had responded to the President's speech of March 31 and meetings had begun in Paris in May. It was, however, a euphemism to call them peace talks. In midsummer, substantive discussions had not yet begun. Our negotiators, the able and experienced Ambassador Averell Harriman and his talented associate, Cyrus Vance, were insisting that the Saigon government be a participant in the talks. Hanoi rejected this. President Johnson, rightly and understandably, refused to order a total bombing halt of the North until Hanoi would accept reciprocal restraints. Hanoi refused. With this unsatisfactory deadlock, the summer passed in Paris.

In Viet Nam, American casualty lists were tragically long, week after week. The enemy was not winning but, I felt, neither were we. There were many other areas in the world where our influence, moral force and economic contributions were sorely in demand and were limited because of our preoccupation with our involvement in Southeast Asia.

I returned from a NATO meeting in Bonn on Sunday evening, October 13, to find a summons to a White House meeting the following morning. There had been movement in Paris. There were no formal agreements, but certain "understandings" had been reached by our negotiating team and the North Vietnamese. At last the North had accepted the participation of the South in peace talks. We would stop all bombing of North Viet Nam. Substantive talks were to start promptly. We had made it clear to Hanoi that we could not continue such talks if there were indiscriminate shelling of major cities in the South, or if the demilitarized zone were violated so as to place our troops in jeopardy.

The President outlined the situation to his advisers. We spent a day of hard and full review. The Joint Chiefs of Staff were unanimous in stating that the bombing halt under

these circumstances was acceptable. The State Department was authorized to report to Saigon that we had won a seat at the conference table for the Saigon government and to request the earliest possible presence of their delegation in Paris. I felt a sense of relief and hope; we were started down the road to peace.

These feelings were short-lived. The next three weeks were almost as agonizing to me as March had been. The cables from Saigon were stunning. The South Vietnamese Government, suddenly and unexpectedly, was not willing to go to Paris. First one reason, then another, then still another were cabled to Washington. As fast as one Saigon obstacle was overcome, another took its place. Incredulity turned to dismay. I felt that the President and the United States were being badly used. Even worse, I felt that Saigon was attempting to exert a veto power over our agreement to engage in peace negotiations. I admired greatly the President's ability to be patient under the most exasperating circumstances. Each day ran the risk that the North might change its mind, and that months of diligent effort at Paris would be in vain; each day saw a new effort on his part to meet the latest Saigon objection.

To satisfy himself that the bombing halt would neither jeopardize our own forces nor those of our allies, the President ordered General Creighton W. Abrams back from South Viet Nam for a personal report. Finally, on October 31, President Johnson announced that the bombing of North Viet Nam would cease, peace talks would begin promptly and Saigon was assured of a place at the conference table. However, it took weeks to get the Saigon government to Paris, and still additional weeks to get their agreement on seating arrangements.

By the time the various difficulties had been resolved, certain clear and unequivocal opinions regarding the attitude and posture of the Saigon government had crystalized in my mind. These opinions had been forming since my trip to South Viet Nam the preceding July.

The goal of the Saigon government and the goal of the United States were no longer one and the same, if indeed they ever had been. They were not in total conflict but they were clearly not identical. We had largely accomplished the objective for which we had entered the struggle. There was no longer any question about the desire of the American people to bring the Viet Nam adventure to a close.

As Ambassador Harriman observed, it is dangerous to let your aims be escalated in the middle of a war. Keep your objectives in mind, he advised, and as soon as they are attained, call a halt. The winning of the loyalty of villagers to the central government in Saigon, the form of a postwar government, who its leaders should be and how they are to be selected—these were clearly not among our original war objectives. But these were the precise areas of our differences with the Saigon government.

As Saigon authorities saw it, the longer the war went on, with the large-scale American involvement, the more stable was their régime, and the fewer concessions they would have to make to other political groupings. If the United States were to continue its military efforts for another two or three years, perhaps the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong would be so decimated that no concessions would be needed at all. In the meantime, vast amounts of American wealth were being poured into the South Vietnamese economy. In short, grim and distasteful though it might be, I concluded during the bleak winter weeks that Saigon was in no hurry for the fighting to end and that the Saigon régime did not want us to reach an early settlement of military issues with Hanoi.

The fact is that the creation of strong political, social and economic institutions is a job that the Vietnamese must do for themselves. We cannot do it for them, nor can they do it while our presence hangs over them so massively. President Thieu, Vice President Ky, Prime Minister Huong and those who may follow them have the task of welding viable political institutions from the 100 or more splinter groups that call themselves political parties. It is up to us to let them get on with the job. Nothing we might do could be so beneficial or could so add to the political maturity of South Viet Nam as to begin to withdraw our combat troops. Moreover, in my opinion, we cannot realistically expect to achieve anything more through our military force, and the time has come to begin to disengage. That was my final conclusion as I left the Pentagon on January 20, 1969.

v

It remains my firm opinion today. It is based not only on my personal experiences, but on the many significant changes that have occurred in the world situation in the last four years.

In 1965, the forces supported by North Viet Nam were on the verge of a military takeover of South Viet Nam. Only by sending large numbers of American troops was it possible to prevent this from happening. The South Vietnamese were militarily weak and politically demoralized. They could not, at that time, be expected to preserve for themselves the right to determine their own future. Communist China had recently proclaimed its intention to implement the doctrine of "wars of national liberation." Khrushchev's fall from power the preceding October and Chou En-lai's visit to Moscow in November 1964 posed the dire possibility of the two communist giants working together to spread disruption throughout the underdeveloped nations of the world. Indonesia, under Sukarno, presented a posture of implacable hostility toward Malaysia, and was a destabilizing element in the entire Pacific picture. Malaysia itself, as well as Thailand and Singapore, needed time for their governmental institutions to mature. Apparent American indifference to developments in Asia might, at that time, have had a disastrous impact on the independent countries of that area.

During the past four years, the situation has altered dramatically. The armed forces of South Viet Nam have increased in size and proficiency. The political situation there has become more stable, and the governmental institutions more representative. Elsewhere in Asia, conditions of greater security exist. The bloody defeat of the attempted communist coup in Indonesia removed Sukarno from power and changed the confrontation with Malaysia to cooperation between the two countries. The governments of Thailand and Singapore have made good use of these four years to increase their popular support. Australia and New Zealand have moved toward closer regional defense ties, while Japan, the Republic of Korea and Taiwan have exhibited a rate of economic growth and an improvement in living standards that discredit the teachings of Chairman Mao.

Of at least equal significance is the fact that, since 1965, relations between Russia and China have steadily worsened. The schism between these two powers is one of the watershed events of our time. Ironically, their joint support of Hanoi has contributed to the acrimony between them. It has brought into focus their competition for leadership in the communist camp. Conflicting positions on the desirability of the peace negotiations in Paris have provided a further divisive factor. In an analogous development, increased Soviet aid to North Korea has made Pyongyang less dependent on China. The Cultural Revolution and the depredations of the Red Guards have created in China a situation of internal unrest that presently preoccupies China's military forces. The recent border clashes on the Ussuri River further decrease the likelihood that China will, in the near future, be able to devote its attention and resources to the export of revolution.

These considerations are augmented by another. It seems clear that the necessity to devote more of our minds and our means to our pressing domestic problems requires that we set a chronological limit on our Vietnamese involvement.

A year ago, we placed a numerical limit on this involvement, and did so without lessening the effectiveness of the total military effort. There will undeniably, be, many problems inherent in the replacement of American combat forces with South Vietnamese forces. But whatever these problems, they must be faced. There is no way to achieve our goal of creating the conditions that will allow the South Vietnamese to determine their own future unless we begin, and begin promptly, to turn over to them the major responsibility for their own defense. This ability to defend themselves can never be developed so long as we continue to bear the brunt of the battle. Sooner or later, the test must be whether the South Vietnamese will serve their own country sufficiently well to guarantee its national survival. In my view, this test must be made sooner, rather than later.

A first step would be to inform the South Vietnamese Government that we will withdraw about 100,000 troops before the end of this year. We should also make it clear that this is not an isolated action, but the beginning of a process under which all U.S. ground combat forces will have been withdrawn from Viet Nam by the end of 1970. The same information should, of course, be provided to the other countries who are contributing forces for the defense of South Viet Nam.

Strenuous political and military objections to this decision must be anticipated. Arguments will be made that such a withdrawal will cause the collapse of the Saigon government and jeopardize the security of our own and allied troops. Identical arguments, however, were urged against the decisions to restrict the bombing on March 31 of last year and to stop it completely on October 31. They have proven to be unfounded. There is, in fact, no magic and no specific military rationale for the number of American troops presently in South Viet Nam. The current figure represents only the level at which the escalator stopped.

It should also be noted that our military commanders have stated flatly since last summer that no additional American troops are needed. During these months the number of South Vietnamese under arms in the Government cause has increased substantially and we have received steady reports of their improved performance. Gradual withdrawal of American combat troops thus not only would be consistent with continued overall military strength, but also would serve to substantiate the claims of the growing combat effectiveness of the South Vietnamese forces.

Concurrently with the decision to begin withdrawal, orders should be issued to our military commanders to discontinue efforts to apply maximum military pressure on the enemy and to seek instead to reduce the level of combat. The public statements of our officials show that there has yet been no change in our policy of maximum military effort. The result has been a continuation of the high level of American casualties, without any discernible impact on the peace negotiations in Paris.

While our combat troops are being withdrawn, we would continue to provide the armed forces of the Saigon government with logistic support and with our air resources.

As the process goes on, we can appraise both friendly and enemy reactions. The pattern of our eventual withdrawal of noncombat troops and personnel engaged in air lift and air support can be determined on the basis of political and military developments. So long as we retain our air resources in South Viet Nam, with total air superiority, I do not believe that the lessening in the military pressure exerted by the ground forces would permit the enemy to make any significant gains. There is, moreover, the possibility of reciprocal reduction in North Vietnamese combat activity.

Our decision progressively to turn over the combat burden to the armed forces of South Viet Nam would confront the North Vietnamese leaders with a painful dilemma. Word that the Americans were beginning to withdraw might at first lead them to claims of victory. But even these initial claims could be expected to be tinged with apprehension. There has, in my view, long been considerable evidence that Hanoi fears the possibility that those whom they characterize as "puppet forces" may, with continued but gradually reduced American support, prove able to stand off the communist forces.

As American combat forces are withdrawn, Hanoi would be faced with the prospect of a prolonged and substantial presence of American air and logistics personnel in support of South Viet Nam's combat troops, which would be constantly improving in efficiency. Hanoi's only alternative would be to arrange tacitly or explicitly, for a mutual withdrawal of all external forces. In either eventuality, the resulting balance of forces should avert any danger of a blood bath which some fear might occur in the aftermath of our withdrawal.

Once our withdrawal of combat troops commences, the Saigon government would recognize, probably for the first time, that American objectives do not demand the perpetuation in power of any one group of South Vietnamese. So long as we appear prepared to remain indefinitely, there is no pressure on Saigon to dilute the control of those presently in positions of power by making room for individuals representative of other nationalist elements in South Vietnamese society.

Accordingly, I anticipate no adverse impact on the Paris negotiations from the announcement and implementation of a program of American withdrawal. Instead, I would foresee the creation of circumstances under which true bargaining may proceed among the Vietnamese present in Paris. Unquestionably, the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front would do so in the hope that any political settlement would move them toward eventual domination in South Viet Nam. But their hopes and expectations necessarily will yield to the political realities, and these political realities are, in the final analysis, both beyond our control and beyond our ken. Moreover, they are basically none of our business. The one million South Vietnamese in the various components of the armed forces, with American logistics, air lift and air support, should be able, if they have the will, to prevent the imposition by force of a Hanoi-controlled régime. If they lack a sense or a sufficiency of national purpose, we can never force it on them.

In the long run, the security of the Pacific region will depend upon the ability of the countries there to meet the legitimate growing demands of their own people. No military strength we can bring to bear can give them internal stability or popular acceptance. In Southeast Asia, and elsewhere in the less developed regions of the world, our ability to understand and to control the basic forces that are at play is a very limited one. We can advise, we can urge, we can furnish economic aid. But American military power cannot build nations, any more than it can solve the social and economic problems that face us here at home.

This, then, is the case history of the evolution of one individual's thinking regarding Viet Nam. Throughout this entire period it has been difficult to cling closely to reality because of the constant recurrence of optimistic predictions that our task was nearly over, and that better times were just around the corner, or just over the next hill.

We cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that this is a limited war, for limited aims and employing limited power. The forces we now have deployed and the human and material costs we are now incurring have become, in my opinion, out of all proportion to our purpose. The present scale of military effort can bring us no closer to meaningful victory. It can only continue to devastate the countryside and to prolong the suffering of the Vietnamese people of every political persuasion.

Unless we have the imagination and the courage to adopt a different course, I am convinced that we will be in no better, and no different, a position a year from now than we are today.

At current casualty rates, 10,000 more American boys will have lost their lives.

We should reduce American casualties by reducing American combat forces. We should do so in accordance with a definite schedule and with a specified end point.

Let us start to bring our men home—an let us start *now*.

A SALUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN BERNARD W. "PAT" KEARNEY, ONE OF THE ORIGINAL AUTHORS OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS, ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THAT HISTORIC LANDMARK LEGISLATION

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out that on Sunday, the 22d of June, we will be marking the 25th anniversary of the GI bill of rights, one of the historic landmark pieces of legislation passed by the Congress throughout the entire history of this great legislative body.

One of the co-authors of that GI bill was the gentleman from New York whom I had the privilege of succeeding in this body when I first came here back in 1959, Bernard W. Kearney, popularly known as "Pat" Kearney. I am happy to say that in spite of congressional redistricting, Congressman Kearney is still a resident of my congressional district, now living in Canandaigua, N.Y., at the other end of it from my home. He is enjoying a very vigorous and a very happy retirement, I am glad to say to his many friends in this House.

All of us who had the opportunity to participate in the advantages and benefits of the GI bill of rights, indeed, all the young men and women of America, who served in uniform, owe a very great debt of gratitude to "Pat" Kearney and to the other Members of the House who originated that legislation and saw it through to enactment.

We are proud to be able to pause on this historic occasion to salute them for what they did for us and for what they did for America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an interesting article on "Pat" Kearney from a recent issue of the Canandaigua Messenger:

SIGNIFICANT DATE: 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF GI BILL IS MILESTONE IN NATION'S HISTORY

In a little more than three weeks, the people of the United States will celebrate the 25th anniversary of an event which has changed the social, economic and educational level of this nation.

This was the message brought to the Canandaigua Kiwanis Club yesterday by one of the men responsible for this event.

June 22 will mark the 25th anniversary of the GI Bill, Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney (Maj. Gen. ret.) reminded the Kiwanians at their weekly meeting.

General Kearney, who spends winter in Florida and summers in Canandaigua, was a member of Congress in 1944 and a coauthor of the Veterans Rehabilitation Act, which he first gave the name, the GI Bill of Right.

PRECEDENT SETTING BILL

"The precedent set by the signing of that first GI Bill a quarter of a century ago has turned the tide in the concept of what a government benefit can do for its people and their country," he said.

"The first GI Bill provided almost 16 million American veterans with precedent-setting benefits; benefits that allowed them to receive college educations or specialized training; that allowed them to purchase a home with little or no down payment; that provided medical care and looked after their economic well-being immediately following their discharge," and the tall, dignified former soldier-congressman.

The first GI Bill, signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and subsequent ones, signed by Harry S. Truman in 1952 and by Lyndon B. Johnson in 1966, gave benefits to some 26 million living American veterans, who with their families comprise almost half the country's population, he said.

But the real greatness of the three bills was not just in what it did to recognize what the veterans did for their country.

BENEFIT TO UNITED STATES

"There is another and more important side," he said. "We have actually made money from this investment. The economists who tally the cost, point out that out of an initial disbursement of $21 billion, we have exceeded a $60 billion return to the treasury in taxes.

"This was possible because of the increase in salaries the veterans made after receiving higher education and advanced technical training."

General Kearney, who represented the old 32nd district (Fulton, Hamilton, Montgomery, Schenectady and Otsego counties) for 16 years before retiring in 1959, was succeeded by Samuel S. Stratton who now represents the 35th district which includes Ontario County.

He said yesterday that in addition to the monetary benefits of the bill passed while he was in Congress, there are "other aspects" of it.

"The educational level of our nation has been enhanced by the opportunities afforded to our veterans through these GI Bills.

"The educational level of World War II and Korean veterans averages about two years above the level of men of the same age who are not veterans.

"As a result,' he said, "these men are also rearing families that are endowed with the desire for better and more education. The cycle is never ending."

The GI Bill, which led to higher education, better incomes, more teachers, scientists, doctors and trade and industrially trained men, also provided members of Congress, governors, cabinet members and even astronauts and a justice of the Supreme Court who had taken training under the GI Bill.

EVERYONE BENEFITED

"The American people had intended to grant benefits to our veterans out of appreciation for their gallant efforts during wartime," said General Kearney. "However, it was the people who in the long run became the beneficiaries."

"Yes," he concluded. "It is time for congratulations . . . congratulations for 25 years of understanding and compassion, of progress and achievement. It is a period of realization for the seeds we sowed back in 1944. We are reaping a harvest of rewards."

CONTINUED REPORTS OF POLITICAL REPRESSION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, according to reports in yesterday and today's New York Times and Washington Post, President Thieu, of South Vietnam, is apparently launching a campaign against the leading advocates of peace and a stable government among his countrymen. His weapons are summonses, police questioning, and detention. The ultimate result if he continues this renewed campaign of political repression and press censorship will be a police state—a government without the support of the Vietnamese people which will require continued American involvement in Vietnam for its lifeblood.

I for one am not ready to support that kind of government and I hope that Members of this body would join with me in asking the President and the Department of State to investigate these continuing reports of repression.

I am speaking today from experience and discouragement that such reports persist and minimal notice is taken of them. Yesterday's New York Times reported that leading advocates of a "reconciliation" government representing "nationalist elements acceptable to both sides" have once again been called to national police headquarters in Saigon for questioning.

As a member of the U.S. study team on political and religious freedom in Vietnam I spoke with several of these individuals less than 10 days ago, and heard numerous reports on the techniques of interrogation used at the national police headquarters.

Our team saw Tran Ngoc Lieng, one of Saigon's most prestigious lawyers and the defender of former presidential candidate Truong Dinh Dzu now in prison for having advocated peace. Lieng is a man who has had the courage recently to head a committee calling for recession of the 5-year sentence against Thich Thien Minh, a leading Buddhist monk arrested in February for allegedly giving refuge to a known Communist at the Buddhist Youth Center. Lieng also stepped forth on June 4 as the head of the Progressive Nationalist Committee which called for a reconciliation government that would have popular support from the Vietnamese people. He is likewise an avowed anti-Communist. This is just one of the men apparently subject to reprisal for advocating what he believes is in the best interest of his country. Considering his involvement with both Dzu and Minh—both of whom now sit in jails—Lieng is fully cognizant of the risks he has been taking, but he continues to speak out on the absolute necessity of forming an effective and stable non-Communist political force in Vietnam.

However, as Senator MATHIAS stated only last week the time may fast be approaching when "a democratic assembly of non-Communist South Vietnamese leaders could only take place in jail."

I would hope that the Nixon administration might soon recognize the relationship between full and active political participation and protection of civil liberties for all Vietnamese and the ability of that country to fashion its own stable government.

Articles from the New York Times of June 18 and 19, 1969, follow:

FOUR OF OPPOSITION GROUP IN SAIGON ARE SUMMONED TO POLICE INQUIRY

(By Terence Smith)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 17.—At least four members of a liberal opposition group that recently called for the formation of a "government of reconciliation" were ordered tonight to report for questioning by the National Police.

Summonses were delivered this evening by police officers to four members of the newly organized Progressive Nationalist Committee, a left-of-center group of students, intellectuals and members of the professions. They were ordered to appear before the chief of the special police at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The summonses appeared to be the first step in a widely expected Government campaign against liberal political groups and persons.

In the last few days there have been reports from South Vietnamese sources that the Government was planning to take steps against groups that have been publicly calling for a softer negotiating position in the Paris peace talks.

President Nguyen Van Thieu warned of such a crackdown in a news conference last week on his return from Midway Island where he conferred with President Nixon.

I WILL PUNISH THEM

"From now on," the President said, pounding his fist for emphasis, "those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country, whoever they be, whether in the executive or the legislature, will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the army and the people. I will punish them in the name of the Constitution."

At the same time, President Thieu warned that action would be taken against any newspapers that distorted the news in a manner that would demoralize the nation. On Saturday, the leading English-language paper, The Saigon Daily News, was closed on such a charge. It was the 32d paper shut down by the Government for political reasons in the last year.

According to reliable South Vietnamese sources, the Government is planning to subdue the more militant elements of its opposition by issuing warnings to some politicians, and by arresting others suspected of maintaining contacts with Communists. More newspaper closings are expected.

The Progressive Nationalist Committee is headed by Tran Ngoc Lieng, the lawyer who defended Truong Dinh Dzu, a former presidential candidate now in prison for advocating a coalition government with the National Liberation Front, or Vietcong.

The committee first appeared on June 4, just four days before President Thieu was to confer with President Nixon. In a public statement, it called for the formation of a government of reconciliation that would be composed of "Nationalist elements acceptable to both sides."

The purpose of the reconciliatory government, according to the statement, would be to "prepare and organize elections to determine the political future of South Vietnam."

THIEU REPORTED UPSET

The statement was reported to have irritated Mr. Thieu, who was said to have felt that it was an effort to undercut his position on the eve of the Midway meeting.

At his news conference following the meeting, Mr. Thieu was asked if he planned to take any action against Mr. Lieng or members of his committee. He declined to answer the question with the explanation that he had not read the committee's statement, but he promised that he would look into the matter.

The summonses issued tonight were delivered to two deputy chairmen of the committee and to two members. Mr. Lieng did not receive one.

At his home tonight, Mr. Lieng said in an interview: "If the Government means to repress the genuinely nationalist organizations by this technique, the Communists will reap the benefits. The whole nationalist movement will suffer as a result."

Mr. Lieng said he would be surprised if he did not eventually get a summons. "They called me in once before, in February," he said. "That was when we had just begun to put the organization together. They questioned me for several hours and then released me."

Mr. Lieng said that his committee was not in favor of the formation of a coalition government as such. "The members of the reconciliatory government would not be Communists," he said. "They would be true nationalists acceptable to both sides."

The secretary general of the committee, Chau Tam Luan, a militant young professor, objected bitterly to the Government's action tonight. "The object of these summonses is to suppress opposition," he said, "to make people afraid to join us. This is a way of warning people, letting them know that if they join us they can expect a call from the police."

THE WRONG HORSE IN SAIGON

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—Tran Ngo Lieng is a slender, intense man who keeps a law office in his pleasant villa on a street snarling with motorbike traffic not far from downtown Saigon. As a lawyer, he defended Truong Dinh Dzu, the presidential candidate who was thrown in jail for advocating a coalition government with the National Liberation Front; as an activist, he is a member of a most unusual committee of Catholic and Buddhist leaders working to free Thich Thien Minh, a monk jailed on political charges; and as a politician, Lieng is the official leader of the Progressive National Committee, which advocates a new "government of reconciliation" for South Vietnam.

Lieng makes no effort to hide his dim view of the Thieu-Ky regime. Sitting under one of the revolving overhead fans that cool the high-ceiling Saigon villas even in the brutal heat of Southeast Asia, he was asked by one recent visitor whether the present Government had any support at all among the South Vietnamese people.

"Certainly not," Lieng replied, without hesitation. And when asked if he was expressing this and other pungent views for publication, he replied at some length that he was anxious to be quoted, that South Vietnam was in such bad shape that the consequences to him did not matter; what was important was that the world should know about the political repressions and lack of support of the Thieu-Ky regime.

NON-COMMUNIST NATIONALISTS

Some informed Saigon political figures are not sure whether Lieng's patriotism or his political ambition moves him the most. For the moment, however, his activities have put him on a collision course with President Thieu; now Thieu has struck back by summoning four close associates of Lieng for national police questioning; and all of this suggests much of what is wrong with South Vietnamese politics and the American role in Saigon.

This is because Lieng is equally outspoken in his opposition to the Vietnamese Communists, is opposed to a coalition government because he fears the Communists would take it over, and believes that the real salvation of South Vietnamese freedom lies in "nationalist" forces that are not Communist but that give no real support to Thieu and his American-sponsored regime.

He compares such South Vietnamese nationalists to "grains of sand"—innumerable but separate. Defeating the Communists politically, Lieng believes, will require that they be unified behind leaders they respect and a program they can support—neither of which he finds in the Thieu-Ky regime. Hence, the Progressive Nationalist Committee's proposal for a "government of reconciliation," composed of men acceptable *both* to the N.L.F. and to non-Communists (Gen. Duong Van Minh is frequently cited as one such man), and empowered to prepare and organize elections to determine the political future of South Vietnam.

FOR POLITICAL COMPETITION

Lieng talked of these ideas politely and with restraint to a visiting American, but there was ample fire and brimstone in the remarks of two of Lieng's younger associates—Chau Tam Luang, secretary general of the committee and widely considered its "action man," and Le Duy Tam, who, ironically, perfected his fluent English while teaching Vietnamese for the State Department in Washington. Luang, at least, was one of those summoned by Thieu's national police.

Luang and Tam asserted in uncompromising language that the greatest political difficulty for nationalist forces is the adamant and overpowering American political, military and economic support for the Thieu regime. While that support continues, they bitterly insisted, few Vietnamese believe it possible either to oust Thieu or to force him to abandon the repressive police tactics that alienate the South Vietnamese people—much less persuade him to broaden the appeal of his Government by bringing into it Buddhist leaders or men like General Minh. And that, they said, is why it is so difficult to organize an effective non-Communist opposition, and why the real strength of non-Communist forces in Vietnam is not being organized for the ultimate "political competition" with the N.L.F.

If this is accurate (and many Vietnamese were eager to tell an American, a few weeks ago, that it was all too accurate), what a final, baleful irony may be added to the long and tragic record of American folly in Vietnam! If in backing the military-oriented, politically repressive Thieu regime against all pressures and until the last muffled groan, the United States succeeds only in easing the way for a Communist government in South Vietnam, the bankruptcy of cold war diplomacy will have been reached not with a bang but a whimper.

ON THE QUESTION OF MISPLACING VALUES

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest the last 2 days during the debate and while amendments were being offered to the legislation that was under consideration.

I am quite concerned about remarks made by those who opposed the bill. It was said that if we pass this legislation, we will be misplacing values where our youth are concerned. If we pass the legislation in its present form, we would be failing our young people and we had to live with our own consciences.

I do not question that the majority of those who voted in opposition to the bill did so out of concern and did so seriously, but those who spoke and insinuated we were misplacing values are questioning the integrity of those who supported the bill. To these, I address my remarks.

You have determined the way to protect our youth is by giving unlimited authority to regulatory agencies to ban advertising of a product that, if it is harmful to anyone, it is the user. And the accusations that have been made against it have not been proven.

While I disagree with these, nevertheless, they have made their grandstand play and now I challenge them to prove their sincerity and concern for our youth by presenting further legislation that would protect our youth from those things that are known to destroy the mind, body, and soul, and I challenge any of these to produce a record that shows a greater concern for the youth of our Nation than I have over the past 10 years; and no one has more confidence in the ability and sees more potential in our youth than I do.

But I disagree with the approach that shows real concern for our youth. The Scripture says, in Matthew 15, verses 17 and 18:

> Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart, and they defile the man.

I am concerned with things that I believe are of real value, and that is showing our young people that we are serious by setting the example for them, to give them that which will help them determine the things of value, that they might be able to choose for themselves the things that will give them those things that will lead to a happy and abundant life. You have made your grandstand play. If you fail to continue to crusade against those things that lead to immorality that poisons the minds of our youth and leads to destruction of the body, I, along with the youth of this Nation, will be waiting to see if you are serious, or have all of your beautiful words just been for the benefit of the headlines back home?

Have you really been the ones who have misplaced the true values? After all that has been said, do you really have a conscience that you can live with? If you fail to take action that will prove your sincerity, then you will have deceived the young people, and they will say that you have been straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, and they will be right. We will be waiting.

AFTER MIDWAY

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the President is to report again tonight to the American people on the situation in Vietnam. He cannot be unaware as he does so, that confidence in the implementation of the Midway Island agreement has been undermined, not by our opponents, but by our allies.

We were told after Midway that the American Government and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam had agreed to work together toward self-determination and political freedom for the people of South Vietnam.

Now we hear, courtesy of one of America's ablest foreign correspondents, Mr. Terence Smith of the New York Times, that when President Thieu returned to Vietnam, he summoned four leaders of the opposition to a police inquiry and warned:

> From now on those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country . . . will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the army and the people. I will punish them in the name of the Constitution.

Now what exactly was the extent of the subversion represented by the group whose leaders are being interrogated? They called for the formation of a government of reconciliation composed of nationalist elements from both sides. The head of this group made clear that he was not in favor of a coalition government as such. He said:

> The members of the reconciliatory government would not be Communists.

In other words, these four men are interrogated for being members of a group which would make considerable fewer concessions than those we have been led to believe would be acceptable to the President of the United States. Meanwhile, we are informed by Congressman CONYERS and others that repression is growing in South Vietnam and we know that major figures like Truong Dinh Dzu are still in jail for political statements that one would have thought would have led to their public commendation by President Thieu himself, if he understood and plans to live up to the Midway declaration.

In these circumstances, the best way that President Nixon can reaffirm his determination to stand by his report from Midway would be for him to announce tonight the withdrawal of further units of American troops. Clearly this would be the most effective way to show the South Vietnamese Government that he meant what he said at Midway; and it is long past time for that Government to understand that fact; if indeed it is a fact.

Nor should the President hesitate to announce further troop withdrawals on the discarded theory that to withdraw is to weaken our negotiations posture. The testimony of Ambassador Harriman and Mr. Vance and perhaps above all the article by former Secretary of Defense

Clifford, should have laid that notion to rest once and for all. Secretary Clifford's article will be inserted into today's RECORD by Congressman FINDLEY, and I hope all Members of the House and all concerned Americans will study it closely.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted every day with new illustrations of the terrible waste of lives and resources that goes on unabated in Vietnam even as we talk about de-Americanizing the war while the Thieu government increases the repression.

We have the terrible new evidence provided by that invaluably energetic and resourceful reporter Miss Flora Lewis. Everyone should read her detailed account of the battles that have been raging around a distant incline considerably less publicized and apparently considerably more tragic than Hamburger Hill itself. Once again, the American people are indebted to Miss Lewis, and once again, we are reminded of the urgency of changing course in Vietnam. The article follows:

[From Newsday, May 27, 1969]

BLOOD-AND-THUNDER TACTICS

(By Flora Lewis)

NEW YORK.—On the eleventh try, American paratroops and South Vietnamese soldiers finally took the crest of Apbia mountain up near the border where South Vietnam, North Vietnam and Laos meet. Reports said the Americans, who lost 43 killed and 290 wounded in the 11-day series of bitter assaults, nicknamed the crest Hamburger Hill because it "chewed men up like meat."

Officers were quoted as saying that in a couple of weeks, when the current sweep in the A Shau valley below the mountain is concluded, the allied forces will withdraw and the North Vietnamese will undoubtedly move back to Hamburger Hill.

That's the way it usually happens on sorrowful hill after hill. I don't know whether that's what happened on Nui Coto, a mountain straddling the Cambodian-South Vietnamese border in the delta. When I left the area some weeks ago, the Allies were in the midst of their fourth major attempt in less than a year to take the peak. Military authorities wouldn't allow anything published while the latest drive was actually going on, but it must be over now.

The story is still worth telling. The mountain is part of an improbable range called the Seven Sisters that rises straight up out of the flat rice paddies. People who live in the hamlets at its feet don't go up Nui Coto. It is barren, littered with ton-sized stones that hide the entrances to deep caverns.

The people say demons and dragons with poisoned breath live in the caverns, but they and the Allied forces have long known that the Viet Cong camp there. For years there have been rumors that the biggest cave holds a battalion headquarters, a hospital, a radio room, telephone systems and huge warehouses stocked from nearby Cambodia. It may or may not be true. The mountain has scant strategic value, but it was a challenge that became an obsession.

For psychological reasons, American advisers thought Vietnamese forces ought to conquer the magic mountain. After a series of futile minor attempts, they launched a massive operation last July. First, there was a series of strikes by 24 B-52s, each plane releasing a string of 106 bombs. As an intelligence officer at American headquarters in the area told me, "It rearranged some rocks." Then jets, rockets and gunships sputtered at the granite while napalm and defoliation spray cleared off foliage below the cliffs.

A thousand men were sent in, some perched on the crest by helicopter. Many skittered down, only to be scooped up and ordered dropped on top again by angry commanders. The operation lasted a week. Results: 32 caves yielding four weapons, one flag, 23 booby traps and one dead Viet Cong. Cost including air strikes: something over $5,000,000.

It was an admitted fiasco. So the second try last November was on a much bigger scale. It lasted 12 days, cost very much more, and scored a total haul of six guns, two grenades, four wooden stamps, one inkpad, one antenna, a gasmask and 9 microphones. The third offensive was mounted in December. It straggled on for two months and produced more allied casualties, more frustration, little else.

The fourth try, in March this year, was organized by U.S. forces, American planners were optimistic at the start. "We've got more men, more supplies, better planning."

Some reporters who followed the Nui Coto story from the start estimated that the cost of the repeated assaults has now reached $1 billion, but that could not be confirmed. Nor is there a total casualty figure, though it's admittedly high. The results of the last try were a little better in the sense that more caves were entered, somewhat more weapons were found. But you couldn't say that battered Nui Coto had been taken out of the war, or even really taken. I asked some American officers involved why that particular, isolated mountain was worth so much, whether it really mattered to the war. They laughed harshly.

If they had been Alec Guiness on the River Kwai, or John Wayne, no doubt they would have said, "Because this is war, lady, you keep going." But they weren't actors, they were lieutenant colonels. Lieutenant colonels aren't supposed to comment on the obsessions and ambitions of generals. Still, there's nothing in the manual against a laugh.

Nui Coto and Apbia haven't been the only ones. There has still been no order to commanders in Vietnam to save men and avoid fruitless offensives while the haggling goes on in Paris to end a war no one can win.

This is one thing President Nixon and President Thieu can decide to do immediately when they meet on Midway. All it would do would be to save many lives and huge amounts of money. It wouldn't sacrifice an inch of territory or a comma in the eventual settlement or a bit of American prestige. It might only cost some general or colonel another blood-and-thunder tale to tell old friends when he retires.

AUDITING OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT WOULD NOT END THE ABUSES—H.R. 12107 WOULD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 12, I introduced legislation designed to bring a desperately needed abrupt halt to secrecy and waste in military procurement.

As I had noted in previous floor speeches, much of this steadily expanding problem, with its competition restriction and dollar waste, stemmed directly from the old and rampant technique of the secretly negotiated, sole-source, noncompetitive contract.

As I had also noted, the prime, blanket alibi for this broadly used technique has been the too-long-permitted rationale known as "urgency of need for American forces in Vietnam."

Curiously, typically, the response of military procurement commanders to congressional charges of great waste via this simple device, has been the illogical no argument which says, in effect, "We are not wasting a single penny; the charge is groundless and politically inspired—but, even if we are wasting a few million dollars—and we may be as some may choose to see it—we are wasting it for our boys in Vietnam."

Among the other things that Congress and the people and the media are not supposed to know, presumably, is that some of this precedes our Vietnamese involvement, at least in concept and design and order; some of this equipment never reaches Vietnam; not all of it that does reaches "our boys," and some that does proves so badly designed that it does not function properly, or attracts the enemy and costs the lives of the men who carry it. The latter condition means the option of using it, producing further casualties, or to order it redesigned, producing further costs and delivery delays while the war goes on.

At the moment when I introduced my bill—now known as H.R. 12107 and assigned to the Armed Services Committee—I was aware of sincere suggestions and conscientious belief by many within Congress that the answer to the whole, sprawling military procurement problem might hopefully be found in improved and intensified auditing efforts by the Department of Defense and by the General Accounting Office.

I hasten to advise my distinguished colleagues who entertain that thought, that hope, that, in my own study of the military procurement problem—the study which increased my concern over that problem—I had long since realized that the ordering, or promising, of such audits could not possibly begin to be the answer; rather, that such orders, such promises, could and would only compound the problem.

Not only would such auditing promises or efforts fail to strike at the heart of this most basic of problems of the total problem of the threat of the military-industrial complex, but it would provide for the lulling of Congress, the people and the media into a false sense of security that the problem, at last, was under control—which it would not be; for the same practices and practitioners who have created the problem we now suffer would continue busily at work, practicing the same basic practices, alibiing the same basic alibis, beneath a slightly improved facade.

Such audits would, at best, therefore, be something worse, something more dangerous, than too little too late. Such audits, with the general belief that they would be effective to the point of protecting the public interest, would only create an entirely new, more far-reaching set of problems.

To say the least, in all respect to those who would consider improved or intensified auditing, the answer, such technique would not even begin to treat with the real symptoms of the most deeprooted disease of military procurement: competition restriction and dollar waste.

There are, indeed, innumerable cases

in which, over the years, General Accounting Office auditing efforts, procedures, instructions, decisions and orders have been frustrated, circumvented, ignored and immasculated, and rendered ineffective, immobilized and meaningless. None, however, has better documented this fact than the case which, one June 4, I called to the attention of the House.

That was the classic case in which, on January 11, 1968, the Comptroller General, in a formal decision, declared "plainly illegal," an award by procurement personnel of the Air Materiel Area, Tinker Air Force Base, to Tridea Division of Conductron, fourth highest bidder in a field of seven for equipment known as AN/GPA–118. In that plainly illegal decision, the Comptroller General ordered cancellation of the $1,170,930 award to Tridea in favor of the $982,450 bid from Dayton.

Yet, the Tinker Air Force Base procurement people responded to this finding, this order, from the head of the General Accounting Office, so-called watchdog of Congress, by canceling their requirement for the equipment, their previous claim of "urgency of need" notwithstanding, and, that done, seeking to replace it with the purchase, for $1,000,000, of another piece of equipment, "BRITE 1" from ITT. Yet, no one, anywhere, was so much as even reprimanded, although Dayton Electronic Products carried its appeal to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

If such peculiar military procurement conduct gives one cause to wonder about the military procurement attitude, if such action gives one cause to wonder about the attitude, determination and resolution of the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General, let such person note, and consider well, the utterly incredible suggestion, on Friday, June 13, by the Comptroller General, before the Joint Economic Committee, that he believed the Pentagon was the best qualified monitor of its own spending.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, perhaps, I might well rest my case.

It is against examples such as these that we can only conclude that Congress, which must appropriate the money, and the people, whose heavily taxed dollars must be appropriated, must have more than a better watchdog, they must have a better lwa under which that watchdog can function in better service to the public welfare and interest. That, in short, is the meaning, the purpose, and the character of H.R. 12107.

My long-considered, carefully checked legislation would create a Presidentially-appointed 12-member Military Procurement Review Board within the executive branch of the Government. It would be vested with the necessarily vast responsibility and attendant authority to consider all of the facts, all of the evidence, all of the pitfalls, all of the dangers, all of the consequences, of all military procurement proposals—then approve or reject them while making, at least, an annual report to Congress, complete with any recommendations which, from daily, deep experience, the Board would deem essential for further legislation in the public interest.

It is both cynical and arrogant that, in testy response to congressional disclosures of that which, at best, is demonstrated indifference about military procurement, those in command proclaim, unctiously and piously, that they function strictly in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the laws which Congress has established. Yet curiously and significantly, they rail and bellow in professed pain and anguish at the slightest suggestion within Congress that Congress take a closer look at what they are doing or that, in concern for what they are really doing, Congress should tighten the law in the interest of better performance and its resultant savings of dollars and easement of the grip of the tightening noose which, under present law, the military-industrial complex has succeeded in skillfully affixing about the national jugular vein.

There could, indeed, be no more poignant testimony in behalf of the urgent need for the Military Procurement Review Board which H.R. 12107 would establish than such erratic conduct and verbal forays by those representatives of the military procurement element which, in fact and in practice, is really the great, hulking backbone of the ever-expanding military-industrial complex.

If, in frantically flailing about for a defensive mechanism, the military procurement people elect to blame Congress for establishing the laws which serve as the frame, backdrop and umbrella for the ever-more-odd actions of the procurement people, then, indeed, the Congress, in all logic, can only respond by enacting new laws to remove that frame, backdrop and umbrella which, too long, has protected the abuse of, if nothing more, common sense and sound business practice.

Military procurement personnel would render a distinct, much-needed public service if they would, in fact, begin to impose upon themselves some of the more basic, better-known, cost-and-production-conscious concepts of good business practices.

What military procurement people, from command echelon down, must, at last, begin to be made to appreciate and understand is that all they really have to offer as their alibi for official existence is the service of acquiring the best materiel in the least-expensive, most expeditious manner possible, and see that it is delivered to our forces in combat-ready condition.

In short, military procurement personnel must realize that it requires no special genius to spend vast sums of money, particularly when the spender labors under the misconception that the source of that money is virtually endless; but that a most particular genius is required to spend money wisely and well—particularly public money. Such personnel must realize, further, that, particularly when that money belongs to the American people who, collectively wealthy though they may appear to be, do, in fact, have limitations, not only in terms of economics, but in terms of endurance, patience, and tolerance regarding those in public life who dissipate it, even necessarily and wisely.

Meanwhile, it is more than obvious that H.R. 12107 is urgently needed, not only as remedial legislation for the problems and the abuses of the past and present, but as therapeutical legislation against the problems of the immediate future; for we stand, at this moment, at the critical milestone in U.S. military-political history in which the President and Commander in Chief has announced his decision to begin withdrawing our forces from the ever-more-unpopular conflict in Vietnam which, too long, has been the all-too-convenient alibi for the military procurement people and for their wasteful abuses in the all-too-convenient name of urgency of need for our men in Vietnam.

As the first 25,000 American troops are being prepared for that first phase of the presidentially ordered withdrawal from Vietnam, the stock alibi of "urgency of need in the interest of saving American lives in Vietnam" which in fact, has not held water, will now be transferred to the new alibi of "urgency of need in the interest of saving South Vietnamese lives in Vietnam."

In fact, it is even suggested that, actually, this urgency of delivery need may even be intensified on the claim that South Vietnamese forces, infinitely more reluctant than American forces to make contact with the enemy, emphatically inferior as fighters, and with infinitely less regard for sophisticated American-made-and-paid-for equipment and cost thereof, can be expected to permit more loss of that equipment than ever suffered by American forces.

At this point, then, it becomes something more than obvious that the military-industrial complex, created by World War II, sustained by the cold war, and expanded by Korea and Vietnam, has not the slightest determination to be diminished by U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam; quite the contrary, it is perfectly obvious that it fully intends to become perpetuated in power, ad infinitum, via the prime route of military procurement sustenance on the immediate alibi of the new course of events in and about Vietnam, U.S. troop withdrawal notwithstanding, and in the claimed interest of preparing for, God forbid, the Vietnams, or worse, of tomorrow.

In sum, therefore, it is quite apparent that the answer to the military procurement abuses which lie at the fatty heart of the rapidly expanding, even scandalous, problem of the military-industrial complex is no more to be found in so-called tougher auditing than in the tragic belief that, given an end to U.S. combat or support participation in Vietnam, those abuses, that problem—that awful threat to our traditional American system of governmental checks and balances, with its civlian control of the military—will somehow disappear of its own volition and initiative.

Mr. Speaker, it will not.

Quite the contrary.

It will become even the greater tail that wags the consequently ever-more subservient watchdog.

And that is too great a risk—too great a threat—to the survival of this American Government and Nation as intended and as constituted by our Founding Fathers.

THE FAILURE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO ADMINISTER THE FREE FOOD PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, complaining of the failure of the Department of Agriculture to adequately administer the free food distribution—surplus commodity—program. The letter calls attention to the pending return to the U.S. Treasury by the Department of Agriculture of approximately $110 million in unspent money available for the free food program in fiscal 1969.

The documentation contained in the letter casts serious doubt on the sincerity of the President's May 7 commitment to the elimination of hunger and malnutrition. For many of the goals he set forth are false—goals which can be achieved at least in part with money and authority already available.

Let me cite four examples:

First, in that speech, the President called for the establishment of food programs in every county in America. There are currently 414 counties which do not have a food program and whose officials in most cases do not want to admit that there is a need for such a program in their county. A listing of these counties appears in exhibit No. 1. A total of 221 of these are among the 2,000 poorest counties in America. With the $110 million the Department of Agriculture is planning on returning to the Treasury, a federally administered surplus commodity program could be established in each of these 221 counties for a total annual cost of $5.9 million. This figure comes from the Department of Agriculture.[1]

Unfortunately, the Department has chosen to do nothing. It has refused to go into even one additional county beyond the initial 44 of the previous administration, all of which are among the poorest 1,000 counties in America. A listing of the 44 counties appears as exhibit No. 2.

Second, in the same message, Mr. Nixon also pledged to move "on a high priority basis" to establish cost-sharing arrangements with the counties for administrative expenses and to insure that all counties offered the "full range of available foods." The need for such a broadening of the number of available commodities carried by counties currently operating free food distribution programs is well documented in the breakdown of the number and types of commodities carried by county which appears as exhibits No. 3A and No. 3B. As of January fully one-third of the counties carried less than 18 of the available commodities. I am currently analyzing county-by-county data for April—data not analyzed by the Department of Agriculture—which I will insert in the RECORD next week.

Mr. Nixon subsequently asked Congress to appropriate $15 million for the new fiscal year to accomplish the above-stated objectives. There are currently 28 counties which have requested financial assistance to continue operating free food programs. There are 11 others which have requested assistance in order to begin a food program. A listing of the counties which have formally requested financial assistance appears as an exhibit No. 4.

I cannot understand why a cost-sharing arrangement is not being implemented this fiscal year with part of the $110 million. Nor can I understand why the Department is waiting to broaden the range of available commodities in counties with existing free food distribution programs. While the Department of Agriculture could not supply me with an estimate of the cost of cost-sharing or the expansion of the number of commodities, I am sure it is very minimal. After all, it has asked Congress for just $15 million to accomplish both these objectives as well as to establish federally administered surplus commodities programs in those counties without food programs.

Third, the President has requested authority from Congress to establish uniform national standards for eligibility in the food stamp program. Such standards are frequently irrational and discriminatory. This is well documented by the Department of Agriculture's recent "survey of State and county policies that restrict participation in the commodity distribution program."

(See exhibits Nos. 5, 6, and 7.)

In one Indiana county, for example, to be eligible for Federal food aid, a poor family cannot have a dog in their household. In another, a hungry woman is excluded on the grounds that she is "not fulfilling her obligations—as a wife"—if her husband walks out on her, returns, and then leaves again.

What is just as irrational and far more widespread is, that in dozens of counties, farm or others, workers are ineligible for food aid during those months of the year in which farmwork is available—apparently on the theory that jobs are available to everyone during these months. As a local representative of the Department of Agriculture indicated to my staff, the availability of farm jobs does little for the welfare mother, the aged and the disabled. Similarly, it does little for the farm laborer who cannot find a job. Then, too, as exhibit No. 8 suggests, the period of nonprogram operation does not always coincide with the peak period of employment.

The food stamp program was established by legislation and thus requires congressional approval to establish uniform standards. The free food distribution program was established by administrative action. The Secretary of Agriculture thus has the power to initiate now uniform standards for the commodities program. He however refuses to do so. This I cannot understand in view of the fact that proposed standards with regional variations have been drawn up by his staff.

Finally, the President, in that speech, called for a massive expansion of the food stamp program. Yet, the Department of Agriculture is planning on returning $30 million in money appropriated for the food stamp program for this fiscal year. It took a public letter from me to the Secretary of Agriculture focusing on this question to get him to fund even the 42 counties announced last week. In my letter today, I point out that 63 additional counties which have applications for food stamp programs could be funded this month from that $30 million, and at only minimal expense for fiscal 1970. A list of the counties which have formal applications for food stamp programs pending before the Department of Agriculture is found in exhibit number 9.

I can only come to one conclusion as to why the administration is planning on returning a total of $140 million in food stamp and surplus commodity money unspent to the Treasury at the end of the month. It desires to augment the budget surplus. It places greater emphasis on figures in an accountant's ledgerbook than on food in the stomachs of the hungry. I hope this is not the case.

The letter and exhibits follow:

JUNE 19, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Once again I am writing you concerning your Department's administration of the hunger program. And again, it is to point out the gap between rhetoric and action, between the President's promises concerning new hunger programs and your Department's administration of the existing programs.

The Congress can provide unlimited funding for hunger and open ended administrative authority, but it is the Department of Agriculture which in the last analysis must utilize these resources before a single hungry stomach can be filled as a result of a Federal hunger program.

My on-going investigation into the operation of the hunger program has revealed an apparent lack of commitment on the part of the Department of Agriculture in fighting hunger in America; for it reveals much that your Department can do to eliminate hunger that it is not now doing. I am writing to you to urge your Department to make use of its

[1] According to the Department of Agriculture, the average cost of administering the 44 counties with federally administered food programs is $1.34 per person per month, or $16.08 annually (33% of the cost results from certification expenses, 27% from salaries, and 40% from food distribution expenses—warehousing, transportation, and hauling). This comes to $27,000 per county per year (average).

There are 107 counties in the poorest 1,500 counties, which do not have food programs. There are another 114 which rank from the poorest 1501st to the 2000th poorest county in America.

According to the Department, their 221 counties have similar characteristics to the 44 counties which now have federally administered food programs. The Department estimates that the annual cost of establishing a federally administered food program in all 221 counties would, therefore, be $5.9 million. The annual cost of such a program in the 107 counties would be only $2.9 million.

authority and available revenue to do something now about hunger.

I was shocked to discover that your Department planned on returning $30 million in food stamp money unspent to the United States Treasury on June 30th. I could not believe that it was also planning on returning $110 million in free food money similarly unspent at the end of the month.

With 16 million hungry and malnourished in our country, I cannot understand why your Department is returning even one red cent. A budget surplus looks nice on an accountant's ledger, but we are talking about human lives. If you do not want to spend the $110 milion in free food money, give me authority over it for just one day. Better yet, give it to a starving mother in Mississippi, or an elderly blind couple in Virginia, or a child with a bloated stomach in Harlem—any of them could think of at least a hundred uses to which that money could be immediately put.

President Nixon, in his message to the Congress, placed great reliance on the direct food distribution program as the most flexible method of bringing a food program to every county in America by July 1970. In light of this, I cannot understand why your Department is planning to return free food money to the United States Treasury at the end of this month. Your Department should be moving to establish a Federally-administered program in each county which refuses to initiate a program of its own.

Unfortunately, your Department has chosen to do nothing. It has refused to go into even one additional county beyond the initial 44 of the previous Administration. Each of these was one of the 1,000 poorest counties in America.

There are currently 414 counties without a food program. According to information supplied me by your staff, if your Department moved to establish a Federally-administered surplus commodity program in every one of the 221 of the poorest 2,000 counties in America without a food program, the annual cost would be only $5.9 million. This is inconsequential compared to the $110 million you are planning to return to the Treasury. At the very least, you could move into the 107 of the poorest, 1,500 counties without a food program at a cost of only $2.9 million for an entire year.

Since your proposed food stamp bill would require all counties to initiate a food program by 1971, Federal administration of free food programs in these counties would only be an interim, measure but would have the salutary effect of allowing 16 million hungry to eat.

In that same message to Congress, Mr. Nixon also pledged to move "on a high priority basis to establish more distribution points, prompter and simpler certification, financing arrangements. . . ." and to ensure that all counties offered the "full range of available foods."

Instead of returning $110 million to the United States Treasury at the end of this fiscal year and awaiting Congressional appropriation of another $15 million to accomplish the President's promise, you should now implement administrative cost-sharing in the 28 counties which have formally requested financial assistance to continue the operation of their programs and in the eleven other counties which have requested financial assistance to begin a program. The establishment of such a cost-sharing arrangement in the latter 11 counties now could mean food programs in these counties before the end of the fiscal year.

You should require that counties currently participating in the free food program carry all 22 available commodities instead of only 10 or 12. Such a limited selection has resulted in an unbalanced diet for many thousands. At the very least, the minimum requirement for every county should be 18 commodities.

At the same time, the President has recommended to Congress that uniform standards of eligibility be established for the food stamp program to replace present standards which are frequently irrational and discriminatory.

In your recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, you pointed out that "nutritional needs are not required to reflect state. . . . standards nor do they recognize or respect state boundary lines".

This recommendation applies to the food stamp program which was created by legislation and, therefore, requires legislative authorization to establish uniform standards. But the surplus commodities program is not a legislative creation, and you, as the Secretary of Agriculture, have the authority to establish uniform standards of eligibility for this program.

I am informed that uniform national standards with regional variations have been drafted by your Department. I can see no reason for not promulgating these standards immediately.

At the very least, all free food programs should be required to operate the entire year. In dozens of counties, farm or other, workers are ineligible for food aid during those months of the year in which farm work is available—apparently on the theory that jobs are available to everyone during these months. But, as a local representative of your Department indicated to my staff, the availability of farm jobs does little for the welfare mother, the aged and the disabled. Similarly, it does little for the farm laborer who cannot find a job.

Finally, I am pleased that my previous letter resulted in the funding of 42 additional counties for the food stamp program. That letter dealt with your planned return of $30 million in unspent food stamp money to the United States Treasury at the end of this fiscal year. It suggested that the money be used to fund what was then 62 counties that had formally applied for food stamp programs.

I am informed by your Department that there remain 63 counties of which 20 are in the state of Idaho which have formal applications for food stamp programs pending before your Department. According to your Own Departmental estimates, the cost of funding these approximately 63 counties would be less than $6 million. With your Department returning $30 million in unspent food stamp money this fiscal year and requesting a $290 million increase in the authorization for the next fiscal year, it surely can afford to immediately fund these 63 counties.

I understand you are planning on "reviewing the funding situation" after the new fiscal year begins, and that additional counties will be funded at that time. May I suggest that the hungry and malnourished cannot wait for the beginning of a new fiscal year.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Consumer and Marketing Service, Washington, D.C.]

FAMILY FOOD PROGRAMS

Counties and independent cities without plans as of June 16, 1969

Counties	405
Independent cities (all in Virginia)	16
Total	414

California (1): Butte.

Colorado (4): Douglas, Jackson, Pitkin, Summit.

Connecticut (2): Fairfield, Middlesex.

Florida (14): Brevard, Charlotte, Citrus, Collier, Flagler, Indian River, Marion, Martin, Nassau, Osceola, Putnam, St. Johns, Sarasota, Seminole.

Georgia (1): Troup.

Idaho (28): Ada, Adams, Bear Lake, Blaine, Boise, Bonneville, Butte, Camas, Canyon, Caribou, Cassia, Clark, Custer, Elmore, Franklin, Gem, Gooding, Jefferson, Jerome, Lincoln, Madison, Minidoka, Oneida, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, Valley, Washington.

Indiana (2): Newton, White.

Iowa (1): Fayette.

Kansas (76): Anderson, Barber, Barton, Brown, Butler, Chase, Chautauqua, Cheyenne, Clay, Cloud, Coffey, Comanche, Cowley, Decatur, Dickinson, Doniphan, Douglas, Edwards, Ellis, Ellsworth.

Finney, Geary, Gove, Graham, Gray, Greeley, Haskell, Jackson, Jefferson, Jewell, Kiowa, Lane, Lincoln, Linn, Logan, Lyon.

McPherson, Marion, Marshall, Miami, Mitchell, Morris, Morton, Nemaha, Ness, Norton, Osage, Osborne, Ottawa, Pawnee, Phillips, Pottawatomie, Pratt, Rawlins, Reno, Republic, Rice, Riley, Rooks, Rush, Russell.

Saline, Scott, Seward, Sheridan, Smith, Stafford, Stanton, Stevens, Sumner, Thomas, Trego, Wabaunsee, Wallace, Washington, Wichita.

Louisiana (2): Bossier, Plaquemines.

Maryland (1): Calvert.

Massachusetts (4): Barnstable, Berkshire, Dukes, Nantucket.

Michigan (1): Midland.

Minnesota (12): Clay, Dodge, Fillmore, Freeborn, Goodhue, Martin, Olmsted, Rice, Wabasha, Watonwan, Wilkin, Winona.

Missouri (47): Adair, Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barry, Barton, Bates, Boone, Callaway, Camden, Carroll, Cass, Cedar, Chariton Clinton, Cole, Cooper, Crawford, Franklin, Gasconade, Grundy, Henry, Holt, Howard, Jasper, Johnson.

Laclede, Lafayette, Lawrence, Lincoln, Macon, Miller, Moniteau, Montgomery, Morgan, Newton, Pettis, Phelps, Platte, Pulaski, Randolph, Ray, Saline, Scotland, Taney, Vernon, Warren.

Montana (26): Carbon, Carter, Custer, Fallon, Fergus, Garfield, Golden Valley, Granite, Jefferson, Judith Basin, Liberty, McCone, Madison, Meagher, Park, Petroleum, Powder River, Powell, Prairie, Ravalli, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, Teton, Toole, Treasure, Wheatland.

Nebraska (14): Bort, Brown, Cherry, Cheyenne, Fillmore, Grant, Keya Paha, Kimball, Platte, Polk, Red Willow, Saline, Seward, Sioux.

Nevada (5): Douglas, Esmeralda, Lander, Nye, Storey.

New York (5): Chenango, Ontario, Putnam, Rockland, Sullivan.

North Carolina (1): Randolph.

North Dakota (3): Bowman, Renville, Slope.

Ohio (4): Delaware, Gallia, Hancock, Putnam.

Oklahoma (4): Beaver, Harmon, Major, Woods.

Oregon (1): Tillamook.

Pennsylvania (1): Adams.

South Dakota (1): Sully.

Texas (104): Andrews, Aransas, Archer, Armstrong, Bailey, Bandera, Baylor, Bell, Blanco, Borden, Bosque, Bowie, Brazoria, Brazos, Briscoe, Burnet, Calhoun, Castro, Chambers, Clay, Coleman, Collin, Collingsworth, Colorado, Concho, Coryell, Crane, Crockett.

Deaf Smith, Denton, Donley, Ector, Edwards, Ellis, Erath, Fort Bend, Gaines, Garza, Gillespie, Glasscock, Gray, Gregg, Hall, Hansford, Harrison, Hartley, Hood, Hopkins, Hunt.

Jack, Johnson, Kaufman, Kendall, Kenedy, Kerr, Kimble, Lamar, Lampasas, Llano, Loving, Lynn, McCulloch, McMullen, Mason, Menard, Midland, Mills, Mitchell, Montgomery.

Navarro, Ochiltree, Oldham, Palo Pinto, Parker, Parmer, Randall, Reagan, Reeves, Refugio, Roberts, Rockwall, Runnels, Rusk, San Saba, Schleicher, Shackelford, Sherman, Somervell, Stephens, Sterling, Sutton.

Taylor, Throckmorton, Uvalde, Van Zandt, Victoria, Wharton, Wheeler, Wichita, Winkler, Wise, Wood, Yoakum, Young.

Virginia (30): Alleghany, Augusta, Bedford, Botetourt, Campbell, Chesterfield, Clarke, Culpeper, Fauquier, Frederick, Hanover, Henrico, James City, King George, King William.

Lancaster, Loudoun, Mathews, Montgomery, New Kent, Orange, Prince George, Pulaski, Rockbridge, Rockingham, Shenandoah, Spotsylvania, Stafford, Warren, York.

(Independent Cities, Virginia) (16): Buena Vista, Clifton Forge, Colonial Heights, Covington, Fredericksburg, Galax, Harrisonburg, Hopewell, Lexington (New), Petersburg, Radford, South Boston, Staunton, Waynesboro, Wiliamsburg, Winchester.

Wisconsin (3): Green Lake, Jefferson, Walworth.

EXHIBIT 2

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION—USDA OPERATED (44)—AS OF JUNE 3, 1969

Alabama (1): Elmore.

Florida (4): Columbia, De Soto, Glades, Holmes.

Georgia (4): Crawford [1] (no date), Glascock,[2] Schley, Webster.

Iowa (1): Allamakee.

Kentucky (1): Gallatin.

Louisiana (1): West Feliciana.

Montana (1). Wibaux.[2]

Nebraska (1): Knox.

South Dakota (2): Bon Homme, Campbell.

Texas (18): Cass, Cherokee, Comanche, DeWitt, Freestone, Goliad, Gonzales, Grimes, Hill, Jasper, Lee, Leon, Madison, Tyler, Walker, Waller, Washington, Willacy.

Virginia (10): Amherst, Appomattox, Bath, Isle of Wight, King and Queen, Nottoway [1] (July 1, 1969), Pittsylvania, Rappahannock, Richmond, Sussex.

---

[1] Designated Food Stamp Program.
[2] Requested Food Stamp Program.

EXHIBIT 3-B.—NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS DISTRIBUTING THE FOLLOWING NUMBERS OF FOOD CATEGORIES

	December 1968							January 1969						
			N.E.	S.E.	M.W.	S.W.	W.			N.E.	S.E.	M.W.	S.W.	W.
			Number of administrative units							Number of administrative units				
			155	403	381	274	115			153	402	373	273	112
			Percent of total administrative units							Percent of total administrative units				
Number of commodities distributed	Total administrative units	Percent of all units	11.7	30.3	28.7	20.6	8.7	Total administrative units	Percent of all units	11.7	30.6	28.4	20.8	8.5
22	15	1.1	0	15	0	0	0	6	0.5	0	3	1	0	2
21	156	11.7	5	45	64	26	16	92	7.0	2	25	47	9	9
20	185	13.9	7	80	48	21	29	249	19.0	9	64	48	104	24
19	174	13.1	20	57	45	45	7	289	22.0	8	123	40	86	32
18	152	11.4	17	63	42	24	6	249	19.0	40	91	62	42	14
17	126	9.5	23	46	42	9	9	135	10.3	20	41	51	11	12
16	117	8.8	21	20	49	13	14	99	7.5	12	29	49	4	5
15	101	7.6	24	7	32	30	7	67	5.1	22	14	20	8	3
14	154	11.6	14	35	32	63	10	46	3.5	19	5	15	5	2
13	84	6.3	11	25	17	27	4	35	2.6	9	3	15	3	5
12	33	2.5	6	8	7	7	5	23	1.7	7	3	8	1	4
11	16	1.3	5	3	2	4	2	10	.8	2	1	6	0	1
10	5	.4	0	0	1	2	2	4	.3	0	0	4	0	0
9	3	.2	0	0	0	2	1	4	.3	2	0	2	0	0
8	2	.2	1	0	0	0	1	2	.1	1	0	1	0	0
7	1	.1	0	0	0	0	1	1	.1	0	0	1	0	0
6	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	.1	0	0	1	0	0
5	1	.1	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0	0	0
4	0		0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
3	0		0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
2	1	.1	0	1	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
0	3	.2	1	0	1	1	0	2	.1	2	0	0	0	0
Total	1,328	100						1,313	100.0					

EXHIBIT 3-A

SUMMARY OF COMMODITIES NOT DISTRIBUTED TO NEEDY FAMILIES

	December, 1968 (1,328 un ts)							January, 1969 (1,313 units)							
	N.E.	S.E.	M.W.	S.W.	W.			N.E.	S.E.	M.W.	S.W.	W.		
Number of administrative units in district	155	403	381	274	115			153	402	373	273	112		
Percent of total administrative units	11.7	30.3	28.7	20.6	8.7			11.7	30.6	28.4	20.8	8.5		
Commodities	Percent of all units	Total	Number of administrative units not distributing					Number of State agencies in which commodities not available	Percent of all units	Total	Number of administrative units not distributing					Number of State agencies [1] in which commodities not available
Flour	1.8	24	6	13	3	1	1	0	3.0	40	10	12	18	0	0	0
Chopped meat, canned	1.9	25	5	0	13	2	5	3	3.4	45	12	10	20	1	2	4
Vegetables, canned	2.1	28	5	5	12	4	2	3	2.8	37	13	3	13	5	3	4
Fruit and vegetable juice	3.1	41	6	9	11	11	4	3	5.6	73	8	8	53	2	2	4
Lard/shortening	3.8	51	4	31	12	0	4	0	6.6	87	7	37	35	0	8	1
Milk, evaporated	4.1	54	4	0	28	12	10	3	4.0	53	5	3	26	11	8	0
Rice	4.6	61	25	9	18	1	8	1	7.2	94	7	9	75	0	3	1
Milk, non-fat dry	4.7	63	12	15	25	7	4	0	6.2	82	10	24	33	11	4	4
Oats/wheat	5.2	70	16	0	17	29	8	4	5.0	65	17	5	13	27	3	3
Peanut butter	6.2	82	11	60	6	0	5	4	7.8	102	8	53	39	2	0	1
Egg mix	6.3	84	7	15	32	8	22	4	12.3	162	18	68	51	14	11	4
Cheese	8.0	106	5	56	21	7	17	0	10.0	131	11	55	39	9	17	0
Raisins/prunes	8.2	169	14	21	55	3	16	9	2.5	335	22	150	110	31	22	11
Potatoes, dehydrated	10.8	144	21	25	27	57	14	2	.5	177	46	33	63	25	10	4
Sirup, corn	11.2	149	62	11	44	18	14	2	9.1	119	35	11	42	18	13	4
Cornmeal	12.5	170	77	12	59	6	16	4	10.9	143	68	16	43	2	14	2
Butter/margarine	14.7	195	0	132	30	17	16	1	14.8	195	4	136	23	17	15	0
Beans, dry	19.6	264	98	64	75	16	11	6	10.2	200	112	21	57	5	5	4
Poultry meat, canned	46.0	611	89	129	255	84	54	11	1.6	546	81	73	236	91	65	4
Peas, dry	58.6	778	122	227	196	176	57	23	0.6	927	132	254	259	235	47	17
Grits, corn	59.3	788	146	134	309	85	114	32	68.3	766	135	136	296	85	114	30
Bulgur	77.3	1,026	143	360	192	263	68	28	77.8	1,022	143	357	191	266	65	24

[1] Florida, Georgia, Indiana not reported.

EXHIBIT 4

Counties which have submitted formal applications for financial assistance to the Department of Agriculture to pay for part of the local administrative cost of operating a Surplus Commodity Program, as of June 18, 1969:

[Per capita income rank]

Counties with no food program (11)

FLORIDA	
Collier	2,748
MISSOURI	
Barry	1,021
Clinton	1,601
Jasper	2,136
Macon	1,199
Newton	1,646
Saline	1,767
Taney	1,035
OKLAHOMA	
Harmon	2,702
TEXAS	
Montgomery	1,162
Victoria	1,843

Counties with a food program (28)

ALABAMA	
Shelby	859
St. Claire	587
FLORIDA	
Palm Beach	2,837
Union	374
KENTUCKY	
McLean	773
LOUISIANA	
Grant	401
MASSACHUSETTS	
Franklin	2,571
MISSOURI	
Lewis	1,534
Monroe	1,174
Pike	1,451
Ripley	368
NORTH CAROLINA	
Currituck	737
Hyde	183
Tyrrell	83
TENNESSEE	
Decatur	380
Carroll	638
Greene	727
Henderson	410
Madison	1,201
TEXAS	
Burleson	542
Lavaca	503
Milam	934
Newton	328
Polk	688
Red River	716
San Patricio	942
San Jacinto	164
Trinity	642
Walker*	714

*Walker County, Texas, withdrew its application subsequent to submission.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1969]

BIZARRE RULES GOVERN ISSUANCE OF HUNGER AID

(By Spencer Rich)

In one Indiana community last year, poor families were ineligible for Federal food aid if they had a dog in the household.

In another, a hungry woman could be excluded from getting surplus food—on grounds "the wife is not fulfilling her obligation"—if her husband walked out on her, returned, but then left again.

These are but two examples of the varied and often seemingly irrational eligibility requirements set by local communities for people seeking to participate in the Federal direct food distribution program.

These and dozens of other rules somewhat less quixotic were reported in the Agriculture Department survey taken early this year. The survey revealed a chaotic variety of conditions, with vastly different eligibility rules from one county to the next.

The Federal direct food distribution program operates in about 1400 counties and cities and reaches about 3.7 million persons. The Federal Government makes food available, but eligibility standards and actual distribution of the food are handled by state and local authorities.

The U.S. Government pays the entire food costs, so the local authorities need pay only for their administration—often relatively cheap because the food is frequently just handed out at a central depot.

Nevertheless, many of the local eligibility rules reported in the Agriculture Department survey appear designed to exclude rather than include the hungry.

In dozens of counties, farm or other workers were ineligible for food aid during those months of the year in which farm work was available—apparently without regard to their income during those months or to whether they were actually employed.

In San Patricio County, Texas, for example, an unemployed father could get food aid for his family only during December, January and February, because of the presumed availability of seasonal employment the rest of the year.

The Agriculture Department survey notes—somewhat sardonically—that the program there did operate year-round for the aged and disabled "and presumably for the blind."

In dozens of other counties, only those who were unemployable because of age, injury or mental unfitness, or who could prove they had tried to find work, could get food.

Residency requirements, some of great duration, were also imposed for the hungry in many jurisdictions, with Texas the most notable example. For example, Anderson County required a year's residence in the state and six months in the county; Denison, a year in each case.

Income limits for eligibility varied enormously. A family that could eat in one state would go hungry in another. A family of four in New York could get food aid if its income was no higher than $325 a month, but New Jersey, a short mile across the Hudson, had a $220 monthly limit. Louisiana had the lowest income limit—$165 for a family of four. (Maryland: $185; Virginia: $225.)

Families meeting all other requirements could still be excluded if they had more than a minimal amount of assets. Arizona allowed families to get food—provided they met all other tests—even if they owned a home worth up to $12,000 and had liquid assets of up to $1200; the figures were about half that for Arkansas.

Under certain conditions, farm families in the latter state could be denied Federal food if they had more than one milk cow, one hog, one "beef" and 90 pounds of mutton or goat per person.

Arizona showed these curious variations:

A family with a guide dog was eligible if it had income up to $12 more than the normal limit and a family with a student in high school if it had income up to $10 more. (Presumably a guide dog costs more to support than a student.)

Navajo Indians usually received only 12 of the 22 commodities available from the Agriculture Department each month, because a state official reportedly explained, the capacity of the Indians' pickup trucks was too small to handle full packages. (Actually, only 380 of the 1400 participating counties in the nation give people 20 or more of the 22 available commodities, according to a March 17 report of the Food and Nutrition Committee of the President's Urban Affairs Council.)

The "dog in the house" rule, which applied in Indiana's Boone Township (Cass County), was probably the most exotic of all local rules, but Center Township in Indiana's Starke County sent in this summary of a rule of its own: "If one or both parents are drunks, they are excluded for the sake of the children."

EXHIBIT 6

SUMMARY

Survey of state and county policies that restrict participation in the Commodity Distribution Program:

1. Agencies that do not serve donated commodities to both public assistance and non-public assistance categories:

California: King, Lake, Merced, Tulare, and Yuba Counties.

North Carolina: Richmond County.

2. Agencies that provide commodities to unemployables only. (Sick, injured, mentally ill, etc.):

New Jersey: Hudson and Monmouth Counties.

Nevada: Clark County.

Indiana: Swanee and Wright Townships.

3. Agencies that provide commodities on a partial year or seasonal basis. (Farm labor, sharecropper, migrant workers, etc.):

South Dakota: Brule, Hutchinson, Hyde, Jerauld, and Union Counties.

California: Yuba County.

North Carolina: Columbus, Montgomery, and Pitt Counties.

Wisconsin: Lac du Flambeau Indian Reservation.

Missouri: Dunklin and Pemiscot Counties.

North Dakota: Foster, Ramsey, and Ward Counties.

Iowa: Allamakie, Cedar, Chickasaw, Iowa, Monroe, and Webster Counties.

Indiana: (townships are shown in the county in which they are located): Clark County (Union), Decatur County (Jackson), Fulton County (Aubeemulbee), Green County (Stafford and Washington), Johnson County (Pleasant), Lawrence (Spice Valley), Montgomery County (Ripley), Morgan County (Jackson), Ripley County (Otter Creek), Vermillion County (Vermillion).

4. Agencies that exclude from participation in the Commodity Program persons who are not citizens of the United States. None reported. (See Note.)

5. Agencies that exclude from participation in the Commodity Program unemployed persons over 18 who cannot show they are physically or mentally unfit to work:

Florida: Lee County.

California: Fresno County.

North Carolina: Burke, Lenoir, and Pitt Counties.

Nevada: Lincoln County.

Indiana: (townships are shown in the county in which they are located): Blackford County (Hartford City), Clinton County (Perry), Fountain County (Wabash and Mill Creek), Franklin County (Posey), Grant County (Center), Huntington County (Union and Huntington), Johnson County (Blue River), Lawrence County (Pleasant Run), Montgomery County (Ripley and Union), Noble County (Washington), Pulaski County (Monroe), Washington County (Jefferson and Jackson).

6. Agencies that exclude from participation in the Commodity Program public assistance recipients whose income or resources exceed the standards of eligibility (generally, public assistance recipients are eligible by definition):

Tennessee: Stewart, Washington, Carter, Marshall, and Carroll Counties.

California: Fresno, Kern, Kings, Merced, Sacramento, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tulare, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba Counties.

North Carolina: Duplin, Hoke, Madison, Montgomery, Richmond, and Yadkin Counties.

Nevada: Clark County.

Pennsylvania: All Counties.

Indiana (townships are shown in the county in which they are located): Blackford County (Hartford City), Clark County (Silver Creek, Wood, and Oregon), Clay County (Harrison), Crawford County (Jennings), Dearborn County (Lawrenceburg), Decatur County (Adams and Washington), Dubois County (Columbia), Elkhart County (Concord and Elkhart), Fountain County (Mill Creek and Logan), Franklin County (Posey), Green County (Wright), Henry County (Spiceland), Huntington County (Union), Jackson County (Pershing), Jasper County (Marion), Jay County (Pike), La Porte County (Center and Pleasant), Lawrence County (Shawswick, Pleasant Run, Marion, and Perry), Monroe County (Polk), Montgomery County (Ripley), Morgan County (Jackson), Noble County (Albion and Wayne), Parke County (Rachoc), Porter County (Portage), Ripley County (Shelby), Scott County (Johnson), St. Joseph County (Portage and Penn), Sullivan County (Turman), Monroe County (Polk), Vermillion County (Clinton), Vigo County (Prairie Creek, Sugar Creek, and Fayette), Washington County (Polk and Jackson), Wells County (Harrison).

7. Agencies that exclude from participation in the Commodity Program unemployed persons who cannot show they have attempted to find work:

Florida: Lee County.

California: Tehama, Tulare, and Yuba Counties.

North Carolina: Burke, Carteret, Lenoir, and Pasquotank Counties.

Nevada: Churchill and White Pine Counties.

Virginia: All Counties.

Indiana (townships are shown in the county in which they are located): Blackford County (Hartford City), Clark County (Silver Creek), Fountain County (Cain and Mill Creek), Henry County (Greensboro), Huntington County (Union and Huntington), Jackson County (Carr), LaPorte County (Pleasant), Lawrence County (Guthrie), Montgomery County (Ripley and Union), Noble County (Albion), Pulaski County (Monroe), Ripley County (Otter Creek), St. Joseph (Portage and Penn), Vigo County (Prairie Creek), Washington County (Brown and Jackson), Whitley County (Columbia).

8. Agencies that exclude from participation in the Commodity Program persons who are considered to be employable who refuse work for which they are qualified and for which the prevailing wage would be paid:

Florida: Lee County.

Colorado: All Counties.

California: Fresno, Merced, Santa Cruz, Tulare, and Yuba Counties.

North Carolina: Burke, Carteret, Lenoir, Pasquotank, Washington, Wayne, Yadkin, and Sampson Counties.

Virginia: All Counties—Nevada, Churchill, Elke, Lincoln, Ormsby, White Pine.

Indiana (townships are shown in the county in which they are located): Carroll County (Deer Creek), Clark County (Silver Creek and Owen), Clinton County (Owen, Ross and Clay), Dearborn County (Sparta), Crawford County (Whiskey Run, Sterling, Union, and Ohio), Decatur County (Adams, Jackson, and Washington), DeKalb County (Union), Fountain County (Cain, Mill Creek, and Logan), Franklin County (Blooming), Green County (Wright), Henry County (Henry and Greensboro), Huntington County (Union and Huntington), Jackson County (Carr and Vernon), Johnson County (Blue River), Lagrange County (Clay), La Porte County (Center and Pleasant), Martin County (Mitcheltree), Monroe County (Washington), Montgomery County (Ripley and Union), Morgan County (Jackson), Noble County (Albion), Parke County (Rachoc and Jackson), Pulaski County (Monroe), Lawrence County (Pleasant Run), Ripley County (Otter Creek), Scott County (Lexington and Johnson), Starke County (Railroad, California, and Center), St. Joseph County (Portage, Penn, and Lincoln), Vermillion County (Vermillion), Vigo County (Prairie Creek and Fayette), Wabash County (Noble), Sullivan County (Haddon), Washington County (Jefferson, Brown, Washington, and Jackson), Whitley County (Columbia).

9. Agencies that have a required residence period in order to qualify for participation in the Commodity Program:

Florida: Santa Rosa County.

Nevada: Churchill, Clark, and Ormsby Counties.

Missouri: Green County.

Indiana (townships are shown in the county in which they are located): Blackford County (Hartford City), Cass County (Boone), Clark County (Charlestown and Owen), Clay County (Harrison and Lewis), Crawford County (Boone, Sterling and Liberty), Dearborn County (Sparta and Lawrenceburg), Dubois County (Marion), Fountain County (Jackson, Fulton, and Swanee), Fulton County (Aubeemulbee and Rochester), Green County (Riceland, Taylor, and Center), Jackson County (Salecreek) Jasper County (Marion, Union, and Democrat), Jefferson County (Saluda) Franklin County (Ray), LaPorte County (Center) Lawrence County (Bono and Spice Valley), Noble County (Albion and Wayne), Orange County (Stamper), Parke County (Howard and Adams) Pulaski County (Monroe), Scott County (Lexington (Starke County (Washington, Railroad and Center), St. Joseph County (Penn). Monroe County (Polk), Sullivan County (Jefferson), Vigo County (Prairie Creek, Lost Creek, and Fayette), Washington County (Washington).

10. Agencies that require employables to register with Employment Office prior to being certified for participation in the Commodity Program:

Florida: Lee County.

New Mexico: All Counties.

Colorado: All Counties.

California: King, Merced, Tehama, Tulare, and Yuba Counties.

North Carolina: Burke, Carteret, Transylvania, and Sampson County.

Nevada: Churchill, Elko, and Ormsby Counties.

Indiana (townships are shown in the county in which they are located): Clark County (Silver Creek), Crawford County (Sterling), Fountain County (Logan), Johnson County (Blue River), Noble County (Albion), Porter County (Pine), St. Joseph County (Penn), Washington County (Jackson).

11. Other policies not listed above that restrict certification of applicants for commodities:

Indiana: Boone Township, Cass County (insist that no dogs be in household).

Silver Creek Township, Clark County (if a husband leaves his family for a period of time, we will help if the wife tries to bring suit for support, but if he comes back when he gets ready and leaves again the wife is not fulfilling her obligation).

Marion Township, Dubois County (must show willingness to work and improve their conditions).

Center Township, Starke County (if one or both parents are drunks, they are excluded for the sake of the children).

(NOTE.—The State of Texas is reported to have some type of residence or citizenship requirement in practically all counties. Many counties require that public assistance recipients meet county standards. Some counties exclude public assistance recipients. A county report was not submitted as state manuals is in the process of revision.)

EXHIBIT 7.—STATE OF MONETARY STANDARDS OF ELIGIBILITY USED FOR CERTIFYING AN INDIVIDUAL OR A FAMILY AS BEING IN NEED OF FOOD ASSISTANCE

United States— Number of persons	Monthly allowable income by family size										Additional per person over 10	Allowable liquid assets
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Alabama	$100	$120	$145	$175	$205	$235	$265	$295	$325	$350	$30	4 times allowable monthly income.
Arizona	107	155	202	232	261	287	338	338	338	338		$800 single; $1,200 for 2 or more.
Alaska [1]												
Arkansas	85	170	180	190	200	210	220	235	250	265	$15 with maximum of $325	$200 for 1; $400 for 2 or more.
California	169	205	237	292	348	404	451	497	538	579	$40	$1,000 for 1; $1,500 for 2 or more.
Colorado [1]												
Connecticut	140	185	235	280	335	365	395	420	445	470		$1,000 for 1 and $1,500 for 2 or more.
Delaware	100	140	180	215	250	285	310	330	350	370	$20	$420 for 1 to $1,190 for 10 plus $70 each additional over 10.
District of Columbia [1]												
Florida	115	160	220	250	280	305	330	360	395	420	$30	$600 for single; $1,200 for 2 or more.
Georgia	90	140	195	215	245	270	290	305	320	335	$355 for 11 or more	$800 for household of 1; $1,600 for household of 2 or more.
Hawaii [1]												
Idaho	132	170	212	238	266	297	330	351	381	411	$30 in excess of 10	$500 single; $1,000 for 2 or more.
Illinois	150	200	230	280	325	365	410	430	460	495	$30	$400 single; $600 for 2 plus $100 for each person through 10.
Indiana	130	185	230	275	315	355	395	435	470	500	$30	$600 single; $800 2; $900 3; $1,000 4 or more.
Iowa	130	200	250	295	330	370	405	455	490	540	$35	$750 single; $900 husband and wife; $100 each dependent through 9, maximum allowable liquid assets for household of 9 or more, $1,550.
Kansas [2]												P/A standards ($750 for 1; $1,250 for 2 or more).
Kentucky	110	140	170	200	230	255	280	305	330	350	$15	$500 for 1; $1,000 for 2 or more.
Guam	125	155	210	251	270	289	322	340	359	378	$397; $30 in excess of 11	$750 for 1; $1,000 for 2 or more.
Louisiana	110	130	150	165	185	220	240	275	295	315	$22	$500 for single; $1,000 family.
Maryland	100	140	165	185	220	240	265	290	315	340	$25	$300 per family; $500 additional for each person 65 years or over.
Maine	132	190	230	271	320	363	404	445	485	527	$41	$1,000 for 1; $1,200 for 2 or more.
Massachusetts	148	190	240	286	330	380	430	480	520	560	$40	3 times monthly scale.
Michigan urban	125	185	225	265	295	330	365	400	435	470	$35	$750 for 1; $1,000 for 2 through 5; $100 per person for 5 or more.
Michigan rural	100	160	200	240	270	305	340	375	410	445	$35	

Footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 7.—STATE OF MONETARY STANDARDS OF ELIGIBILITY USED FOR CERTIFYING AN INDIVIDUAL OR A FAMILY AS BEING IN NEED OF FOOD ASSISTANCE—Continued

United States—Number of persons	Monthly allowable income by family size										Additional per person over 10	Allowable liquid assets
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Minnesota	135	205	250	290	335	370	390	425	460	495	$30	$750 for 1; $1,000 for 2 or more plus $250 for each person over 65
Mississippi	90	130	155	180	210	230	250	270	290	310	$15	$500 for 1; $1,000 for 2 or more.
Missouri	140	190	230	270	310	350	390	430	470	510	$40	$750 for 1; $1,500 for 2 and above.
Montana	125	183	212	253	290	318	353	388	413	438	$25	$1,000 for single; $1,500 for 2 or more.
Nebraska	120	180	230	270	305	335	360	385	410	435	$25	$750 for single; $1,500 for 2 or more.
Nevada	138	175	215	260	305	335	375	420	445	475	$30	$750 for 1; $1,500 for 2 or more.
New Hampshire	154	180	215	244	272	301	315	342	370	397	$24	$1,000 single; $1,500 for married couple if not separated.
New Jersey	90	150	185	220	265	290	325	360	[3]	[3]	$40 each over 8	$1,000 for 1; $1,500 for 2.
New York	150	210	290	325	365	405	445	485	525	565	$40	3 times monthly scale.
New Mexico	110	150	180	215	245	275	305	345			$30	$250 for 1; $500 for 2 or more.
North Carolina	110	140	170	195	215	230	240	255	270	280	$15	$500 single; $700 for 2; $750 for 3; $800 for 4 or more.
North Dakota	140	185	260	295	330	365	385	415	440	460	$25	$1,000 per household.
Ohio	130	200	225	260	295	330	365	400	435	470	$35	$1,000 for 1; $1,500 for 2 or more.
Oklahoma	93	160	186	212	238	259	279	294	315	315		$350 single; $500 man and wife; $50 each additional; $600 maximum.
Oregon	128	193	221	258	288	328	357	386	411	426	$25	$500 single; $1,000 family.
Pennsylvania	130	195	235	275	315	345	385	425	465	505	$30	$1,000 for 1 person; $1,500 for 2 or more.
Puerto Rico [4]												P/A standards.
Rhode Island	130	175	205	245	285	325	365	400	435	470	Add $35 to income scale for each person over 10.	$1,000 for 1; $1,500 for 2 through 4; $1,750 for 5; $2,000 for 6; $2,250 for 7; $2,500 for 8; add $250 per person over 8.
South Carolina [1]												
South Dakota	125	175	215	250	285	320	355	390	425	455	$50	$1,000 for 1; $2,000 for 2; $300 for each additional.
Tennessee	95	130	165	200	240	275	315	350	385	420	$35	$500 single; $1,000 for 2 and 3; $1,250 for 4 or more.
Texas	110	150	170	190	210	230	250	270	290	310	$15	$300 single; $450 for 2; $50 additional person to $600.
Utah [1]												
Vermont	145	205	250	285	325	355	400	435	470	505	$35	$1,000 single; $1,500 married and not separated.
Virginia (min.)												
Virginia (basic)	125	160	195	225	250	275	300	325	350	375	$25	$500 for 1; $600 for 2; plus $50 for each additional person to $1,000.
Virgin Islands [2]												P/A standards.
Washington [1]												
West Virginia [1]												
Wisconsin	135	185	215	260	295	350	385	420	445	460	$30	$500 single; $750 man and wife; $100 each additional; $1,000 for 2 persons who are eligible for OAA.
Wyoming [5]	145	200	235	300	330	360	390	435	480	520	$40	$1,000 for 1; $1,500 for 2 or more.

[1] No program.
[2] Eligibility computed on public assistance budget.
[3] Exclusive of rent.
[4] Only PA and public health outpatients eligible.
[5] Wyoming—Indian reservation only.

Note: New Jersey—To the income scale is added an allowance for actual amount of rent paid and any other extraordinary expenses such as medical expenses. North Carolina—The counties also have the option of using State public assistance standards instead of the income scales listed. Oklahoma—If applicant has shelter expense in excess of $8 per month, additional allowance can be made up to $22.

EXHIBIT 8.—COUNTIES WHICH PROVIDE SURPLUS COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS ON A PARTIAL YEAR OR SEASONAL BASIS

[Partial list]

State and county or township(s)	Dates of no program	Date of peak employment	Estimated span of crop season
Indiana:			
Clark, Union	July-September		
Decatur, Jackson	do		
Fulton, Aubeemulbe	do		
Green, Stafford, and Washington	do		
Johnson, Pleasant	do	Sept. 10	May 1 to Oct. 15.
Lawrence, Spice Valley	do		
Montgomery, Ripley	do		
Morgan, Jackson	do		
Ripley, Otter Creek	do	Sept. 10	Aug. 1 to Sept. 30.
Vermillion, Vermillion	do		
Missouri:			
Dunklin	September-October	June 15	May 1 to July 15.
Periscot	do		
North Dakota:			
Foster	July-September		
Ramsey	do		
Ward	do		
South Dakota:			
Brule	do		
Hutchinson	do		
Hyde	do		
Jerauld	do		
Union	do		
Texas: San Patricio	March-November	July 30	July 20 to Aug. 15.
Wisconsin: Lac Du Flambeau Indian Reservation	July-September		

EXHIBIT 9

Counties with formal applications pending before the Secretary of Agriculture for a food stamp program as of June 17, 1969:

State and County:	*Per capital income rank*
Arkansas: Searcy	148
California:	
Madera	2164
Santa Cruz	2954
Florida: Dade	2956
Georgia:	
Bartow	1138
Clayton	2243
Effingham	588
Early	54
Fannin	635
Miller	137
Montgomery	400
Idaho: [1] Taylor	153
Louisiana: [2]	
Bossier [3]	1637
East Feliciana	58
St. Charles	1286
St. Mary	1531
Terrebonne	1442
Michigan:	
Alpena	2088
Kent	2940
Lenawee	2367
Emmet	1607
Minnesota: Travers	807
Nebraska: Burt [3]	1480
New Mexico:	
Catron	1720
Dona Ana	2019
Grant	1692
Hidalgo	1829
Luna	1977
Sierra	1765
Socorro	854
North Carolina:	
Johnston	306
Wayne	592
Vance	632
New York: Chenango [3]	2388
Pennsylvania: Fulton	1039
South Dakota:	
Deuel	640
Grant	827
Hamlin	460
Hand	782
Marshall	772
Potter	1227
Sanborn	719
Virginia: Surry	239

[1] The State of Idaho has submitted an application for the funding of at least 2 counties (there are 28 without food programs).
[2] The Department of Agriculture refuses to accept the five county applications from Louisiana counties as formal applications since the State has no funds with which to pay the local administrative share.
[3] Counties in which no food program currecently exists.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION WELCOMES NEW DIRECTOR, JOHN F. THOMAS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration is fortunate, indeed, to have as its Director, Mr. John F. Thomas of the United States.

Mr. Thomas assumed his duties in the Geneva, Switzerland, headquarters on February 19, 1969, after being unanimously elected as Director of ICEM during the 29th session of the Council on November 28, 1968.

ICEM, a 31-member government international organization, was established in 1951 and has helped resettle 1.6 million refugees and migrants in new lands and opportunities.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee who has closely worked with ICEM and with John Thomas, I am proud that he is at the helm of this humanitarian organization which serves both people in need and countries in need of people. Mr. Thomas has enjoyed the respect and cooperation of all who have worked with him. His nomination by the United States is recognition of his ability both in the administrative and operational sectors of refugee assistance.

Mr. Thomas, born on January 24, 1907, in Minneapolis, Minn., is the fifth Director of ICEM since its creation in 1951. He is the fourth American to hold this position. During the past 25 years he has held important posts in various national and international organizations dealing with refugee resettlement and migration. Until recently he was the director of U.S. refugee affairs in Vietnam and previously director of the Cuban refugee program in the United States. After the end of World War II, Mr. Thomas worked successfully for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and International Refugee Organization in Germany where he was responsible for the resettlement of thousands of displaced persons. The new Director of ICEM is well known to those who have been associated with the activities of ICEM since 1952, as he served in Geneva as Deputy Chief of Operations of ICEM until 1963. In 1957 he was awarded the Joseph E. Chamberlain Prize by the New York Committee on Refugees.

Since assuming the ICEM directorship in mid-February, Mr. Thomas has had extensive meetings with permanent delegates in Geneva of ICEM member governments, leaders of various governments, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and his officials, and with leading representatives of the various voluntary agencies who are active in migration activities.

I know that Members of Congress and friends of ICEM welcome John Thomas to his new position and wish him well in his commendable endeavor.

THE SHAME OF AMERICA'S ALMOST NONEXISTENT MASS TRANSIT

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, across every industrially developed nation spreads a modern network of urban mass transit aimed at moving masses of people easily, swiftly, and comfortably. Only in the United States is the exception. In Japan, there is a fully developed, operating and profitable railroad passenger service. The Bullet Trains make a jest out of even the Penn Central's Metroliner, although I believe the latter is a fine beginning.

While our roadbeds are falling into increasingly unsafe disrepair, the Japanese built new roadbeds and trains. No grade crossings, long welded rails, and computer controlled traffic are their highlights. Profits are rolling in on these ventures. In Montreal and Moscow, marvelous subway systems make mass passenger travel a pleasure instead of a dangerous venture.

Several weeks ago in Paris, I drove for 2 hours to visit and inspect a new concept in air-cushioned intercity transportation known as the aerotrain. Riding in it, I found that it was at least 3 years ahead of anything we have here at home. The ride was smooth and the experimental car was comfortable, pleasant, and well appointed. The aerotrain rode on a solid concrete track, divided in the center, approximately one inch above the track. Certainly the technology involved did not seem to be beyond the reach of our Nation. Test models of the train had a speed of 285 miles per hour. This is indeed a concept that merits attention ahead of the SST.

Their metro, or subway, is just as great an advance over what we are suffering with here at home. While in Paris, I purposely visited the subway on two separate occasions. Once at the hour of 4 p.m., before the rush hour, and the second time at 6 p.m., during that rush hour. Lines were similar to those encountered in New York or even longer. A double line was required, one for purchase and one to give the ticket.

Tickets were 1 franc, or 20 cents. Even during the heavy rush, the crowd was extremely good natured. There was an effective system of crowd control so that only a limited number of people were permitted at one time on the subway platform. All others had to wait behind the gate, even after they had obtained their tickets. Trains arrived at frequent intervals—every 30 seconds. Subways were incredibly clean—windows and all. Stations were bright, cheery, and well decorated. There were few seats on each train, most of the space being devoted to standing room. Compared to the New York subways, the ride was silent, smooth, and swift. Every facility was well lit, and a pleasure to come in contact with. All in all, this is a system far superior to our own anywhere in the land.

What is happening meanwhile back in America? Already, American workers spend 13 percent of their time commuting or driving to work. The Secretary of Transportation states that this percentage could rise to 20 percent in 2 or 3 years. The state of America's urban mass transit is a national disgrace and sorrow. We are the richest nation on earth, and we cannot today travel rapidly with any consistency in large groups within the confines of megalopolis.

Instead of bullet trains, we have traffic jams of masses of automobiles which pollute the air and cover our landscape with junk. Our cities are literally choking on these gasoline guzzling dinosaurs, with all their attendant evils. Instead of better subways, we have 2 and 3 hour traffic jams. Instead of better passenger trains, we have more and larger concrete freeways which slash the intestines out of viable neighborhoods in our cities. Rather than STOL and VTOL aircraft, we have plans and significant government subsidization of the SST, which is the ultimate in noise pollution with its sonic boom.

We are going to turn around and find, very shortly now, that we have fallen completely out of the race to make our cities livable and workable. As people find it increasingly intolerable and impossible to function daily, our cities, which are fountainheads of wealth and population, will collapse. The rest of the Nation will inexorably collapse with them. Where will the SST be then? Flying shrieking across the land from one abandoned rubble heap to the other? Who will fly in it?

Disaster stares us in the face as a nation if we do not forthwith turn our priorities around. We do not require more highways, tearing the viability out of our cities and carrying more masses of cars across the land. We need a mass transit government trust fund exactly like the one highways have had for years. User taxes could and would easily pay for it. The Department of Transportation is studying such a plan now—ad infinitum, ad nauseum. What are we waiting for? A time has come for action, instead of further study. If they must study, let them go to Japan, which lay in ruins two decades ago. They will teach us how to build what we cannot do now.

I have joined the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) and 73 other Members of the House in sponsoring a bill which would accomplish just such a purpose.

We can destroy the world with our weaponry. We are changing the face of the land with our constructions. We can destroy whole populations, including ourselves. But we still cannot do what they did years ago here in America, and what they are doing successfully overseas—move masses of people with smoothness and rapidity from one place to another on the ground. Let anyone who has been in a traffic jam recently argue with that statement.

THE SURTAX HOAX REVISITED

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, proponents of the surtax say it will lick inflation. Has it? Any housewife can tell you the answer. For the year April 1968 to April 1969 during which the surtax has been in effect, the consumer price index has gone up nearly 5½ percent. In March of this year it went up 0.8 percent, or at an annual rate of almost 10 percent. In April, the rise was almost as much, 0.64 percent, or at an annual rate of over 7½ percent.

Did the surtax prevent the continuation of tight money? The question would be funny if it were not so sad. With a prime interest rate at an unheard of, unprecedented, and indeed shocking 8½ percent, we reach the crowning proof of the futility of the surcharge as a weapon against tight money. The homebuilder and the home buyer are for all practical

purposes put in the deepfreeze for the duration.

Has the surtax enabled us to keep our commitments to the poor, the untrained, the aged? Are we solving the problems of our cities? Every day we see evidence to the contrary. Job centers are being closed. A host of poverty programs lack full funding. The model cities program hardly gets off the ground. On almost every domestic front, the inaction of the administration is getting more and more inexcusable every day. Certainly the surcharge has not prevented the Government's efforts at solving our domestic problems from grinding down into very low gear indeed. And what did the advocates of the surtax say a year ago? The surtax would make it possible for us to win the battle of inflation. The surtax would bring a halt to tight money. The surtax would enable us to get moving in our efforts to cure urban blight, poverty, inadequate schools, and all the other domestic ills that we know of all too well.

What has the surtax accomplished? I could mention two statistics that some might point to with pride. Corporate profits are at a record level—at an annual rate of $96 billion before taxes in the first quarter of this year compared to an annual rate of $88.9 billion in the first quarter of 1968. After taxes the comparable figures are $53 billion this first quarter of this year compared to $49.1 billion the first quarter of 1968. Our corporations are indeed doing well.

Second, the President has been able to point with pride to the prospect of a balanced budget. But, I ask you, what good is a balanced budget when prices rise at over a half a percent each month? What good is a balanced budget when interest rates are so high that the homebuilder and the home buyer are completely stymied? What good is a balanced budget when there are over 2.5 million unemployed, many of them without sufficient education or training to be able to get decent jobs in the foreseeable future?

Clearly the surtax has proved to be the wrong medicine for the ailments of our Nation. Its cost has simply been added to the other costs most consumers, most taxpayers, have to bear.

Clearly, a responsible national policy must call for a far different tax program than has yet been presented to the Congress. Since the Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings on tax reform from almost the beginning of the 91st Congress, we are more keenly aware than ever before of what some of the loopholes in our tax structure are. We know the enormous benefits the oil industry gets from the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance. We know how the multiple surtax exemptions afforded corporations are used as a tax reducing device by many large businesses. We know how high salaried corporation officials benefit because of the favorable tax treatment accorded stock options. The unlimited charitable contribution deduction is another loophole which favors the very wealthy. Our treatment of capital gains from property when transferred at death from one person to another likewise provides inordinate benefits to the wealthy. As the Ways and Means hearings revealed a number of foundations have abused their tax exempt status toward ends that are not consistent with the purposes for which their tax exempt status was provided for by law.

Clearly, it is high time that loopholes such as these be closed. This is a much sounder way of increasing Federal revenue than is retention of the surtax.

Finally, as the Vietnamese conflict continues, month after month, it is more important than ever that we in the Congress make certain that businessmen in this country do not profiteer. Defense contracts must be negotiated with far greater care than appears to have been the case many times within recent years. Defense spending cannot be done on a virtually blank check basis with billions appropriated by the Congress with appallingly little detailed study and debate. The possibility of an excess profits tax should be examined with care.

No one denies that we must fight inflation now. But it must be fought with tools appropriate for the task. The surcharge is clearly not such a tool. Let us be man enough to admit its failure. Let us let it die. Then let us get on with the task equipped with tools that are designed for the purpose and that are fair to all the American people.

ARAB DREAMS COLLIDE WITH SOVIET REALISM

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days the Soviet Union seems to have come to a growing realization that Arab intransigency and growing extremism are a lighted fuse leading to further Middle Eastern conflict and a possible world war. Instead of accepting the reality of Israel and shifting their focus to internal development and meaningful negotiations, the Arabs again trumpet aloud to the world the fruits of their continued self-delusions.

Again we hear them drumming up the self-induced fury which made them think they could destroy Israel three times in the past. Once more they shreik of armed might, subscribing increasingly to the terrorist dictum of total military defeat and physical dismemberment of the Jewist state. No delusion could be more foolhardy, self-defeating, or dangerous to the peace of the world.

The Soviets have seemingly tried to defuse the powder keg they have so assiduously constructed with their arms supply policy to Nasser and his ilk. Mr. Gromyko received a reply, all right. It was a stinging rebuke to Soviet efforts to muzzle their destructive little clients, into whose hands they have placed more and better weapons than the Israelis destroyed and captured in 1967.

Now the Arabs again delude themselves by taking their own rhetoric seriously. Nothing is more foolish than a person with an infinite capacity for self-delusion. Nothing is more dangerous than an armed fool with the same affinity for believing what is palpably untrue. Never has the world seen such unlimited foolhardiness than the present spectacle of Nasser and others—prisoners of their own bombast.

One element, however, has been added to the powder magazine through which Nasser and his allies flit, waving torches and bellowing threats. There are major American and Soviet naval forces confronting one another in the Mediterranean. Another Middle East conflict could bring them into physical confrontation to support respective foreign policy positions taken by their governments. Then, only a small incident or accident would be the final Sarajevo. If the Arab States would sit down at the conference table with the Israelis and enter into immediate face-to-face negotiations Mrs. Meir has spoken of, much might be resolved—if the Soviets would make it clear to the Arabs that under no conditions could they expect major further Soviet assistance, particularly in a military showdown.

If another war should come, Israel, of course, will turn the Suez Canal area into an Egyptian graveyard—an awful way of finally convincing Nasser and his followers that Israel is and will continue to be. But to chance an international conflict is another matter entirely. I wonder what the Soviets are thinking? Is a world war worth another sop to Arab ego and deflated military reputations? Will the Soviets never learn and help us defuse the powder keg? I pray that they will.

THE HYDRA IS REBORN AMONG US

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Greek mythology is at times a fascinating study, and never more so than now. According to such legends, one of the 12 tasks of Hercules was to end the existence of the Hydra, which was a nine-headed monster dwelling in the Lernean marshes near Argolis. Each time one of its deadly heads was cut off, two others grew immediately to replace it. A grusome little nugget from the fertile minds of the ancient Greeks. Until today.

For the Hydra has been reborn in a new, far more deadlier form. Technology is its father. Militarism is its mother. Geopolitics and the arms race are its grandparents. Its families on both sides are the respective Military Establishments of the United States and the Soviet Union. We are providing money for its development, testing, and deployment. In short, the Hydra is MIRV, or multiple intercontinental reentry vehicle—an ICBM with individually targeted multiple warheads. Its emergence and mutual deployment means the end of all possible hopes for meaningful international disarmament or inspection as we now understand the terms. Man thus takes another giant step toward the abyss of the last world war.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union are busily engaged in significant tests of MIRV, and I suppose the results will be satisfactory. Through the mist of camouflage maintained by the Defense Establishment, it is easy to ascertain that plans are already well advanced for emplacement of this system. Of course, the Soviets are replying in kind. Why, then, is there such debate?

Once Minuteman and Poseidon are

fully MIRVed, there will be from three to a dozen warheads atop each missile, a multiple-pronged streak of megadeath, poised to leap outwards on its appointed mission. At present, spy-in-the-sky satellites, launched into Polar orbit, are capable of picking out individual telephone lines on the ground and overhearing individual telephone conversations—almost as good as our wiretappers here at home. Their growing effectiveness could conceivably be put to excellent use to attain meaningful international arms inspection. Each silo housing every missile can be detected, counted, and continually observed. MIRV dashes all such frantic hopes.

Why? Because no matter how sophisticated or ever-present, no spy in the sky can accurately reveal how many warheads are poised under each ICBM nose cone. There could be one city-killing warhead—three—or a dozen. Each side automatically is placed in a state of geopolitical jeopardy because the other side might be developing a true first strike capacity. Such multiple warheads could conceivably be targeted at individual missile silos, giving a potential enemy capacity to destroy the retaliatory force.

I fear it is already too late to prevent further final testing. Appeals along this line have already been made in the most eloquent manner—to no avail.

Where does this particular road lead us? Down a winding, crooked alley marked dead end and total mutual destruction. Odd, is it not? Hercules slew the Hydra in Greek mythology. But today, reborn, the Hydra rears its head of many horrors, bidding fair to reverse the mythical decision of so long ago. We have truly created the means of our own final destruction. The open pit yawns before us. Shall we avoid it, saved by commonsense or an instinct of self preservation? Will we make some attempt to enter into meaningful disarmament discussions with the Soviet Union? We should. We could. We must.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR BASIC SCIENCE

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a recent report of the committee on Federal legislation of the New York County Lawyers Association on the matter of long-range Federal support for basic science. The report follows:

REPORT ON BILLS DEALING WITH LONG-RANGE FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR BASIC SCIENCE

Concern for effective legal foundation for federal encouragement of scientific research goes far back in our history. Proposals for a national university and other national action for this purpose were made by some of our early Presidents.[1] The principal legal step taken to encourage science was adoption of the federal patent system.

During the twentieth century, it has been increasingly recognized that more extensive commitments were necessary, and they have been made.

At the present time, however, the scientific community believes that a crisis exists regarding federal support for scientific efforts because of indecisiveness in our commitments and cutbacks in the funding of projects previously undertaken.

This requires a rethinking of the adequacy of the legal foundation for federal scientific activity.

H.R. 35 would authorize appropriations for grants to institutions in this field, including relief from cuts in funds under other programs. This would help to provide flexibility to institutions in meeting their needs.

In our view, while this is desirable, the problem is more basic, and can only be met by a legal structure permitting long-term planning, and adherence to this without altering our support for science based on frequent changes in the fiscal outlook.

Advances in technology and applied science are dependent upon advances in basic research. These are often relatively less expensive, but find it more difficult to secure the necessary support because it takes more imagination to visualize the far-reaching implications involved.

Research aimed at bringing already available basic knowledge to bear for the solution of pressing problems is also of the highest importance.

The light which new discoveries can shed on basic processes is urgently needed to provide new ways of dealing with age-old problems confronting mankind. Many of these problems have become more urgent because of growing interdependence.

Today more than at any time in the past, immense challenges are confronting mankind. We now see ourselves for the first time as travellers together on a planet with a potentially limitless future and limitless tasks before us. To meet these challenges, and to involve all men in opportunities to meet them, a basic commitment to ongoing basic science is necessary. During the last third of this century the competition between more or less open and growing societies and those under tight ideological blinders is bound to continue. Indeed, many illusions in this regard were shattered by the Czechoslovak tragedy of August 1968. Entirely aside from considerations of defense, the ability of competing systems to provide greater opportunities and creative challenges will determine the political landscape of the future. For this reason as well, scientific progress in indispensable to hopes for a future world community of openness, peace, order and justice.

The inadequacy of our legal structure for these purposes is equally plain.

This has been made clear by the consequences of recent violent fluctuations in federal support for long-range research.

A unanimous 1969 report of a committee of the nationally representative New York Academy of Sciences on "The crisis facing American Science" reached the following sobering conclusions:

"Cutbacks are leading to the loss of substantial investments already made . . . New schools, hospitals and research centers are not being fully utilized, research that is now reaching a fruitful stage will have to be discontinued, and experienced research teams are being disbanded.

"The future supply of scientists is being adversely affected. Training programs for both scientific and technical personnel are being cut back severely.

"The pressing needs of our society, in many crucial areas, are failing to get the scientific attention they deserve."

We believe that in addition to appropriate short-range steps, such as H.R. 35, long-range correctives are needed.[2]

Under the statutes governing federal support for space exploration, it has been wisely recognized that decisions far more than one year in advance are indispensable to effective scientific endeavor. 42 U.S.C. § 2459 (a) provides: "Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for the construction of facilities, or for research and development activities, shall remain available until expended."

We recommend that this principle be adopted and consistently applied to federal programs concerning basic science wherever long-term projects requiring long-term planning are involved, without mid-program cutbacks unless based on defects in the program in question.

This would strengthen the basic legal structure for effective federal support for basic science, so vital to the future.

THIEU REGIME VIOLATES ITS OWN CONSTITUTION

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, a report released by the U.S. study team on political and religious standards in Vietnam of which our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) was a member—a private group sponsored by an interreligious ad hoc committee who recently returned from South Vietnam—as well as an article by Terence Smith in yesterday's New York Times, document the continuing shocking and outrageous action by the South Vietnamese Government to control political dissension within the country.

Newspapers are being shut down by the Government on charges of distorting "the news in such a manner that would demoralize the nation." Yesterday, the Saigon Daily News became the 32d paper to be closed in the last year because of political reasons.

Thousands of people are being arrested by the Thieu-Ky regime, many of whom have been detained or jailed without charge or benefit of trial. There is an estimate of at least 20,000 non-Communist political prisoners. Torture and physical abuse are widespread, especially in the detention and interrogation centers. The large majority of prisoners are held because they oppose the Government. The Government claims they are Communists—a label easily applied to any political opponent or undesirable, someone inimical to continuing Government control. Yet most are nationalists, caught between the barricades, whose only crime is their search for peace in their country.

One of the most well-known cases is that of Truong Dinh Dzu, who 2 short years ago ran in the South Vietnam national elections as the peace candidate, polling 18 percent of the vote, second only to the Thieu-Ky ticket which received 35 percent. On May 1, 1968, Dzu was arrested on charges of urging the formation of a coalition government as a step toward peace. In August, he was sentenced to 5 years of forced labor. And the NLF, as he suggested, is now participating in the Paris peace talks, but Dzu still remains in jail.

It is shocking that the United States is not only financing but supervising the construction and improvement of more correctional institutions intended to

[1] Thomas Jefferson, Message of December 2, 1806, 1 STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGES OF THE PRESIDENTS 87–88 (Chelsea House 1966); John Quincy Adams, Message of December 6, 1825, id. at 246, 248–49.

[2] See Hornig, "United States Science Policy: Its Health and Future Direction," 163 Science 523 (2/7/69).

hold these political prisoners—a system which the Saigon government says is "based on the principles of humanity, charity, and equality."

The South Vietnamese Constitution provides:

> Any restriction upon the basic rights of the citizens must be prescribed by law and the time and place within which such a restriction is in force must be clearly specified. In any event *the essence of all basic freedoms cannot be violated.* (Emphasis added.)

These constitutional protections become hollow, empty, meaningless words under the Saigon regime. Just 2 days ago, President Thieu proclaimed:

> From now on, those who spread rumors that there will be a coalition government in this country, whoever they be, whether in the executive or the legislature, will be severely punished on charges of collusion with the enemy and demoralizing the army and the people. *I will punish them in the name of the Constitution.* (Emphasis added.)

Is this then what we are defending and fighting for and for which so many of our young men have died?

SECRETARY STANS SUPPORTED

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in his recent trips to Europe and the Orient, Secretary of Commerce Stans encountered some strong opposition to his proposal that the trading nations of the world hold an international conference to discuss limitations on textile imports. This attitude came as no surprise to those of us who have been working toward a solution of this problem over the years. After all, as the television commercials say, they "have a good thing going."

Textile imports in 1968 were double what they were in 1964 and better than triple what they were 10 years ago. Each month, we read about new records being set as a result of an overly generous trade policy which has made the United States the only free market in the world for all of the burgeoning production of wool and manmade fiber textiles. The nations which are flooding our markets with low-wage imports—made at wages and under working conditions which would be illegal in this country—are showing little or no inclination to cut back on their shipments to the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are confident that Mr. Stans will succeed in his mission to bring these countries to the negotiating table where a reasonable plan which will restore order to world textile trade can be worked out. We are confident he will succeed, because he has the determination to do so, he has the firm backing of the President, and he has the support of the millions of Americans who depend upon the textile industry for a livelihood.

Since the time when Mr. Stans returned from Japan, a number of newspapers have commended him for the fine job he is doing, and I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a few of the newspaper editorials which have come to my attention. As the Greenville News points out, the textile industry "asks only for an even break."

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, June 2, 1969]

TEXTILES ASK ONLY FOR EVEN BREAK

The latest round of what is expected to be an industry-wide series of wage increases, the eighth in about 7 years, should be a clear indication that the American textile industry intends to continue the battle for survival against competition in which the odds favor its competitors.

An industry which raises salaries and wages when many aspects of its future are anything but certain is viable, full of life and capable of fighting for quality and its share of the market at home and abroad. It is an industry with alert and daring leadership which is determined to have its share of the best workers and to attract young blood and imaginative executive material.

It is quite plain that the textile firms operating in this area are out to meet wage and salary competition resulting from expanding economic development and diversification, both of which the enlightened textile leadership of our time has helped to promote.

Further, the advance booking of exhibits and reservations for visitors to the first international textile machinery show in Textile Hall this fall is indicative that the industry is capable of originating and willing to accept innovations in products and production methods. These facts combine to increase worker productivity, which makes higher wages possible, and to raise quality and lower production costs, which makes American manufacturing more competitive in both the foreign and domestic markets.

The element of uncertainty in the industry which we referred to above is produced by the current condition of textile export-import trade, which definitely is against the American industry. Despite the benefits of the one-price system on cotton and negotiated voluntary quotas on some categories of goods effective at times in the past, well-developed countries like Japan and the Common Market nations have a tremendous competitive advantage in the United States and in the world market.

In addition, textiles is one of the fields in which the planners of the American foreign aid program have chosen to assist allies, former enemies and under-developed countries alike to build their own manufacturing economies. Taxes collected from American industry and workers have financed the growth of foreign competition.

These countries enjoy the advantages of low labor costs, unrestricted American imports on categories such as man-made fibers and finished garments and restrictions placed by their governments on incoming American goods.

This is why the textile industry of the United States is still asking for action which amounts to "protectionism" as distinguished from the long-held American ideal of "free trade." It also is why the Nixon administration through Commerce Secretary Stans and certain White House aides is trying to get voluntary international agreements on import quotas and why Congress is threatening to pass restrictive laws if the negotiations fail.

It is well, however, to understand just what the American textile industry is asking for and what it is not. In this light, its attitude is not as selfish as it may appear, what with profits running along at a fair clip and with expansion plans still in the works.

The industry has not asked for and neither the administration nor Congress is proposing prohibitive tariffs on imports which would raise their price above or even up to the level of the American goods which cost more to make. Nor is it asking for a rollback of the amount of foreign goods and garments coming into the United States each year.

Rather, the proposal is a system of quotas in each category of goods which would fix at a certain level the amount that would be permitted to come in under otherwise free trade conditions. The quotas would not be inflexible; some upward adjustment would be permitted from one year to the next, depending on domestic and foreign market conditions.

During the past few years, without quotas, foreign imports have increased as much as 27 per cent in a single year and the balance of textile trade deficits has risen from $766 million in one year to $1.1 billion the next. During one month imports were coming in at the rate of $1.5 billion a year.

The quotas the administration is seeking would be designed to place reasonable limits on imports, according to what the market can absorb, and to gain more nearly equal treatment for American exports in the foreign market. The most important aspect of the matter is that, with quotas, American manufacturers would know how much foreign competition they would have and could plan their production and marketing to meet it.

Given a few years of protection from grossly underpriced competition, American management and workers probably could improve their production efficiency to the point that they could compete on even terms without either tariffs or quotas.

Meanwhile, however, the competing foreign countries actually are practicing heavy-handed protectionism in behalf of their textile industries against American exports. They don't use words like quotas and tariffs for what they are doing, but the restrictions and special charges applied to American goods have the same effect.

So, what the textile industry is seeking really is no more than an even break with foreign imports. Surely it is entitled to at least that. And, as a matter of principle and fair play (omitting the element of gratitude for help rendered) the foreign interests the United States has assisted should be willing to compete on those terms.

Certainly, this country cannot allow its textile industry, which has a big role in the national defense strategy, to be weakened, much less destroyed.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Sun, May 23, 1969]

FAIRER DEAL FOR TEXTILES

The Nixon Administration is taking a firm position on the problem of increasing textile imports which imperil not only the jobs of the American textile workers, but the existence of the industry itself. While there will be no precipitate action, the wheels have been set in motion to provide much needed relief. The news is good for Lewiston and Maine.

The new Secretary of Commerce, Maurice H. Stans, disclosed this week that the nations which sell textiles in the United States have been put on notice that unless they show a willingness to undertake voluntary limits on their shipments within three months this country "may have to look for other solutions." That is a broad hint of the possibility of quotas, a step which has a great deal of support in Congress.

Protectionism is not the objective nor desire of the American textile industry. It is willing to compete and only wants the opportunity to make a living. But it cannot contend with the flood tide of foreign textiles, made with far cheaper labor.

No industry spokesman could have dramatized the need for action more effectively than Secretary Stans' reminder that imports exceeded exports last year by $807 million, with incoming shipments of synthetics alone up 54 percent. The United States, he added, is the only free market in the world today for textiles, all other have bilateral or unilateral restrictions on imports. As a result, the

U.S. industry and its 2.5 million employees are suffering.

The Secretary is proposing a conference of the nations involved under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in Geneva next fall. That means the American textile industry will have to continue struggling with the import problem, but at least, there is light at the end of the tunnel.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, May 21, 1969]

JAPAN: ALL TAKE, NO GIVE

Columnist Charles Bartlett wrote in The Standard-Times the other day, "The Japanese pursuit of equal rights without equal responsibilities is no longer realistic for a nation which has attained the world's second largest gross national product, a surplus of $1.3 billion in its American trade account, and a rosy prospect of continued economic expansion in a democratic framework."

In similar vein, Secretary of Commerce Stans, speaking in Tokyo recently, pointed out that "Japan has grown to the point where it no longer needs the protection and limitations appropriate to an insecure nation."

Two examples will suffice.

Japan's auto industry is young and perhaps vulnerable, but it is managing to export more than 100,000 cars annually to the United States, while American autos, along with a significant portion of manufacturers and consumer goods of American origin, are excluded from Japan.

At the same time, Japan has flatly refused to establish voluntary quotas on textile exports to the United States, declining to accept the American position that our domestic industry needs protection. In other words, what is sauce for the goose is not necessarily sauce for the gander.

Additionally ironic is the fact that no Japanese would lose jobs as a result of the quota plan envisaged by the Commerce Department because it contains no "rollback" of textile imports such as has been sought by U.S. textile companies. Instead, the quota as proposed would be set at the 1968 import level, which included a record amount of textiles from Japan.

Since few other countries understand American thinking, and particularly the thinking of the American Congress, Japan may fail to realize the advantages of the voluntary quotas and the risk in rejecting some proposal of this type.

The last session of Congress indicated a great deal of rising protectionist sentiment in the United States. If round-table talks do not produce a voluntary solution in textiles, it is very likely that this session will pass legislation aimed not only at protecting that industry, but curbing imports in other areas as well.

Japan can afford to do better than adhere to this inflexible attitude and ought to, in the interests of the many areas of mutually beneficial trade that are possible between us.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, May 22, 1969]

WANTING: MOUNTING TIDE OF TEXTILE IMPORTS BARES TRADE FOLLY

Prior to 1960, an Associated Press Washington dispatch reports, this Country's exports of textiles far exceeded imports. Last year, however, the value of textile imports exceeded the value of exports by $807 million. Receipts of foreign synthetics alone were up 54 per cent.

Now Secretary of Commerce Stans says it may become necessary for the United States Government to impose textile quotas unless the exporting Countries agree to limit their shipments to this Country voluntarily.

Undoubtedly inflation has aggravated import competition on the American market. In the absence of a reversal of this trend, unfortunately nowhere in sight, it is futile to argue as the free traders do that the way for American manufacturers to cope with the import problem is to meet the price. Obviously, if American producers could do this they wouldn't sit idly by and surrender their home markets to imports while their own products were pricing themselves out of the export market. Hungry as they may be for sales they can't stay in business and operate at a loss.

It never has been clear to this newspaper why our manufacturers of competitive goods should be required to depend on the good offices of foreign producers. If quotas are necessary—and at best they provide only temporary relief—they should be imposed. Better still, why not return to the traditional American policy—abandoned in the first Roosevelt Administration—of equalizing competition by the imposition of appropriate import duties?

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, May 23, 1969]

TEXTILE PROBLEM

Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans is touring Asia and endeavoring to curb the flow of textile imports into the United States. He is making a clear point that if the flood of foreign textile products are not curtailed voluntarily, a protectionist-minded Congress may enact legislation to require it.

Although his point was clear, Mr. Stans got a negative response from Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan.

The point is clear enough here.

The United States is the only major free market for textiles in the world. We become, therefore, a target for every nation which exports textiles.

It stands to reason that a steadily increasing flood of foreign textiles will have an adverse effect on our own domestic textile industry.

Secretary Stans projected a reasonable approach to the Asian nations. He would peg their textile imports at the 1968 figures. He wanted some assurance that the imports would not continue upward.

There is still a chance of working out a solution. It is clear that either an effective voluntary agreement must be worked out or that Congress must pass restrictive legislation.

We cannot permit the United States to be a dumping ground for foreign textiles to the detriment of our own textile industry.

[From the High Point Enterprise, May 21, 1969]

TEXTILE TIGER LOOMS

Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans cautions a Hong Kong textile conference that Uncle Sam can get tough—very tough indeed—if pushed too hard.

The message, uttered politely, forcefully to Hong Kong cloth makers, was timely warning that the United States, faced with the burden of $250 million worth of cloth annually from that British Crown Colony, can become a textile tiger.

Quite understandably, there seems no enthusiasm out there for voluntary quotas on exports to the United States. Same is true of Japan, Formosa and South Korea, where Stans has already made clear American purpose to protect our textile industry from low-cost labor competition.

By now it should be evident to the Far Eastern textile manufacturers that it is to the mutual advantage of their own businesses, as well as ours, that agreement be reached on workable quotas by which they live and let live. This nation can't stand idly by and see its textile industry, already beset by cheap imports, undercut excessively by low-cost Asian fabrics entering their markets.

President Nixon has made clear his desire to avoid restrictive measures which could, in turn, hurt U.S. exports. Congress is under strong pressure to apply sharp import restrictions if some workable mutual agreement can't be reached, as Secretary Stans is earnestly intent upon doing.

Hong Kong, which sends 41 per cent of its textile exports to this country, is a principal offender—it is a painful decision for Hong Kong, but it is one that clearly has to be made.

ESSAYS WRITTEN BY RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF HOBOKEN, N.J.

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to insert at this point in the RECORD three essays written by residents of the city of Hoboken, N.J. The essays in question represented the winning entries in a contest conducted by the local antipoverty organization, Hoboken Organization Against Poverty and Economic Stress—HOPES. I congratulate the three winners, Ida Mead, Richard J. Drexel, and John Murphy, and the executive director of HOPES, E. Norman Wilson, Jr., at whose suggestion I have fowarded copies to President Nixon at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members of this House and all persons who read the RECORD will take a moment to read these essays which, I think, point out the maturity of our young people.

The essays follow:

WHAT I WOULD DO AS PRESIDENT

(By Richard John Drexel, eighth grade, Joseph F. Brandt Junior High School)

There are many problems in the United States today. As President I would try to conquer these problems.

Like most Americans I believe one of our major problems is our large urban areas. I would seek new laws to build more and better homes for the citizens. I would have all old and damaged homes torn down. They would be replaced by soaring skyscrapers, recreation areas, and parks.

Another problem in the United States to me is transportation. New means for rapid and safe transportation in the United States must be developed. At the same time I would try to prevent this from creating a greater amount of pollution.

Our nation is a rich country and all should be able to have opportunities to share in the wealth. This to me can be accomplished by providing more and better jobs.

Our welfare system must be changed. The Federal government should have complete control of welfare and no American should receive if he has the capability to work.

As President of this great nation I believe that all Americans should be united. It is my belief that this can be done by simply accepting one as a friend no matter race, creed, or color.

I would always try to bring peace to our country and would also try to maintain peace in dignity. Peace today is a necessity and can only happen to us by being strong and united.

(By Ida Mead, 10th grade, Hoboken High School)

WHAT I WOULD DO AS PRESIDENT

There is a never ending line of problems to be had by a President, and for this reason the office of the Presidency must be, and so far has been, occupied by capable men who knew what they were getting themselves into when they promised to preserve, protect, and defend The Constitution of The United States of America. These men had to solve many problems and did so, just as our president is today.

I feel that of the many problems a president has to overcome, the most important is that of world peace. As President of the United States I would try to overcome this problem, not only abroad, but in our own home land. Peace at home is so important. How can a president talk of helping other countries when his own country is unable to help itself? As president I would try to make the people realize that they all have the same rights, and that they were all put on this earth equal. No man is better than another. One may have more than another, but he had to work to get it. No one is just given something. Everyone has to work for what he wants. Of course, some people won't listen to reason, and usually these are the people who start all the trouble. If all men would realize this, then the problem would slowly be solved.

After the problem of peace seemed as if it was on the way to recovery, I would use all the power I have to try to build up our nation. I would build new homes wherever possible. Slums would be knocked down and our cities would be cleaned. Water and air pollution would be eliminated from our land. I realize all this takes money, but the money that we are wasting getting our boys killed in war could be saved if there was peace, and used for these purposes.

Also, as president, I would visit the cities and suburbs of the country which I am slowly building up. Not just the big cities, but the small, unknown ones also. I would talk with the people and get more ideas of what they want and I would try my best to give it to them. I feel that by the time I have ended my term I should have visited every state in the nation and talked with millions of people, most of whom I had gotten ideas. out of.

If I were ever elected president, and as president, I accomplished the things I mentioned above, I will feel, when I leave my office and watch as someone else, who feels he is capable of carrying on from where I left off, is sworn in as President, that I have helped if only a little, to ease the tension that was built up before I entered my office and that I have built up the nation that in my dreams I thought could never come true. And I will feel proud knowing that I have helped unite this great nation. After all, what good is a government if the people don't support it?

WHAT I WOULD DO IF I WERE PRESIDENT

(By John Murphy, 12th grade, Hoboken High School)

If I were President my chief concern would be to try for a just peace in Vietnam. It is a very unpopular war, in which we are losing many young Americans. I would try to encourage all United Nations members to put that as most important business at hand and work together for a just and lasting peace between all nations.

Next I would try to improve our image abroad by advising our tourists and business men who travel extensively to change the picture of the "Ugly American".

I would not allow America to be so one sided in the outbursts between the Arabs and the Jews. We should remain neutral.

At home I would first remember that in the last election the vast majority of voters showed a deep desire for law and order; I would ask for the retirement of certain members of the Supreme Court, who have made very unpopular decisions against law enforcement agencies. I would continue federal aid to education but would cut off aid to any College rioters, found guilty of violent protest.

I would continue most poverty programs but would have the government carefully supervise the spending of Federal Funds. I would try to cut all unnecessary funds and therefore lower the high taxes Americans now pay. I would not continue the exploration of Space because millions of dollars are spent trying to land on the moon. I would like to see this world become better, because most people think they can then go to the moon because the earth is very violent. I would spend the money on helping people to help themselves to become educated and better living standards. Also on scientific research in heart, cancer and retardation. The most important thing I would do as President is to try to do the best I can and to make this world a little better place to live.

THE AMERICAN HUMANICS FOUNDATION

(Mr. HALL was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1948 a group of youth and business leaders, led by H. Roe Bartle—at the time, executive of the Greater Kansas City Area Boy Scouts Council—aware of the fact that there was no curriculum or organization designed to train young people for professional youth leadership, decided to do something about it.

The American Humanics Foundation was created and charged with the responsibility of helping provide college preparation for young people who were willing to enter youth serving and teaching careers.

The foundation projects a special curriculum in human relations, leading to the degrees of bachelor of arts or science. It supplies the faculty and underwrites an accompanying program of field trips and professional relationships. It also gives loans and fund assistance to those who cannot complete their college years without such help.

Unlike most foundations, the American Humanics Foundation is made possible by joint gifts of many concerned citizens, rather than the wealth of a few.

American Humanics graduates are now serving with distinction as professional staff personnel for such programs as the Boy Scouts, boys clubs, probation and parole, YMCA's childrens hospitals, Girl Scouts, campfire girls, and others. More than 500 AHF graduates have taken their places as participating citizens in communities large and small, all across the Nation. They are found in 38 States, working in the mainstreams of most community activities, at least, the worthwhile ones.

With the appalling demonstrations being held on the campuses of some of our major universities, it makes one wonder what kind of leaders we are developing. I am happy to report that the American Humanics Foundation, recognizing that the leaders of tomorrow must arise from the youth of today, is on the job, leading the way as it has for the past 21 years. The foundation with its curriculum, faculty, and advisers, plus the carefully selected students, are among the 99 percent who "build the Nation's pillar deep, and lift her to the sky."

MISS LINDA GAMBACH WINS ESSAY CONTEST

(Mr. ARENDS was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Republican State Central Committee sponsors an intern program as a memorial to our late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The winners of an essay contest are given the opportunity of working with the Illinois Republican State Central Committee staff. In this way these young people, who are interested in governmental affairs, secure an insight into the political party machinery which plays such an important part in a free society such as ours.

Miss Linda Gambach, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur D. Gambach, 728 Grant Street, Chenoa, Ill., was one of these three essay winners. She is 20 years of age, a graduate of Chenoa High School and presently attending Lincoln College with political science as her major.

We are all very proud of her and we have every reason to be. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting her prize essay in the RECORD. It merits careful reading. It gives one an insight into the thinking of our young people—their awareness of present-day problems and their faith in proven values. The essay follows.

ESSAY BY MISS GAMBACH

President Nixon, in his inaugural address on January 20, 1969, emphasized again and again the idea of moving the United States of America "forward together" in unity. As President Nixon took office, an orderly transition of executive power took place. The question of the division of the nation which occurred before, during, and after the Presidential campaigns of both parties was spoken to by the President. His call for national unity invoked pride in America, a land where through the orderly transfer of executive position we "celebrate the unity which keeps us free." Mr. Nixon's rhetoric stirred us to remember the heritage we have been given, in which liberty and unity were principles to die for.

Thus having stirred Americans emotionally, did President Nixon stir us into any physical action? Did his address instill each of us with the motivation to do his part for the preservation of freedom and unity in America? Moving the nation "forward together" involves great responsibility on the part of government (the President), as well as the individual citizen. The task of creating unity in any group or organization is great. The individuals and organizations involved must first want to be united. Secondly, they must be willing to devote time and talents in order to become aware and to be able to appreciate what it is this moving "forward together" in unity actually involves. Thirdly, the individual citizen must be willing to give of himself—become involved in the cause of unity. Without a cause, more meaningful than man and his own interests, an individual is not really whole. Fourthly, after involvement comes the idea of challenge and adventure. Once an individual is involved he becomes aware and is able to appreciate both positive and negative aspects, and the idea of change begins to occur. Fifthly, when challenge is faced motivation occurs and research and new and possibly better ideas are created.

The United States is torn by disunity. Every group in our society seems to be primarily interested in its own goals. For example, todays young generation is a "searching" group of young people. They are searching for something more than materialistic values and occupational success. They want to be financially successful, but they are also looking for something deeper, a real meaning

in life—a spiritual fulfillment. Young people today are looking for something they can really get involved with—a cause. The campus riots and demonstrations at Berkeley, Colgate, San Francisco and even the University of Illinois are the results of students looking for a cause. These students have found a cause, but they are restless and the cause they have found does not provide them with results which satisfy their need for a spiritual satisfaction. This restlessness results in riots, demonstrations and unrest some of which lead to violence.

The "Black Revolution" is becoming a great concern for the United States. Our union was almost torn apart by the "slavery question" during the Civil War. It was, in actual fact, divided (though not technically according to President Lincoln, who said the South was never out of the Union) between the North and South. Now the question of "Black Power" has risen again. This time the Blacks want their Constitutional rights and the freedom to live as citizens of the United States without fear of discrimination because of race. The "Black Movement" has risen out of a sense of disunity in our country. The Black man doesn't feel that he is really a part of the United States. He is alienated—a separate group unto himself. The Constitution provides for equality and justice for all, regardless of race, creed or color, but it seems to exclude the Black man. He is still discriminated against in many situations.

Another group in society which must be mentioned is the politicians—the Senators, Representatives, Governors, etc. There is disunity between these elected officials and the citizens they represent. There is often no exchange of opinions or ideas between our elected representatives in government and we the citizens. Even the average citizen at times feels alienated from his country. We have lost, at least for a time the sense of patriotism we once felt when the spirit of nationalism was high. Men would willingly enlist in the service to fight and die for the security and freedom of the country. The patriotic spirit of America seems to have changed and "draft protestors" are not willing to serve their country. They protest by burning their draft cards.

Not all disunity is bad though. Dissent, competition, individual initiative, etc. often help bring about much needed change. President Nixon's goal of moving "forward together" in unity is a goal which may be very hard to attain. He must pull together all the dissenting forces, angry Blacks, militant student leaders, draft card burners, average citizens and also government officials into one union—the United States of America.

The United States isn't as seriously in danger of a real physical division as in the Civil War, but spiritually the United States is becoming divided.

As President Nixon remarked in his inaugural address "The American dream does not come to thoes who fall asleep. But we are approaching the limits of what Government alone can do. Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government to enlist the legions of the concerned and the committed. What has to be done has to be done by Government and people together, or it will not be done at all.

"No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not. To go forward at all is to go forward together . . . Black and White together—as one nation."

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FORMED FOR CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, established by Congress under the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is an independent, nonprofit Corporation created to develop and improve programing for educational public radio and television broadcasting.

Hon. John W. Macy, Jr., the distinguished former Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, became the first President of the Corporation last February. Since that time, the Corporation has actively begun to function in accordance with the purposes of the Public Broadcasting Act.

I have the honor to serve as the senior, ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Yesterday, Mr. Macy, along with the Honorable Frank Pace, Chairman of the Board of the Corporation, appeared before this subcommittee and gave a full complete, informative report on the activities as well as future plans of the new Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

As one member who had some doubts about this program at the outset, I was impressed in particular by Mr. Macy's discussion of the part to be played by the local managers of educational broadcasting as well as the local communities.

One of the steps along this line which has been taken by the Corporation has been the establishment of an advisory board of national citizen organizations representing community interests in a variety of fields—conservation, churches, PTA, 4–H, and many others.

The plan is that the Corporation will provide leadership as well as financial support to the local ETU's for programs. These programs would be available for broadcasting by the local stations if they so desire.

Local chapters of the organizations making up the national advisory group, could use the broadcasting of the programs in which they are interested as part of their own planned activity in the local community.

The first meeting of the national advisory group took place in Washington on May 17. A report of the meeting follows:

EIGHTEEN NATIONAL CITIZENS GROUPS FORM ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 17.—Eighteen national citizens organizations began participating today in what was characterized as a "sustained nationwide effort to involve the viewer and the listener in the future of this great national resource called public broadcasting."

The characterization was made by John W. Macy, Jr., President of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as he addressed a luncheon here marking the founding of CPB's Advisory Committee of National Organizations. The group, still in formation, is representative of a broad range of citizen interest.

Specifically, Mr. Macy urged local citizens groups to gear some of their community action programs to discussion of critical national issues broadcast over public radio and television stations. He said the ideal would be follow up programs on local public stations to pinpoint issues raised in national public affairs presentations. He pledged CPB cooperation with local public stations in efforts to "trigger hundreds of local 'town meetings' in communities across the country, simultaneously focusing on local variations of critical national problems."

The CPB president also urged the organizations to keep their membership informed of upcoming programs of national interest—such as Children's Television Workshop's "Sesame Street"— and pledged that their advice would be sought on the types of programs most needed to meet community needs. "In short," Mr. Macy said, "we want our communications to be of the two-way variety, because public service is our only product."

Organizations sending official representatives to the first meeting of the Advisory Committee of National Organizations, held at the Dupont Plaza Hotel, are:

American Association of University Women.
Consumer Federation of America.
Boy Scouts of America.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Council of Churches.
National Council of Senior Citizens.
National Congress of PTAs.
National League of Cities.
National Conference of Mayors.
National 4–H Club Foundation.
National Education Association.
National Wildlife Federation.
National Audubon Society.
U.S. Jaycees.
National Catholic Office for Radio and Television.
League of Women Voters.

Mr. Macy noted that the final number of committee members would be kept low to allow for meaningful consultation.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, established by Congress under the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is an independent, non-profit corporation created to help develop public radio and television broadcasting through program and station support and establishment of interconnection systems.

Excerpts of Macy's remarks at Advisory Committee luncheon:

"In this age of communications, those of us in the business have sometimes been accused of doing all the communicating and precious little of the listening.

"With the formation of this Advisory Committee of National Organizations today, the CPB takes the first step in what I know will be a sustained effort to involve the viewer and the listener on a national scale in the future of this great national resource called 'public broadcasting.'

"The organizations represented here can all be characterized by their dedication to public service. Although you count membership in the millions, the hallmark of your public service is at the community level. It is there that you receive your strength and vitality as national entities. Organization members of the Advisory Committee have launched effective programs on virtually every major problem facing this country today: the evils of discrimination and malnutrition, the uneven quality of education and the consequent inequality of opportunities for decent employment, deterioration of our cities, pollution of our atmosphere and despoilation of natural resources, crime on the streets and dishonesty in the market place.

"These are negatives. But your organizations have approached them with positive solutions, each in your own way; each in accord with your own constituencies.

"In this approach to public service, you parallel the public broadcasting industry, and CPB itself. We, too, work at the national level to aid individual community stations—184 television and nearly 400 radio—in helping to isolate and solve local community problems. We want to make them strong local forces for public service through grants to

help improve local programming, to enrich their staffs and strengthen their ties with, and bolster their support from, their own community. In addition, we want to supply them with diversity and excellence in national programming so that they are better able to entertain and evaluate, amuse and teach.

"In all this, we need your advice. We need the assistance of your members in communities throughout the country.

"Let me give you an example:

"The Corporation feels that there are many opportunities for local follow-through on national public affairs programs. A program produced under a CPB grant on the nationwide air pollution problem could be followed by a local presentation pinpointing the problem areas in a particular city or state. This approach would be immeasurably enhanced, in my view, if local chapters of the organizations here today were to participate. Perhaps they would focus their own action programs around such television and radio presentations, triggering, in essence, hundreds of local 'town meetings' in communities across the nation simultaneously focusing on local variations of critical national problems.

"One of the major areas of CPB program support is the Children's Television Workshop. Under initial grants from the U.S. Office of Education, the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, CTW's 'Sesame Street' next November will begin a series of daily programs for the pre-school child over PTV stations. CPB is already aiding this vital project and hopes to increase its aid in the years to come.

"These imaginative programs represent a new concept in entertainment-education for children. They will employ colorful animations, and jingles to teach the very young basic letters and numbers and other concepts. What's more, these concepts will be introduced into the hour-long show featuring puppets and live entertainers as 'commercials,' four to six of them each day. Testing has been going on now for several months, and all indications are that this approach will be effective, because the children themselves like it and respond to it.

"Here, too, your local organizations should be alerted to the potential of these programs and others in other fields as they develop. In meetings to come, we hope to be able to show you films of programs under production to get your reaction, and hopefully to warrant your assistance in getting the word to local chapters.

"Following this meeting, we intend to write to each station manager, informing them of the formation of the Advisory Committee on the national level and of our plans for close cooperation. I will strongly suggest that they consider establishing similar Advisory Committees of local organizations, giving consideration to chapters of organizations in our national body.

"I hope that each one of you will give similar consideration to informing your state and local chapters of our plans, and I hope you will urge them to work with local stations and state networks, where they exist, in completing the cycle of constructive involvement between public broadcasters and organizations representing thousands of their viewers and listeners."

RHODESIA CONSTITUTION, RESPONSIBLE REPRESENTATION

(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, tomorrow the people of Rhodesia go to the polls. By referendum, they will accept or reject their proposed new Constitution.

No matter what the result, we can expect a great outcry from the left when the voting is finished.

For that reason, and in view of my personal acquaintance with the beautiful country of Rhodesia and with its distinguished and resolute leaders, I call to the attention of our colleagues some facts which they will not hear elsewhere.

First, the path taken by Rhodesians in severing their connections with England is the same path pioneered by our forefathers two centuries ago. While our cherished independence was bought with blood, the Rhodesians have effected their new status without violence or bloodshed.

Second, their proposed new Constitution is submitted to the people in referendum—a far more democratic process than that by which our cherished Constitution was adopted. Remember that ours was ratified by legislatures or conventions, not by the people directly.

Third, when anguished cries from the negrophiles assail our ears, let us remember that neither the Iroquois, nor the Choctaw, nor the Cherokee Nations were seated in the Continental Congress. There are no Indian signatures on the Declaration of Independence. Nor to the Constitution. To this day we make a constitutional distinction between "Indians not taxed" and others. To this day we maintain reservations for the native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues may do well to realize that in our own beginnings, the uncivilized tribes—dispossessed and ignored by European colonists who had built a civilization in their lands—were far more civilized than the uncivilized tribes similarly dispossessed by the European settlers of Rhodesia.

Where were the anguished cries in 1776? Surely someone must have realized that the Government being constructed in the newly independent United States would be ruled by the European colonists and not by the native savages who far outnumbered them.

So it is today in Rhodesia—with the exception that there is provision in the proposed Rhodesian Constitution for the eventual equal participation of the black African in the Government.

Such participation by our Indians our founders did not provide. While they realized that taxation without representation was tyranny, they were not blind to the fact that there is yet another side to the coin. Representation without taxation is absolute stupidity—leading inevitably to anarchy.

This we can see in our own land today, although most dare not admit the obvious truth. Only to the extent that individuals have an interest in the preservation of an orderly society should they have a voice in directing its course.

Our friends in Rhodesia recognize this truth—as did our own forefathers in their time.

In order that our colleagues may have ready reference to the actual provisions of the proposed new Rhodesian Constitution, I insert following my remarks the announcement released by the Government of Rhodesia and the introduction and summary of the proposed constitution, along with a news story from Johannesburg, South Africa:

[From Rhodesian Commentary, June 2, 1969]

CONSTITUTION SEEKS MAINTENANCE OF STABLE, PROGRESSIVE GOVERNMENT

The proposed new Constitution epitomized a sincere search for a formula which would reconcile radical differences of race, culture and society of all the people and it sought to allow development of conditions under which the two main races could live in harmony without fear of dominance or subjugation, said the Prime Minister, Mr. Ian Smith, in a radio and television speech.

"The very essence of the Constitution is the maintenance of stable and progressive government. This is offered to you in large measure for as far ahead as we can see: thereafter it will be lodged safely in the hands of future generations."

Referendum Day will be Friday, 20th June.

Mr. Smith said he and Mr. Wilson, after the Fearless talks, agreed that the only point of difference was the appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

But after Mr. Thomson (the British Minister at the time responsible for Rhodesia) had talked with African leaders, this single point had grown into nine non-negotiable conditions.

ALMOST CONTEMPT

The new "obstacles" were unacceptable to the Rhodesian Government, and the Fearless proposals were left lying on the table. Since then, Mr. Smith said, Britain had shown no desire to explore the possibility of negotiating any of the Fearless terms.

Mr. Smith said his Government's last two messages to the British Government were treated "with indifference amounting almost to contempt."

Britain was obsessed with the question of majority rule and all else was subservient. The fact that Rhodesians did not want it and that it would be harmful was irrelevant.

The Government was not prepared to accept conditions which the British conceded were not necessarily in Rhodesia's best interests, but which would help Britain in her "ceaseless and vain" effort of trying to placate the Afro-Asian extremists.

[From Rhodesian Commentary, June 2, 1969]

AFRICANS CAN EARN INCREASING PART IN GOVERNMENT

The introduction to the White Paper on the Proposals for a New Constitution for Rhodesia States:

"The Government believes the present Constitution is no longer acceptable to the people of Rhodesia because it contains a number of objectionable features, the principal ones being that it provides for eventual African rule and, inevitably, the domination of one race by another and that it does not guarantee that government will be retained in responsible hands.

"The proposed new Constitution will ensure that government will be retained in responsible hands and will provide Africans with the right to play an increasing part in government as they earn it by increased contributions to the national exchequer. Moreover, the new Constitution will recognize the right of the African chiefs, as the leaders of their people, to take part in the counsels of the nation.

"The existing inequality in the treatment of the land rights of the races will be remedied. Provision will be made for the same protection to be given to the European Area as that given to the African Area. New Bills governing land tenure, which will replace the Land Apportionment Act [Chapter 257] and the provisions relating to Tribal Trust Land in the present Constitution, will be introduced into Parliament at the same time as the new Constitution. The provisions of the new Bills which are designed to protect land rights of Europeans and Africans will be entrenched in the Constitution.

"Power will be vested in the Legislature to

delegate to provincial or regional councils or other bodies certain functions of government as and when such delegation is considered to be appropriate.

"The new Declaration of Rights will not be enforceable by the courts. The rights enshrined in the Declaration will be entrenched and will be safeguarded by the creation of a Senate and the vesting in it of power to delay legislation. In this important function the Senate will be advised by a special committee.

"As the Senate will be entrusted with the duty of upholding the Declaration of Rights no provision will be made for a Constitutional Council.

"In addition, the proposed procedure for constitutional amendments will ensure that the Senate will play a significant part in protecting the Constitution and the rights conferred by it."

[From Rhodesian Commentary, July 2, 1969]

MAIN ASPECTS OF PROPOSALS OUTLINED

PART 1—PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION

Chapter I—Head of State

Under a republican form of government he will be chosen by the Executive Council. Whatever form of government is adopted he will hold office for five years and be eligible for re-election for one further period.

Under a republican government he will be removable only on a resolution passed by two-thirds of the House of Assembly.

Chapter II—Legislature

A Senate with 23 members—10 European, elected by electoral college consisting of the European members of the House of Assembly from candidates nominated by European voters' roll; 10 African Chiefs, five each from Matabeleland and Mashonaland; and 3 persons of any race appointed by the Head of State taking into account the requirements of the Senate Legal Committee.

Senate Legal Committee: Not fewer than three members, majority being senators with legal qualifications. Function will be to examine legislation and statutory instruments vis-a-vis Declaration of Rights.

House of Assembly: Initially, 66 members—50 Europeans elected by Europeans on rolls of voters for 50 constituencies; and 16 African members, eight elected by Africans in four constituencies in Matabeleland and four in Mashonaland and eight elected by four tribal electoral colleges in each of the two areas.

Increase in African Members

In principle the number of African members in the Assembly will be in the same proportion to the total number of members as in the contribution by way of assessed income tax on income of Africans is to the total contribution by ways of assessed income tax on income of Europeans and Africans until the contribution by Africans amounts to one-half of the total contribution.

When the contribution of Africans exceeds sixteen sixty-sixths of the total contribution of Europeans and Africans the following procedure will ensue.

African members will be increased two at a time being one additional member for Matabeleland and one for Mashonaland, until the number of African members is equal to the number of European members.

The first increase of two African members will be allocated to the African members elected by tribal electoral colleges and the number of colleges will be increased accordingly. The second increase of two African members will be allocated to the members elected by the voters on the African rolls and the number of African constituencies will be increased accordingly. Subsequent increases will be made in a similar manner.

Every increase of two African members will be made in direct proportion to the increase in the contribution of Africans compared with the total contribution of Europeans and Africans in such a manner that when the contribution of Africans amounts to half the total contribution of Europeans and Africans at that time the number of African members will be equal to the number of European members.

The Delimitation Commission will be charged with the duty of calculating, from evidence supplied by the Commissioner of Taxes, whether there has been an increase in the contribution of Africans as compared with the total contribution of Europeans and Africans sufficient to warrant an increase in the number of African members.

In calculating the contribution of Europeans and of Africans, income tax will be deemed to include supertax. Taxation on companies will not be taken into account.

Language in Parliament

Proceedings in the Assembly will be conducted in English. Proceedings in the Senate will be conducted in English but, for the convenience of the Chiefs for an interim period, debates may be in Chishona and Sindebele as well as in English and provision will be made for the translation of any language used into the other two languages.

Legislation

Any Bill may originate in either House except a Money Bill or a private Bill, which may originate only in the House of Assembly.

Procedure: After a Bill originating in one of the Houses of Parliament has been passed by that House, it will be sent to the other House for consideration. That other House may pass the Bill with or without amendment or may reject it, provided that the Senate will not be able to amend or reject a Money Bill. If the Bill is passed without amendment, it will be presented to the Head of State for assent. If the Bill is amended, it will be returned to the House in which it originated, which House may accept or amend or reject any amendment made by the other House. After the Bill has been returned to the House in which it originated either House may by message to the other House, pursuant to a resolution, agree to any amendment or withdraw any amendment which has been made to the Bill.

Delaying Powers of Senate

The Senate will have the power to delay for 180 days the enactment of a Bill which has originated in the Assembly. Thereafter the Assembly may resolve that the Bill be presented to the Head of State for assent.

Where a Bill originating in the Senate has been rejected by the Senate or has lapsed and an identical Bill is introduced into and passed by the Assembly, if the Senate has not passed that latter Bill within a period expiring 180 days after the original Bill was introduced into the Senate or, if this period has expired within eight sitting days, the Assembly may resolve that the Bill be presented to the Head of State for assent.

The proposals deal with the functions of the Senate Legal Committee in regard to Bills and to subsidiary legislation and the summoning, prorogation and dissolution of Parliament.

Chapter III—The Executive

Executive powers: The executive government will be vested in the Head of State. He will act on the advice of the Executive Council or the Prime Minister or a Minister, as the case may require, except where the Constitution or any other law otherwise requires.

The Head of State will appoint the Prime Minister and in doing so will appoint the person whom in his discretion, he considers to be best able to command the support of the majority of the members of the Assembly.

The Head of State, on the advice of the Prime Minister, will appoint Ministers and Deputy Ministers who and may be removed from office by the Head of State acting on the advice of the Prime Minister.

Executive Council: To advise the Head of State. It will consist of the Prime Minister and such other Ministers as the Head of State, acting on the advice of the Prime Minister, may appoint.

Chapter IV—Judicature

The judicial authority wil be vested in a High Court and having such jurisdiction as will be prescribed by law.

Chapter V—Declaration of Rights

The new Declaration of Rights will follow the general pattern of the existing Declaration. It will be in a form which is more appropriate to a non-justiciable Declaration.

The preamble will state that it is desirable to ensure that every person enjoys fundamental rights and freedoms but will point out that there are responsibilities and duties expected of an individual who receives the protection of the State. The duty to respect the rights and freedoms of others and the public interest and to abide by the Constitution and the law and, in the case of citizens, to be loyal to Rhodesia will be included.

Right to life: The existing exceptions to this right will be extended to permit the use of force where it is reasonably justifiable in the circumstances for the purpose of suppressing terrorism.

Right to personal liberty: In order to cure an omission the exceptions to this right will be extended to cover arrests ordered by statutory tribunals, quasi-judicial authorities and commissions of inquiry in appropriate circumstances.

Preventive detention and restriction will be authorized in the interests of national defence, public safety or public order. An impartial tribunal will be established to review the case of a detainee within a period of three months, if he so requests, and in any case at intervals of not less than 12 months.

An accused person will not be entitled as of right to be released on bail before and during his trial.

The rights to protection from slavery and forced labour and from inhuman treatment will be retained as will the freedom of conscience.

Protection from deprivation of property: The existing provisions will be redrafted to provide that no person shall be deprived of his property unless such deprivation is authorized by law. As at present compulsory acquisition of property by the Government in circumstances where no compensation is payable will be restricted, but provision will be made for the compulsory acquisition of property by the Government in any circumstances so long as adequate compensation is paid.

Protection from search and entry: The existing provisions will be retained save that it will be specifically provided that a law may authorize the search of a person or the entry into or search of a dwelling-house in circumstances where there are reasonable grounds for believing that the entry or search is necessary for the prevention or detection of a criminal offence or for the lawful arrest of a person.

Protection of law: The existing provision will be retained except that the requirement that a person shall not be compelled to give evidence at his trial will be omitted. This requirement is, in any case, contained in the criminal law and should be subject to regulation by ordinary legislation to reflect current trends in criminal procedure.

Freedom of expression and of assembly and association: The existing provision permitting laws made for the purpose of regulating telephony, telegraphy, posts, wireless broadcasting and other matters will be extended to permit laws for the regulation of newspapers and other publications.

Freedom from discrimination: The existing provisions will be revised. Every person will be entitled to the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms in the new Declaration without unjust discrimination on the grounds of race, tribe, political opinion, colour or creed. Specific provision will be made permitting laws relating to African customary law, jurisdic-

tion of tribal courts and restrictions on the ownership, occupation or use of land.

Public emergencies and disciplinary laws: As in the existing Declaration provision will be made that laws authorizing the taking of justifiable measures during a period of public emergency and disciplinary laws may contain provisions which are inconsistent with certain rights in the Declaration.

Oath of Loyalty

If a republican form of government is adopted persons required under the Constitution to take an oath of loyalty will take an oath to be faithful and bear true allegiance to Rhodesia.

Chapter VII—Amendment of the Constitution, etc.

Ordinary provisions: A Bill to amend the Constitution will require to be passed by the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the total membership of the House of Assembly and two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate:

Provided that, if such a Bill does not receive the required majority in the Senate, it may be reintroduced into the Senate after a period of 180 days, whereupon it may be sent to the Head of State for assent if it has received the affirmative votes of more than one-half of the total membership of the Senate.

Specially entrenched provisions: The procedure to amend the ordinary provisions of the Constitution will be followed in the case of specially entrenched provisions, save that, if the Bill does not receive the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the total membership of the Senate, the Bill will lapse.

Provisions specially entrenched:

(a) The composition of the Senate and the House of Assembly;

(b) The judicature;

(c) The official language;

(d) The Declaration of Rights;

(e) The procedure for amending the Constitution and the provisions of the laws concerning certain provisions of electoral and land tenure laws.

PART 2—ELECTORAL PROVISIONS

Chapter I

Chapter I deals with appointment and functions of the Delimitation Commission.

Chapter II—Qualifications

In Chapter II it is stated that the qualifications as to citizenship, residence, knowledge of English and ability to complete the prescribed application form for enrolment as a voter on any roll will remain as at present. An applicant must be 21 years of age or over.

The existing grounds for disqualification will remain. In addition, a person who is restricted or detained for more than six months will be disqualified for the period of his restriction or detention and for five years after his release.

A European who possesses the general qualifications and is not disqualified will be entitled to enrolment as a voter if he—

(a) Has an income of not less than £900 during each of the two years preceding the claim for enrolment or owns immovable property in Rhodesia valued at not less than £1,800.

(b) Has an income of not less than £600 during each of the two years preceding the claim for enrolment or owns immovable property in Rhodesia valued at not less than £1,200 and, in addition to the income or property qualifications, has completed four years' secondary education of a prescribed standard.

African voters: An African who possesses the general qualifications and is not disqualified will be entitled to enrolment as a voter if he—

(a) Has an income not less than £300 during each of the two years preceding the claim for enrolment or owns immovable property in Rhodesia valued at not less than £600; or

(b) Has an income of not less than £200 during each of the two years preceding the claim for enrolment or owns immovable property in Rhodesia valued at not less than £400 and, in addition to the income or property qualifications, has completed two years' secondary education of a prescribed standard.

Variation of Qualifications

The Head of State, acting on the recommendation of a commission, will be empowered to vary by proclamation from time to time the means and educational qualifications for the African roll in order that the differences between the qualifications for the European roll and the qualifications for the African roll are progressively reduced and eventually eliminated when the number of African seats equals the number of European seats in the House of Assembly.

Chapter III

Chapter III, dealing with elections for roll seats in the Assembly, says a European will not be eligible for nomination for an African roll seat and an African will not be eligible for nomination for a European roll seat.

Chapter IV

Chapter IV deals with Tribal Electoral Colleges.

Chapter V—Members of the Senate

European Senators

The procedure for the nomination of European senators will be similar to that for the nomination of candidates for election to the European seats in the House of Assembly save that a candidate will have to be nominated by not more than 50 or less than 30 persons enrolled on the European voters roll.

A candidate for election must possess the qualifications and none of the disqualifications for nomination as a candidate for a European roll seat in the House of Assembly save that he shall—

(a) Be not less than 40 years of age; and

(b) Have resided in Rhodesia for 10 years during the 15 years immediately preceding his nomination.

The electoral college will be composed of the European members of the House of Assembly. Each member of the electoral college will be entitled to one vote for every vacant seat of a European senator and may not cast more than one vote for any one candidate. The ballot will be secret.

Nomination of Chiefs

The Council of Chiefs will sit as an electoral college for the purpose of nominating and electing chiefs to the Senate. Candidates for election to the five seats reserved for Matabeleland chiefs will be nominated by members of the Council from Matabeleland and candidates for election to the five seats reserved for Mashonaland chiefs will be nominated by members of the Council from Mashonaland.

Procedure for election will be as for European members.

PART 3—LAND TENURE PROVISIONS

Chapter I—Classification of land

All land will be classified as the European Area, the African Area or National Land and the first two will at all times be approximately equal. Various small "islands" of land owned by persons of one race within the area of the other race will be eliminated but the rights of preesnt owners will be safeguarded. It has been calculated that this adjustment will result in the following acreages being allocated to the three categories of land—

(a) 44.9 million acres in the European Area;

(b) 45.2 million acres in the African Area;

(c) 6.4 million acres of National Land.

A board of trustees for each of the European and African areas will determine such transfers and exchanges of land between the land categories as may be desirable to meet changing circumstances and of ensuring that the permitted variations in the area of the respective categories are not exceeded.

Chapter II—European and African areas

Fundamental principles: The European Area shall be deemed to be an area in which European interests are paramount and the African Area shall be deemed to be an area in which African interests are paramount. The rights of Europeans and the restrictions on Africans in the European Area will be on a reciprocal basis to the rights of Africans and the restrictions on Europeans in the African Area.

Composition of Areas: The European Area and the African Area will consist of the following land—(a) privately owned land; (b) State land which may include—(i) forest areas; (ii) national parks; (iii) wild life areas; and will include, in the case of the African Area, Tribal Trust Land.

Residential Areas: The responsible Minister will have the power to declare any area of land zoned for residential purposes to be a non-racial residential area where persons of either race may own and occupy land for residential purposes.

Mining Rights: Any person may occupy land in the Area of the other race if he is granted a right under the mining laws and such occupation is for the purpose of exercising that right.

Certain rights acquired by Africans in respect of the occupation of mission land in the European Area which have been in existence for many years will be subject to registration and review and will lapse on the death of the holders.

Chapter III—National land

National Land will vest in the Head of State and will be inalienable but leasehold rights for periods not exceeding 99 years may be granted to persons of either race.

National Land may be occupied by persons of all races but the use of such facilities as may be provided may be regulated according to the race of the user.

Chapter IV

Chapter IV deals with the entrenchment of certain provisions relating to land tenure.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 18, 1969]

RHODESIANS LIKELY TO VOTE FOR CHARTER

(By John Worrall)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—The Rhodesian referendum Friday is confidently expected by most political observers to provide yet another triumph for the policies of Ian Smith and his ruling Rhodesian Front party.

Some 90,000 voters—5,000 black—are expected to vote overwhelmingly for a republic and a new constitution that will end the chance of a negotiated settlement with Britain and that will rule out the possibility of Africans achieving majority rule by constitutional means.

Yet there are straws in the Rhodesian wind indicating that although Smith may win his referendum, he may not win it convincingly enough to alter irrevocably Rhodesia's course into the future.

In the first place, this is the first time since the unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) in November 1965 that Rhodesians have had the chance to go into a secret ballot to say what they think about Smith and his party.

Many moderates argue that much potential opposition to the Rhodesian Front has been stifled in public; people are frightened to say what they think. In a secret ballot, the results could surprise.

Secondly, for the first time since the Rhodesian Front won a devastating victory in

1964, there is an organized opposition among white voters.

This, rallied round a tough Cockney farmer, Pat Bashford, may well muster a quarter to a third of the voters to oppose the referendum.

Thirdly, and possibly most surprisingly, Smith is actively opposed by a vehement vocal right wing which claims that his proposals do not go far enough.

Many of the far-out right will abstain—one observer puts the number as high as one-third of the voters but this is probably stretching the point—and a few will actually vote against the proposals.

All of which means that Smith's "yes" vote could be reduced to below 50 percent of the total voting strength of 90,000. And if this assessment is correct, Smith will be in a dilemma.

Smith has admitted that when this constitution is implemented it will end hopes of a settlement with Britain, and Michael Stewart, Britain's foreign and commonwealth secretary, has heavily underlined this. Talks and dramatic meetings on British warships will be, it seems, over.

The most remarkable thing is the fact that the vocal majority of white Rhodesians will be glad about this total rupture of relations. There was always a fear on the right of the Rhodesian Front Party that Smith would somehow be persuaded to agree to a settlement which would lead to majority rule one day.

To them an infinity of sanctions, isolation, diplomatic nonrecognition, travel bans and the prospect of worse, is better than a handing over of rule to the blacks.

In three and a half years the Rhodesians have become used to isolation. They rather like it. They have found they can live with it. And it has not really been so lonely, with the friendly South Africans to the south and the Portuguese to the east, helping them with the housekeeping.

The Smith constitution closes the door on African hopes to take part effectively in the government of the country.

The assembly will have 50 white MPs and 16 Africans, eight of whom will be elected by state-employed chiefs and tribal headmen, and eight by direct African vote. Africans will have no influence over the election of white candidates. The multiracial senate is nothing much more than a rubber stamp.

The supreme cynicism of this document lies in the method of increasing the number of African MPs. This is related to African income tax contributions which at present run at about 1 percent. No increased African representation can take place till the African tax payments exceed 16-66ths of the total.

In a white dominated economy, the chances of Africans reaching this figure this century are nil. To make sure, however, Smith's plan will bring in new African members two by two until parity with whites is reached. Then the process stops dead.

To make doubly sure the state can vary the means and qualifications for African voters.

Land is being clamped tighter into the mould of apartheid with approximately half for the 4.5 million Africans and the other half for 215,000 whites. Even that proportion is subject to government edict.

Yet the black population is increasing by 3.5 percent every year and will be 10 million in 20 years time, while the whites may have doubled to a mere 400,000.

NEW CBS PROGRAM ORIGINATING IN NASHVILLE

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my home district of Nashville—Davidson County has long been recognized as one of the Nation's leading recording centers.

Because of its prominence as a recording center, a number of syndicated television programs have originated from Nashville in recent years, and only recently it became a motion picture center.

It is my pleasure to report today that Nashville is the originating point for a new television network program, "Hee Haw," carried by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Here in Washington, television reviewer Mr. Lawrence Laurent, of the Washington Post, had very kind words to say in behalf of the new program, and I was particularly pleased to read in Mr. Laurent's review that:

The biggest inspiration that can be credited to "Hee Haw" . . . was to originate the program at WLAC–TV in Nashville, Tennessee.

Should this hour-long television series prove of lasting success, and I am confident it will, then Nashville can help expand our network television system, which is now basically confined to New York and Los Angeles, for its major productions.

For my fellow Members of the Congress who may have overlooked the review by Mr. Laurent, the text of his review is submitted at this time for inclusion in the RECORD:

"HEE HAW" SUMMERTIME COUNTRY COUSIN OF "LAUGH IN"

(By Lawrence Laurent)

"Laugh In" has a new country cousin called "Hee Haw" (CBS, Channel 9).

The comparisons between the two shows are endless. But then this is television's season of the country and western format and a "Hee Haw" under some title was inevitable.

Those who favor guitar strumming and singing with a heavy nasal flavor are being favored all over the dial. Glen Campbell is now an established superstar. Johnny Cash (ABC, Channel 7) is a summertime hit. Locally, Channel 7 fills the 6 to 6:30 p.m. block Monday through Friday, with Buck Owens, The Wilburn Brothers, and "Billy Walker's Country Carnival." A half-hour Porter Wagoner Show is seen on Saturdays (7 p.m., Channel 7).

Channel 20 has a 90-minute segment of country and western music on Saturdays, beginning at 5:30 p.m.

The biggest inspiration that can be credited to "Hee Haw" producers Frank Peppiatt and John Aylesworth was to originate the program at WLAC–TV in Nashville, Tenn. This provides ready access to the droves of top musicians who have created "the Nashville Sound." All types of recorded music now come from Nashville and that lovely city has escaped its outworn title as the "capital of country and western music."

(Even the old title was an inept description of a city that is neither country nor western.)

For all its simple adaptations of TV's most popular format, "Hee Haw" isn't a bad summertime show. No one apologizes for the antique flavor of the jokes. If anything there's pride in using "The Cornfield" for rapid fire bucolic gags and as one of the farmer-musicians said loudly: "This show's got more corn than the whole State of Kansas."

No one can argue with the claim.

But the jokes come so fast that the viewer has no time to reflect and groan. Before the viewer can react, four more jokes—of varying quality—will have assailed his ears.

The Rowan & Martin of "Hee Haw" are Buck Owens and Roy Clark. They're more musicians than comics, but there is an earnest eagerness to please that overcomes the lack of polish. In a quieter time in our national history, Owens and Clark would have been called "good old country boys" and it would have been a compliment.

For all the unkind words that are uttered by sophisticates about the machine-tooled, computer-arranged rustic entertainment, this form remains the most durable and the most popular in the United States. Professional hillbillies no longer resent the denigrating remarks about their skills. They simply gun their Cadillacs to the next meeting of the bank's board of directors.

The charm of country-western music and comedy is in its simplicity. Tens of millions enjoy it and several hundred thousand even admit to liking it.

"Hee Haw" is slick, professional production with color animation to interrupt the flow of harmless foolishness and a couple of pretty girls, in brief costumes, to distract the male viewer.

The show's only deception is its claim to having four writers—Jack Burns, George Yanok, Archie Campbell and Gordie Tapp (who performs as Cousin Clem). They're not really writers but they must have access to a file of country jokes that is big enough to fill the Library of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BATTLE, CITY HALL CORRESPONDENT FOR THE NASHVILLE BANNER

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard Battle, the city hall correspondent for the Nashville Banner, recently was named recipient of the Metropolitan Nashville Education Association award for his contributions to education in Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of many, many awards which Mr. Battle, through his astute observation, precise reporting and objective comment, has earned over many years as a journalist of known integrity and dedication.

It has been my pleasure to know Mr. Battle during many of his long years on the Nashville Banner, and there is without doubt no more conscientious and deserving journalist in America today than Dick Battle.

Mr. Battle has honored the Nashville Banner many times in the past as recipients of awards such as this, and he is a credit to our community.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HON. JIM WRIGHT OF TEXAS AT HARTWICK COLLEGE, ONEONTA, N.Y., JUNE 8, 1969

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pride to include at this point in the RECORD—and thus to make available for the perusal of my colleagues in Congress—the very eloquent and thoughtful address of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Texas, JIM WRIGHT, to the graduating class of Hartwick College, Oneonta, N.Y., on June 8.

JIM'S remarks are very sound and very relevant to our times. What he said was

well received by the Hartwick graduates and could profitably be read and pondered by all Americans.

In addition to delivering the commencement address, Congressman WRIGHT was also honored by Hartwick by being presented with the honorary degree of doctor of laws in recognition of his outstanding public service through 14 years in this House, and for his brilliant leadership in the fight for better highways and for the maintenance of fresh and pure water supplies across our land.

The address follows:

TOWARD A UNIVERSAL ARISTOCRACY: HOW FAR WE'VE COME, AND YET TO GO

(Commencement address by Congressman JIM WRIGHT, Hartwick College, Oneonta, N.Y., June 8, 1969)

In the age group of today's graduating class, one out of five Americans will finish four years of college. Members of this class are among the fortunate 20 per cent.

What does that statistic say to you? How do you react to it?

Are you inclined, for example, to say: "How great! What a magnificent country this is that so large a number can finish college in America today!"?

Or do you find yourself saying: "Just 20 per cent? How sad! That means 80 per cent don't make it this far! What a shame that, in so rich a nation, we haven't been able to do better than this."?

Or is your reaction more personal? Would you instinctively think: "How lucky to be one of this fortunate number!"?

Any of the three could be correct. In fact, all three summations *are* correct. It depends entirely upon your perspective.

Any statistic, in order to have meaning, must be seen in relation to other statistics. It has to be compared with something.

It is perfectly natural, therefore, for members of my generation to point with pride at social phenomena which the present college generation may view as alarmingly inadequate.

As a point of reference, for 76 per cent of an age group to finish twelve years of public schooling and for 20 percent to progress through four years of college—as is the case in America this year—is a far better record than any nation has ever achieved in the history of humankind. For us, it represents a rapid gain.

Exactly one generation ago, when Congressman Sam Stratton and I were approximately your age, the percentage of our contemporaries who completed work for a bachelor's degree was only about one-fourth the percentage that do so today. And so, in the swelling ranks of academia, we see measurable and heartening progress.

It is natural, too, that those who've lived most of their lives in other countries, comparing our record with theirs, often regard America as the promised land. They can be extremely impatient with our impatience with ourselves.

Throughout the world as a whole, the proportion of college graduates in the ascending generation is not one in five as it is here but more like one in 250. And in some countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America it still is less than one in 1,000.

But it is equally natural for American youth, lacking any such basis for personal comparison, to compare existing conditions with the ideal and find them wholly unacceptable.

The older generation thinks of how far we've come. The younger thinks of how far we have yet to go.

Much has been said about a communications gap between the age groups. I think the heart of the matter is expressed in a line from a play, *The Angry Young Men*. A girl in tears is trying to explain to her father, a comfortable member of the British "establishment," why there is so little understanding between him and her militant, impatient young husband.

"Don't you see, father," she pleads, "you are *both* angry. You are angry because the world is changing so *fast*. And he is angry because the world is changing so *slowly*."

The nation's educational attainments offer only one, but one very good, gage to measure how far and how fast we have progressed toward the goal of which our fathers dreamed.

Thomas Jefferson believed that universal enlightenment was the indispensable key to solving social ills. In 1816, he wrote:

"Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

To measure how far we have come as a people, it is necessary to understand where we set out to go. In one important respect, our goal was different from that of any other major culture. We sought neither to destroy the aristocracy nor to perpetuate it as an exclusive ruling class. We sought instead to *universalize* it.

Unlike the French and Russian Revolutions which strove to bring down the nobility and install a dictatorship of the proletariat, the American Revolution—and it is still in progress—set out to *expand* the privileged class until it shared its benefits with the humblest citizen of the land.

Ours was to be an aristocracy with a difference. Not an aristocracy to which some are born and others forever denied, but one to which *all* could aspire and which *most* could attain.

Our aim was not a snobbish aristocracy which derives its pleasure from exclusiveness, but one which constantly seeks to enlarge its membership. Not an aristocracy of special privilege, but one of universal privilege whose members qualify by self-preparation and by assuming the responsibilities which go with privilege.

Let's see just how far we have come, in recent years, toward that goal. Today's graduates, and those of your generation, may feel that our progress toward a universal aristocracy has been too slow. It would be normal for you to think this way.

Look back with me for one generation. In 1946, a politically active group of college age youth in my state adopted a series of resolutions which set teeth on edge, shocked the satisfied, alarmed the complacent, and frightened the staid and stuffy almost out of their senses. And what did those resolutions advocate? Let me tell you the most terrifying ones:

Federal aid to education;
Medical care for the elderly;
A full employment act;
A fair employment practices act;
An anti-lynching law;
And abolition of the poll tax!

In 1946, all of these were "radical" ideas. Today every single one of them has become the law of the land, and nobody thinks of them as "radical" or frightening.

There is a danger, I know, in one of my generation suggesting to those of yours that you should take pride in the accomplishments already achieved. The danger is that we both may fall prey to self-satisfaction and, looking to the glories of the past, lose sight of the needs of the present and the promise of the future.

But, at the risk of sounding like the Squire of Squaresville, let me ask you to consider only the past eight years—the years since the members of this graduating class were preparing to enter high school. There is abundant justification for pride!

Since February of 1961 we have witnessed 100 months of continuous economic expansion—the longest period of uninterrupted economic growth, unbroken by a major recessionary ripple, in the entire history of this or any other nation!

That isn't bad.

In these few short years, our Gross National Product has grown by better than 50 per cent—an all-time record for a period of such short duration!

Average family income has increased by 56 per cent and—even considering the increase in the General Price Index—the actual buying power of the average American family, after taxes, is up approximately 30 percent from 1961.

We have created the climate for a vibrant private economy in which business profits are up 57 per cent and individual savings have increased by almost 70 percent.

The economy has generated more than 12 million new and additional jobs. There are more than 75 million people gainfully employed in the United States, and unemployment—as a percentage of the population—is at an all-time low!

The last two Congresses have authorized more money for education, for health, and for air and water pollution control than *all* the Congresses in previous history combined.

And more has been done in the past four years—since this graduating class began college—to eradicate the evils of poverty than has been accomplished in any like period by any nation in history.

We still have a long way to go before the dream of equal opportunity for all is a reality. We have been slow to make the dream come true for some of our racial minorities. But think of how far we have come in just the last decade—farther than in all the Century since the Emancipation Proclamation! Ten years ago only 31 per cent of the young nonwhite Americans finished high school. This year it will be 62 per cent—exactly twice as many. Ten years ago only 4.5 per cent of their number finished four years of college, and today it is better than 10 per cent . . . more than twice as good.

No nation, no civilization, no organized society has ever achieved such remarkable gains in so short a period of time!

I mention these things not in an effort to make you satisfied. You should not be satisfied. If your generation were wholly satisfied with the progress our society has achieved, you would have little to give.

There are three basic ingredients which the young—in every succeeding era—must supply for society. These ingredients are idealism, innovation, and impatience. Even the latter—when not carried to a ridiculous extreme—can be a virtue, as hard as it is for some middle-aged Americans to recognize this fact. Impatience with the soluble evils of the age has forever been the spark which has fired the engine of Democracy.

My purpose is dwelling as I did upon the gains we have so recently achieved is simply to demonstrate that *the system is working*—not perfectly, to be sure, but far better than any other system civilized man has ever devised.

What our system boils down to is this: *Everybody* has the right to *have his say*. Nobody has the right to *get his way*. What too many people really mean when they say "the system isn't working" is that they are not getting their way. The system exists to guarantee that everybody may have a *voice*. It provides a forum in which that voice may be *heard*. It does not guarantee that any particular voice will be *heeded*.

Nobody has the right to go outside the lawful processes, to take the law into his own hands just to get attention or just to get his way. Whoever does this behaves in a very juvenile manner. Whatever his chronological age, he is *too immature for a college degree*. And, however impressive his academic attainment, he is too immature for a major role in society.

If we are crossing the ocean together in a ship, and some are dissatisfied with the speed

under which we are moving, they certainly do not hasten progress by setting fire to the boat!

Indeed, youth should be dissatisfied with the progress society has attained. As good as our record is, it is not good enough.

The unfinished business of our age calls for the best that your imagination, your learning and your statesmanship can offer.

The times challenge us to make our cities not only habitable but happy. The teeming squalor of the ghettos will give way when we think not only of face-lifting but of home building.

It is not good enough merely to replace existing slums with glistening high-rise apartments whose rents are totally beyond the capacity of the slum dweller.

It isn't good enough merely to compensate the unemployed with begrudging monthly payments when government and industry together have the capacity to train the unemployed to the skills that have value in the market place.

It isn't enough that we have the busiest factories and the most automobiles of any nation in the history of mankind. We also should have the cleanest air and the purest water and be first in the quality as well as in the quantity of things our society produces.

It isn't enough to be the envy of the world. More important that we should be the inspiration of the world.

We can better boast when an atmosphere of public civility replaces the angry fanaticism that stalks some parts of our land, when our love of liberty is matched by our respect for law, and when all the streets are safe for women and children to walk without fear.

Each of these is a challenge which can be conquered. But they will not be conquered without your help—without your idealism, your innovations, and your intelligently directed impatience.

My generation also had its "bags" and its "hang-ups." When Sam Stratton and I were in college, the twin evils of the time were fascism and depression. If you properly accuse us of "materialism" and consider those of my generation too preoccupied with financial security, just remember that there was for us a burning idealism in the dream to broaden the base of America's aristocracy so that the *average family* need not know the pangs of economic want.

Perhaps I can understand at least a part of the disenchantment in your generation. Our institutions have become increasingly impersonal and people are in danger of becoming numbers, statistics only. So here is a challenge—to see somewhow that an ever more crowded and ever more computerized social structure does not rob life of the warmth, the friendliness and the graciousness of humanity.

Many of my generation share your revulsion for the pursuit of the fast buck, the hunger for power, the demands of status, the jungle of machines, the brutalizing of human values, the cold and growing impersonality of public institutions.

Somewhere along the line there *should* be time for graciousness, for serene reflection for courtesy, for generosity, for mercy. Somewhere along the line there *should* be a moment to . . . well, to do unto others as we'd have them do unto us.

As long as there are people, there will be a society. The only way to escape from society is to die. So let's make it a good society—a little more the way a gracious God meant it to be.

Do you dispute the system of values on which you were nurtured? Fine. Go ahead and question them. But before you simply discard them, create something better to put in their place.

For these are the values evolved by some 200 hip generations before you, generations who were not wholly satisfied by the older values.

So don't just sit there and curse the darkness. Light a candle.

The current generation of college graduates can approach society and its problems in one of three ways. You can *resign from society*, drop out, tune off, join the little cadre of self-indulgent drones who produce nothing, contribute nothing, blaze no trails and leave no footprints for anyone to follow.

Or you can *be at war with society*, adopt an attitude of unreasoning hostility and total mistrust for anyone who does not embrace your ideas fully and immediately, stage endless and senseless demonstrations against the very social order itself, follow the politics of disruption and in the end destroy the very machinery of the orderly Democratic process which alone can produce the solutions you claim to want.

Or you can do as the best from other generations have done. You can *participate as full-scale members* in the orderly electoral process, sharing with society your dreams and your hopes, your visions and your labors, and thus building a brighter and a better future for our land and for all mankind.

To our political institutions, bring your gifts of idealism and innovation and impatience. The years will temper the impatience and purify the spirit of innovation through the filter of wisdom. But let them not tarnish the idealism, for it is the leaven in the loaf, and without it we would perish.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN (at the request of Mr. PODELL), for Thursday, June 19, 1969, and Monday June 23, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. PODELL), for Thursday, June 19, 1969, on account of illness.

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. GROSS, for 40 minutes, on Monday, June 23; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, for 60 minutes, on June 25.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 60 minutes, on June 26.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DORN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANDMAN and to include extraneous material.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, to extend her remarks immediately following those of Mr. DELLENBACK and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. BATES.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. OBEY in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. BENNETT in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in two instances.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 856. An act to provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions proposed to be held in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to enable the United States to organize and hold a diplomatic conference in the United States in fiscal year 1970 to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty and authorize an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 23, 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:

870. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for foreign economic assistance transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91–132); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

871. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Keystone Job Corps Center for Women, Drums, Pa., operated by the RCA Service Co., a division of the Radio Corp. of America, under a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12307. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 446. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4284, a bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act (Rept. No. 91–317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 447. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11249, a bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center (Rept. No. 91–318). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 448. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12167, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–319). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 449. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12307, a bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–320). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS (for himself, Mr. BOGGS and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 12290. A bill to continue the income tax surcharge and the excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, to terminate the investment credit, to provide a low-income allowance for individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RONAN, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 12291. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make crime protection insurance available to small business concerns; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 12292. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize certain federally owned real property to be made available to persons displaced as a result of highway construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12293. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 12294. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for equal treatment of men and women with respect to eligibility for annuities on the basis of age 60 and 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 12295. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms, to develop methods for detecting storms for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 12296. A bill to provide equitable treatment to purchasers of U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 12297. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12298. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself and Mr. STAGGERS):

H.R. 12299. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for annual reports to 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. RIEGLE:

H.R. 12300. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12301. 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. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12302. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a more equitable system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12303. 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.

H.R. 12304. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit coordination with corrective action by the States where exemption from tax is denied to certain organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of such code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 12307. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. FRASER):

H. Con. Res. 292. Resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 443. Resolution restoring to Adam Clayton Powell certain rights and benefits as a Representative in Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HICKS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Res. 444. Resolution urging the President to resubmit to the Senate for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYLIE (for himself, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. WATSON, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HUNT, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ZION, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. BRAY, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BETTS, and Mr. McCLURE):

H. Res. 445. Resolution relating to the recovery of Government funds improperly expended for private purposes by Adam Clayton Powell, Representative in Congress from the State of New York; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

227. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to an investigation of the recent increase in the prime interest rate and enactment of appropriate legislation to control interest rates, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12305. A bill for the relief of Jose Cristobald Tapia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12306. A bill for the relief of Michele and Ivana Tiriticco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

149. By Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Petition of Rapides Parish School Board, Alexandria, La., relative to redress of grievance over a decision by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss E. Hawthorne, and others, relative to the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Gus Grissom, Ed White, and Roger Chaffee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

151. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to publication of an annotated version of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

152. Also, petition of the Association of Indiana Counties, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., relative to taxation of State and local government securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

153. Also, petition of the County Council, Greenville County, S.C., relative to taxation of State and local government securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.