Now, with the same backing, The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 (H.R. 7366) is ready to daub in Title VII and add new Title IX to PL 90–577, featuring auditing and joint funding respectively.

The Grant Consolidation Act of 1969 may become the new Title X of PL 90–577; S. 2035 reintroduces the kicked out consolidation authority. Companion bill is H.R. 10954. House and Senate Subcommittees which approved the original PL 90–577 will hear both pending bills.

Grant packaging (consolidation) by The President is falsely ballyhooed as a correction of bureaucratic bungling and waste. Actually, the measure veils a devolutionary technique that switches legislative and executive powers. Whereas Congress constitutionally makes the laws, and the President signs or vetoes them, the pending bill, Sec. 1005(a), S. 2035 calls for the House and Senate to veto by resolutions of disapproval, or by silence permit the Executive Law to go into effect.

The chain of events typify the revolution incubated by Syndicate 1313, self-named from the communal address, 1313 E. 60th St. Chicago. The Metro syndicate units are too numerous to list here, but include National Municipal League of New York and the Council of State Governments (CSG) which is relocating in Lexington, Kentucky.

ACIR conceived, packed and controlled by 1313*, expedites the self-seeking syndicate's monopoly over U.S. Government. ACIR, funded by congressional appropriations, also accepts money from the U.S. Treasury** direct, also the Housing and Urban Development Dept., and Ford Foundation.

One of 1313–CSG's fifty state links, The Louisiana Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is designated as that state's agency to fulfill a requirement of Title II Sec. 201 of PL 90–577.***

1313 groups are backing the new PL 90–577 titles.

It is shocking that the U.S. Government can be kept under that type of syndicate attack while an oblivious American public celebrates an independence that is fast vanishing under 1313.

---

Re. *"ACIR Federal Beachhead" in Blame Metro by Jo Hindman; **ACIR 10th Report 1–31–69 and "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System, Vol. I, 1967; ***Louisiana Memorial To Congress Sen. Concurrent Res. 35, Louisiana Legislature, Cf. Congressional Record Jan. 6, 1969, p. 93.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, July 7, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him.*—Psalms 37: 7.

O God, our Father, grant that we may have so enjoyed our holiday that our bodies have been renewed and our spirits restored, making us ready for the responsibilities of these days.

Give us steadfast hearts that no trouble may overcome, strong spirits that no temptation may overwhelm, and steady minds that worthy thoughts may keep wholesome.

Teach us to serve Thee and our Nation faithfully and fully, to give and not to count the cost, to fight and not to heed the wounds, to labor and not seek for rewards, save that of doing Thy will and seeking the best for our people.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 2, 1969, 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 853. An act to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; and

S. 1373. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, June 30, 1969, he did on July 2, 1969, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 12167. An act 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.

## PUBLICATION OF EULOGIES TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on Printing currently is receiving many calls in connection with the publication of congressional eulogies in tribute to former President Eisenhower. The joint committee now has set Friday, July 11, as the closing date for final acceptance of any further insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It must be noted that ample time has been extended to all Members who wished to express their sentiments. It is the joint committee's intention that these tributes be published and distributed later this year. For that reason, all copy must be submitted on or before the above-mentioned date.

## TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join with many of my colleagues in the Congress and with President Nixon in wishing Chief Justice Warren well upon his retirement from the highest judicial bench in the land.

The former Chief Justice has concluded a long and distinguished career of public service—as a member of the California Legislature, as attorney general of the State of California, as Governor of California for 10 years, and as Chief Justice of the United States for nearly 16 years.

Many Americans may have forgotten that prior to his being named to the U.S. Supreme Court by the late President Eisenhower in September 1953, Governor Warren was the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1948.

I was privileged to serve with the former Chief Justice on the special Presidential commission named by President Johnson to investigate the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. I want to commend the former Chief Justice once again for assuming that heavy and extraordinary burden. In his capacity as head of that Presidential commission, Chief Justice Warren displayed exemplary leadership in a time of national crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Chief Justice Warren as he begins his retirement and wish him many years of good health and happiness.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

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

## DISCONTINUANCE OF ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS AS TO ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4246) to discontinue the annual report to Congress as to the administrative settlement of personal property claims of military personnel and civilian employees.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the question has been asked as to whether this relaxation of the reports to Congress would be in fact delegating additional authority of the Congress to the executive branch, and, at the other end of the stick, it has been maintained that these reports are of no real value, and that few read them.

Certainly the gentleman from Missouri, who has reserved the right to object, wants to expedite the business of the Government, and we do not need unnecessary reports, but from time to time we have found additional and valuable material available in connection with such reports.

I would like to ask my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who has visited with me concerning his subcommittee report on the bill H.R. 4246, if in view of the next Consent Calendar bill, H.R. 4247, increasing the amount for administrative settlements to $15,000, we would thereafter have no reports on any case that is settled under $15,000?

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's first question, may I advise that the bill H.R. 4246 does not increase the limitation for the settlement or adjustment of claims under this particular act. H.R. 4246 merely has to do with the settlement and the adjustment of property damage sustained by military and civilian personnel, for instance, in the loss or damage done to their personal property while in transit from one station to another.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the response made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but the gentleman apparently did not get the full impact of my question.

My question is: Will the same lack of rendering of detailed reports apply between the area of $5,000 and $15,000?

The $5,000 being now authorized for administrative settlement, and after H.R. 4247 passes, if we give unanimous consent that it do pass without amendments and debate, then will there be a lack of reports up through the $15,000 range of administrative settlements, also?

Mr. DONOHUE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sorry that I did not make myself as clear as I possibly could or should.

Under the settlement of claims under H.R. 4246 there is no limitation of $5,000 at the present time. The limitation in the settlement and administrative adjustment of property damage claims for personnel of the military departments has a limitation of $10,000. In the settlement or adjustment administratively of claims of employees of other departments, this is solely for property damage, now, it is $6,500.

Insofar as reports are concerned, may I say that the repeal of this particular section is in line with prior acts which eliminated the reporting requirements under other claims statutes.

Mr. Speaker, I might also mention that the elimination of this annual report will not prevent the auditing of claims payments or the proper agencies from furnishing to the Congress any information concerning individual claims or the total amounts presented, and the amounts of such claims and the amounts awarded. These figures are compiled in connection with the annual reports, appropriate reports to the Committee on Appropriations of the Congress, and are available in the months of August and September of each year.

Mr. Speaker, I might also mention further that these figures and these reports are furnished to the Bureau of the Budget each year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, again I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman, and the gentleman has anticipated my next, and I hope my last question.

In the committee report on page 3 at the top of the page, in the top paragraph, it does say that witnesses at the hearing pointed out complete data as to each claim settled by the department and agency under this relaxation of the Military Personnel and Civilian Claims Act of 1964—31 U.S.C. 240, 241, and 242—would be available to the Congress; is that correct?

Mr. DONOHUE. Yes.

I might mention also to the gentleman from Missouri that in the fact sheets that we have prepared, there is a fact that I think may be of great value to the gentleman and to the Congress. It goes on to say that in preparing and in furnishing statutory reports to the Congress, the agencies are duplicating individual claim reports or files of paid claims that are forwarded for review by the General Accounting Office. That agency is the watchdog of the Government and an agency of the legislative branch. It makes an annual report of the executive departments of their operations to the Congress. These files are retained by the GAO for 12 years according to the information received or sent through channels.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the gentleman's explanation, and in view of the further study of this committee report on the bill, plus the departmental staff recommendations for its passage, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

H.R. 4246

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 3(e) of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, as amended (31 U.S.C. 241(e)), is repealed.

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

---

## AMENDING TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY CONCERNED TO MAKE PARTIAL PAYMENTS ON CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4247) to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have been deferring action on this new bill since at least May 19 of this year, primarily because of the belief of some of us that a bill of this scope probably should not be on this particular calendar even though it may meet the technical criteria established by the objectors at the beginning of this Congress; under the principle that it might need more debate and/or amendment.

However, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has conferred with those of us on this side and although it increases the amount that can be settled administratively from $5,000 to $15,000, I wonder if the gentleman can give us the same assurance as it applies to this different type of bill that he did to the one on the Consent Calendar, No. 17, just passed.

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

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

Mr. DONOHUE. I might say to the gentleman by way of preface, this bill has to do with the settlement and adjustment of personnal injury and death claims as distinguished from the previous bill which was limited to the settlement and adjustment of property damage claims.

This bill as amended by the committee has two aims: The first is to provide authority for partial payment of settled claims under section 2734 of title 10, commonly known as the Foreign Claims Act. These claims are filed by foreigners as a result of noncombat activity on the part of our Armed Forces in foreign countries.

The second is to increase the settlement authority under section 2733 of title 10, the Military Claims Act, and section 715 of title 32, the National Guard Claims Act, from the present $5,000 to $15,000. This is the amount provided, as I stated before, in the Foreign Claims Act.

The committee feels that claims for personal injuries and death or property damage caused by military activities are a category of claims that should be subject to smiliar procedures. This bill as amended would have this effect in the aspects just mentioned.

Section 2733 of title 10, which is the section which includes authority to settle claims of our own people, presently contains a provision for a partial payment. In other words, if the parties involved and the Government agreed on a settlement, insofar as claims arising in this country, the Government would be in a position to make a partial payment up to $5,000. If the claim should involve, say, $10,000, they would make a payment in part for $5,000, and then the balance would be certified to Congress for the payment or the other $5,000. That is not so with foreign claims.

Let us assume for a moment that a person suffers serious injuries in a foreign country in an incident involving our military, and the amount agreed upon for settlement was $25,000. Under present law our Government could not make any partial settlement with them. Those people would have to wait until the $25,000 was appropriated by the Congress. As a result, a strained relationship has developed in foreign countries toward our Government, and particularly toward our military.

This bill would permit the department involved to make a settlement up to $15,000 and appease them for the moment until such time as Congress reached the point of paying them the remainder.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, would what the gentleman has stated be applicable to claims filed by citizens of other sovereign nations where they had a claim against our Government, or because of an accident as a result of military action or our military equipment, even in peacetime?

Mr. DONOHUE. It is my understanding, in answer to the gentleman from Missouri, that it would.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, furthermore, in the opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, is the Congress completely relinquishing its prerogative and, indeed, its responsibility by allowing this increase of foreign claims up to $15,000 without individual review?

Mr. DONOHUE. Congress always retains the right of review. I would say, however, that Congress would probably not reverse the decision of the military in the event that they had made a partial payment. It would, however, insofar as the excess is concerned, retain the right to disapprove the excess.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, this bill would allow a partial or full payment up to $15,000 for any foreign claim, whether by one of our nationals or a citizen of another nation, caused and agreed upon by our Government overseas, be it the armed services responsible or whatever, up to $15,000 with practically no recourse.

Mr. DONOHUE. Under present law they have the right to adjust up to $15,000 at the present time. The only other aspect of it is that for the 2-year waiting period, probably before the Congress reached the point of approving it, we would have a strained relationship between the foreign government involved, or a citizen of the foreign government involved, with our military and with our Government.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that statement. I think that throws new light on the subject.

Do I understand also that this will simply make available for our own citizens of the United States in fairness and equity the same prerogatives that are now available to foreign nationals?

Mr. DONOHUE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the same question I did about the preceding bill on the Consent Calendar: Will individual Members of the Congress be able to obtain individual reports, in spite of the action on the other bill or under this bill, of cases so settled?

Mr. DONOHUE. I am informed that the Judiciary Committee or the Appropriations Committee and, if necessary, the General Accounting Office will have that information available.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts several questions. I believe the gentleman mentioned this bill extends to the National Guard certain coverage that has not been given before. Would this cover cases similar to a situation which recently occurred in my home State when two National Guard aircraft were involved in a midair collision and one aircraft crashed into someone's house? As I understand it, presently the Government has no obligation. If we pass this bill, would the Government be permitted to pay up to $15,000 in personal property damage resulting from a midair collision between two National Guard aircraft?

Mr. DONOHUE. If they were engaged in a maneuver at the time which was approved by the United States, the United States would be responsible.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. At any time they go up they are flying Government property. I do not believe we could classify it as a maneuver. One of these planes was on a mission to the north, and one was on a mission to the south, and they ran into each other on approach to the airfield, and a house was destroyed. Luckily no one was killed. Neither of the pilots nor any of the people in the residence lost their lives, although the home was destroyed and there was approximately $12,000 to $13,000 in property damages.

Mr. DONOHUE. First, it would have to be determined if the mission the planes were engaged in at the time was a federally authorized mission. In other words, we all recognize that the National Guard is under the jurisdiction of the respective States. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, the hiring and firing of National Guard personnel is under the direction of the States as it is generally, but the missions, funds, and authorization of the National Guard is under jurisdiction of the Federal Government, under the National Guard Bureau in Washington.

Mr. DONOHUE. I would say to the gentleman that in my opinion before the Federal Government would assume the responsibility for any damage caused by National Guard facilities, there would first have to be the determination as to whether the mission they were engaged in at the time was federally authorized. When that determination is made and if it is made, on the basis that it was a federally authorized mission, under the existing law and under this law the Federal Government would assume the responsibility of satisfying the damage.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. What the gentleman is saying—and I appreciate what he is saying—and as I actually interpret it, this situation would be covered unless it could be proven that such a mission was not federally authorized. To take a truck out without permission and crash into a house or automobile—this would not be an authorized mission. But certainly I would think if two military aircraft were involved in a midair collision, that would be a proper mission and would be covered under this bill the gentleman is presenting before the House today.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, giving the gentleman an off-the-cuff opinion, I would have to go back to my original premise, that it would have to be a federally authorized mission.

That of course would be determined, in my opinion again, probably through legislation which might emanate from the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker. further reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that this bill provides for a tripling of the amount of administrative settlement, from $5,000 to $15,000?

Mr. DONOHUE. The gentleman is correct insofar as claims arising through the fault of our military here in this country involving our own citizens are concerned, to bring it in line and to make it parallel with the adjustment of claims which arise in foreign countries involving foreign nationals. In other words, we are trying to treat our own citizens the same as we treat foreign nationals.

Mr. GROSS. Inflation has been more than even I thought, if we are here about to triple the amount of administrative settlement.

The question has been asked as to who is going to provide oversight concerning what happens from the tripling of the amounts settlements damage, and the gentleman said that we could get a report from the General Accounting Office. I do not recall where else. Why not at the source, from the Defense Department?

Do we have complete assurance that somebody is going to ride herd on what happens with this tremendously increased administrative settlement procedure?

Mr. DONOHUE. It is my hope, I say to the gentleman from Iowa, that the people in the military—the legal officers and those who have jurisdiction over adjusting these claims—might be deeply concerned about the fiscal policy of our country and would not make exorbitant settlements or out-of-line settlements with the increase involved.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman's subcommittee give some oversight to what transpires?

Not "some," but will the subcommittee give oversight to what transpires? Let me eliminate the word "some." I want some real, downright, good assurance today that in exchange for this tremendous increase in administrative settlement somebody is going to watch to see what happens in the future with respect to these claim settlements.

Mr. DONOHUE. I personally want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I would be deeply concerned about these settlements, and I know that every member of the Judiciary Committee feels the same way.

To give the gentleman an idea of how prudent the military have been in other years on the matter of settling property damage claims, the Air Force had private claims submitted in the amount of $12,269,000, and those claims were adjusted in an amount of less than 50 percent of the amount claimed actually being paid. The same is true insofar as the Army and the Navy are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman, I have had some experience reading the bills with respect to property settlements in the military in days gone by. I can recall a high-ranking officer who tried to get compensation of $40,000 or $50,000 for antique and other furniture he picked up somewhere overseas and was bringing back when his shipment was damaged.

I can go down the list with the gentleman on several other claims bills in the past and I can tell him that it was not

all lovely but the goose was hanging high with respect to some settlements that were made by the military.

Mr. DONOHUE. Of course, as the gentleman from Iowa appreciates, under existing law the military authorities have administrative authority to settle these claims.

Mr. GROSS. I know they have authority.

Mr. DONOHUE. Up to the amount of $10,000 in the matter of claims by personnel of the military departments under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees Claims Act of 1964.

Mr. GROSS. And I think that legislation came out of your committee, too. Did it not?

Mr. DONOHUE. I would say that it undoubtedly did.

Mr. GROSS. And, having come out of your committee, are you conducting oversight on what they are doing by way of administrative settlements?

Mr. DONOHUE. I would say to the gentleman that we do and that we will continue.

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

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

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

H.R. 4247

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsections (d) and (e) of section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(d) If the Secretary concerned considers that a claim in excess of $15,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be covered by this section, he may pay the claimant $15,000 and certify the excess as a legal claim for payment from appropriations made by Congress therefor, together with a brief statement of the claim, the amount claimed, the amounts allowed, and the amount paid.

"(e) Except as provided in subsection (d), no claim may be paid under this section unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, after "excess" insert "to Congress."

On page 2, after line 5, add the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking '$5,000' and inserting '$15,000'.

"(b) Subsection (d) of section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) If the Secretary concerned considers that a claim in excess of $15,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be covered by this section, he may pay the claimant $15,000 and report the excess to Congress for its consideration.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 715 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking '$5,000' and inserting '$15,000'.

"(b) Subsection (d) of section 715 of title 32, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) If the Secretary of the military department concerned considers that a claim in excess of $15,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be covered by this section, he may pay the claimant $15,000 and report the excess to Congress for its consideration.'"

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned to make partial payments on certain claims which are certified to Congress and to provide equivalent authority for administrative settlement and payment of claims under section 2733 of title 10 and section 715 of title 32, United States Code."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2785) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg spur of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on this bill.

This bill I notice does not explicitly revise the boundaries of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Does the chairman think that the legislation should include metes and bounds descriptions in order that we might prevent some future misinterpretations of the boundaries?

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my colleague from Iowa yield?

Mr. KYL. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. In response, I want to say that I raised this precise question during the consideration of this bill by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. At that time, the Director of the National Park Service indicated that he felt that the general language would be adequate. Subsequently, because the question had been discussed, the matter was referred to the Solicitor's Office of the Department of the Interior and we were advised by letter on June 3, 1969:

The perimeter boundary of the park has not been defined by statute; accordingly there is no need in this regulation to redefine a boundary for the purpose of excluding the lands from the park. Upon the conveyance they would be so excluded.

With this legislative history, I feel that there can be no mistake that we intend only to authorize the conveyance of these specific segments of the existing roadways to the State of Tennessee. In implementing this legislation, the boundary of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park will be revised accordingly.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2785, by my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), is not a complex bill. It seeks, simply, to convey to the State of Tennessee some existing roadways under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service which are not needed for park purposes. These lands cannot, of course, be conveyed without congressional authorization.

Two of the roads involved are Tennessee Highway 73 and Tennessee Highway 72 which skirt a portion of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Four segments of Route 73, totaling 3.38 miles, and 2.33 miles of the northbound lane of Route 72 are presently located within the park. They were constructed by the State pursuant to special use permits.

Conveyance of these portions of the highways will enable the State to exercise uniform jurisdiction over them. At the present time, those portions of the roadways within the park are under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the United States, thus making traffic control and accident investigation unduly complicated and inefficient. On the other hand, the highways are not necessary for park purposes and the conveyance of them will not isolate any parklands from the main body of the park.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that H.R. 2785 does not involve any new construction. It provides that the Secretary shall convey the roadways subject to such conditions as he deems necessary to protect the park environment. And, I hasten to add, it will save the Federal Government approximately $25,000 per year in administrative and maintenance costs.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of these facts, I urge the Members of the House to approve H.R. 2785.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in support of H.R. 2785 which was introduced by my friend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN).

The Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation conducted hearings on this proposal and concluded that its enactment would be in the best interests of all concerned. Not only will it simplify the administration and maintenance of the highways involved, but it will save the Federal Government a few dollars.

I want to emphasize that the conveyance of these roadways will leave the park intact. All of the parklands will remain contiguous. The Gatlinburg spur is merely an appendage to the park and the boundary with respect to the other two highways will merely be moved so as to exclude the roads from the park. In doing so, H.R. 2785, if enacted, will clearly define the park boundaries in this area.

So far as I know, there is no controversy concerning this legislation. The roads are in place and the legislation explicitly authorizes the Secretary to make the conveyances subject to such conditions as he deems necessary to protect the natural and scenic values of the adjacent parklands.

Mr. Speaker, it is always pleasing to have an opportunity to bring a bill before the House that will result in a savings to the Federal Government. This one cannot balance the national debt, but it is always encouraging to

note that a few dollars are being saved—especially when the economy can be effected without impairing the program.

As one who is familiar with the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and as one who recognizes its natural and scenic values to the people of the Nation, I am confident that H.R. 2785 is in the best interests of sound administration and I recommend its favorable consideration by the Members of the House.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill—H.R. 2785—is to cede back to the State of Tennessee the Gatlinburg spur of the Foothills Parkway, between Gatlinburg and Pigeon Forge, and jurisdiction over two State highways along the borders of this park.

There is at present an agreement between the State of Tennessee and the National Park Service that this section of the parkway known as the Gatlinburg spur will be returned to the State upon completion of the Gatlinburg bypass, which will remain a National Park Service road.

The State highways which should be excluded from the park are Tennessee Highway 73 from Gatlinburg toward the Cocke County line, and a portion of Tennessee Highway 72, also known as U.S. 129, along the western boundary of this park.

My reasons for desiring the return of jurisdiction over portions of State highways 72 and 73 to the State of Tennessee stem from the following circumstances:

In 1951, the State of Tennessee commenced construction of an extension of State Highway 73 from Gatlinburg to join Highway 32 at Cosby; and the National Park Service issued three special use permits to the State for construction of the road through portions of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

By act of Congress approved May 16, 1958—United States Code, title 16, section 403g–1—the National Park Service was authorized to exchange governmental land north of the newly constructed Highway 73 for privately owned lands lying south of that highway. The exchanges have been completed and the north right-of-way line of Highway 73 is now the park boundary in some five different places aggregating 3.3 miles.

In 1956, the Aluminum Co. of America commenced construction of the Chilhowie Dam on the Little Tennessee River which made it necessary to relocate a portion of U.S. 129—Tennessee Highway 72. In making this relocation, the northbound lane of that highway is inside the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from Tabcat Creek to Abrams Creek, a distance of some 2¼ miles. This construction was also under special use permit from the National Park Service.

As the National Park Service has exclusive police jurisdiction within the park, you can readily see the complications of accident investigation and traffic control which these two situations pose. There is, because of these situations, a duplication of effort since the highway patrol must cover portions of both highways on both sides of the park while park rangers must also patrol these segments of the highways that are inside the park.

For these reasons I have asked for this legislation authorizing the reconveyance—or the retrocession of jurisdiction—from the United States to the State of Tennessee of such portions of these highways as now lie within this national park. In short, to make the south right-of-way line of Tennessee Highway 73 east of Gatlinburg and the east right-of-way line of Tennessee Highway 72 between Tabcat Creek and Abrams Creek the park boundary.

I believe that the retrocession or reconveyance of the Gatlinburg spur and the elimination of the above-mentioned portions of Tennessee Highways 72 and 73 from the park should be realized, and I urge your favorable consideration on my bill to accomplish this.

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

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

H.R. 2785

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the State of Tennessee, subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary to preserve the natural beauty of the adjacent park lands, approximately twenty-eight acres of land comprising a portion of the right-of-way of Tennessee State Route 72 (U.S. 129), and approximately forty-one acres comprising portions of the right-of-way of Tennessee State Route 73 east of Gatlinburg, which are within the boundary of Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is further authorized to convey to the State of Tennessee, subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary to assure administration and maintenance thereof by the State and to preserve the existing parkway character of the conveyed lands, the rights-of-way heretofore conveyed to the United States for the purposes of the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foothills Parkway together with any and all parcels of land heretofore conveyed by the State of Tennessee to the United States for the control and stabilization of landslides along said Gatlinburg Spur, except such lands as the Secretary determines may be necessary to provide for (1) the interchange between the road known as the Gatlinburg bypass and United States 441, (2) the interchange between United States Highway 441 and the Foothills Parkway in the vicinity of Caney Creek, and (3) the management and administration of the Foothills Parkway: *Provided,* That such reconveyance shall not be effected until construction of the Gatlinburg bypass and of two rock retaining walls to control erosion on the Gatlinburg Spur are completed, and Interstate Route 40 is open to public travel from Newport, Tennessee to United States Route 19 near Waynesville, North Carolina.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the lands described in sections 1 and 2 of this Act shall eliminate them from the park and parkway. Upon such conveyance and upon acceptance by the State of Tennessee of legislative jurisdiction over the lands and notification of such acceptance being given to the Secretary of the Interior, such jurisdiction is retroceded to the State.

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

## TO COMPENSATE CERTAIN INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 671) to compensate the Indians of California for the value of land erroneously used as an offset in a judgment against the United States obtained by said Indians.

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

H.R. 671

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 3 of the Act of September 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 860; Public Law 90–507), is redesignated as subsection (a) of section 3 and a new subsection (b) is added as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to credit to the judgment account referred to in subsection (a), for distribution as a part of such account, the sum of $83,275, plus interest at 4 per centum per anum from December 4, 1944, which sum represents the value of sixty-six thousand six hundred and twenty acres of land erroneously used as an offset against said judgment."

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1944 the Indians of California obtained a judgment against the United States for slightly more than $17 million. Setoffs allowed against the judgment amounted to about $12 million, which left a net judgment of about $5 million.

The setoffs allowed against the judgment contained an error. They included $83,275, representing the value of 66,620 acres of public domain that were thought to be reserved for Indian use. In fact, however, the Executive order reserving the land for Indian use had been revoked before the judgment was rendered by the Court of Claims, and the Indians had never had the use of the land. This part of the setoff was therefore an administrative error.

H.R. 671 will correct the error by crediting to the balance still in the judgment fund amount of the erroneous setoff, $83,275 plus interest from the date of the 1944 judgment. The judgment itself, when credited to the account of the Indians, bore interest at the rate of 4 percent and the erroneous setoff should bear the same interest. Four percent interest for 25 years—1944 to 1969—will double the principal, making the total amount of the credit approximately $166,550.

A much larger judgment recovered by the Indians of California in 1964 is now in the process of being distributed. The balance in the 1944 fund, including the credit authorized by H.R. 671, will be included in this distribution.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 18, 1969:

H.R. 3480. An act for the relief of the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.; and

H.J. Res. 782. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes.

On June 23, 1969:

H.R. 4622. An act to amend section 110 of title 38, United States Code, to insure preservation of all disability compensation evaluations in effect for 20 or more years.

On June 30, 1969:

H.R. 1437. An act for the relief of Cosmina Ruggiero;

H.R. 2667. An act to revise the pay structure of the police force of the National Zoological Park, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4229. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid, and to continue for 1 month the existing rates of withholding of income tax;

H.R. 4600. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States," approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804);

H.R. 6607. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss; and

H.J. Res. 790. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1969:

H.R. 1939. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth.

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Mario Santos Gomes.

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant; and

H.R. 5136. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed.

## SECRETARY KENNEDY MEETS IN SECRET WITH THE JET-AGE BILLIONAIRES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the jet set of the banking industry—the really big boys of the financial world—are arriving in Washington today to meet with the Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, in secret behind locked doors at the Treasury Department.

These jet-age billionaires, according to the Treasury Department news release, are scheduled to talk to the Secretary about inflation and high interest rates. It appears that the big bankers are coming to Washington to tell the Federal Government how to run monetary affairs—how to run them to suit the bankers.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury should stand up and demand that these bankers roll back the latest prime rate increase. It should be done tomorrow morning when the banks open for business. The Secretary has the power to do this if he will use it in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the bankers arriving on the jet specials today are the elite of the world's financial community.

As a group, these 25 bankers hold more than $148 billion of the Nation's bank deposits. In addition, they hold more than $131 billion in assets in their trust departments.

In short, Mr. Speaker, these 25 bankers—25 out of more than 13,000 commercial banks—control 36 percent of the Nation's bank deposits. And they also control one-half of the trust assets.

Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest mass of financial power that has ever been gathered in one room at the Treasury Department.

Yet, Secretary Kennedy persists in his plans to hold this meeting in secret with the press and the public barred. The questions of high interest rates and inflation are in the public domain and there is absolutely no excuse for the meeting to be held in secret.

Secrecy has created most of our problems in the monetary field over the past years. The Federal Reserve operates in secret and this is one of the reasons we have such outlandish and poorly administered monetary policy and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace for a Secretary of the Treasury to go behind closed doors with billionaire bankers to decide public policy.

Mr. Speaker, here are the list of banks that will participate in the meeting and a list of their trust assets and bank deposits:

| | Market value of trust assets (1968) | Deposits, Dec. 31, 1968 |
|---|---|---|
| Chief executive officer, Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, San Francisco, Calif. | $4,988,265,148 | $21,502,892,000 |
| Chief executive officer, Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., New York, N.Y. | 14,579,093,000 | 16,709,925,657 |
| Chief executive officer, First National City Bank, New York, N.Y. | 11,930,777,493 | 16,643,247,000 |
| Chief executive officer, Manufacturers Hanvoer Trust Co., New York, N.Y. | 7,959,479,000 | 9,202,391,539 |
| Chief executive officer, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N.Y. | 18,575,119,000 | 8,211,715,952 |
| Chief executive officer, Chemical Bank-New York Trust Co., New York, N.Y. | 5,658,125,000 | 7,640,535,069 |
| Chief executive officer, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N.Y. | 13,319,707,504 | 6,827,713,405 |
| Chief executive officer, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., Chicago, Ill. | 6,192,052,485 | 6,301,503,000 |
| Chief executive officer, First National Bank, Chicago, Ill. | 6,499,551,217 | 5,746,162,000 |
| Chief executive officer, Security Pacific National Bank, Los Angeles, Calif. | 2,718,018,000 | 5,711,376,229 |
| Chief executive officer, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., San Francisco, Calif. | 2,165,627,000 | 4,734,097,623 |
| Chief executive officer, Irving Trust Co., New York, N.Y. | 1,976,864,572 | 4,412,980,656 |
| Chief executive officer, Crocker-Citizens National Bank, San Francisco, Calif. | 2,210,234,458 | 4,207,243,461 |
| Chief executive officer, United California Bank, Los Angeles, Calif. | 2,784,728,000 | 3,765,607,866 |
| Chief executive officer, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa. | $8,218,705,778 | $3,748,752,656 |
| Chief executive officer, First National Bank, Boston, Mass. | [1] 5,323,411,245 | 3,260,839,600 |
| Chief executive officer, Franklin National Bank, Mineola, N.Y. | [2] 177,212,000 | 2,301,163,116 |
| Chief executive officer, Marine Midland Grace Trust Co., New York, N.Y. | 1,493,662,406 | 2,280,847,318 |
| Chief executive officer, First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa. | 3,157,213,000 | 2,173,968,000 |
| Chief executive officer, Cleveland Trust Co., Cleveland, Ohio | 3,690,492,000 | 2,129,999,331 |
| Chief executive officer, Detroit Bank & Trust Co., Detroit, Mich. | 1,972,334,206 | 1,899,344,777 |
| Chief executive officer, Philadelphia National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa. | 703,477,986 | 1,723,053,059 |
| Chief executive officer, Seattle-First National Bank, Seattle, Wash. | 862,364,676 | 1,692,349,092 |
| Chief executive officer, National Bank of Detroit, Detroit, Mich. | [2] 3,427,431,000 | 3,443,048,504 |
| Chief executive officer, Manufacturers National Bank, Detroit, Mich. | [2] 1,282,614,000 | 1,772,165,266 |
| Total | [3] 131,929,469,174 | [4] 148,042,922,166 |

[1] Includes Old Colony Trust Co.
[2] As of December 1967.
[3] This figure represents approximately ½ of all trust assets in the 13,000 commercial banks in the United States.
[4] This figure represents 36 percent of all bank deposits in the 13,000 commercial banks in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I sent Secretary Kennedy the following telegram asking that he seek an immediate rollback in the interest rate and urging that the meeting be opened to the public and the press:

JULY 7, 1969.

DAVID M. KENNEDY,
*Secretary of the Treasury, U.S. Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.:*

Your meeting today with the 25 giants of the banking industry gives you an unparalleled opportunity to roll back the prime interest rate to a reasonable level.

A simple statement that this is the Nixon administration's policy will bring a rollback in the interest rates before the banks open their doors tomorrow morning. I urge you to make this the number one item on the meeting agenda and to use the fullest powers of your office to enforce the rollback.

I urge you in the strongest possible terms to open this meeting to the press and the public. The entire agenda is clearly in the public domain and there is no reason to exclude the public from this deliberation. There should be no secret discussions of public policy between the big bankers and the Secretary of the Treasury.

An open session, fully reported by the Nation's press, would do much to clear the air of suspicion about the relationship of the Treasury Department and the big banks. As the former chief executive of one of the participants in the meeting—Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago—it is particularly inappropriate for you to go behind closed doors to discuss public policy with leaders of the banking industry.

This fact is heightened by your continuing financial ties to this bank, and the American public can only be highly suspicious of any attempt by you to go behind closed doors to discuss Treasury Department policy with the executive officers of the bank.

A press briefing, carefully cleansed of controversy, is inadequate when the public is so vitally affected and concerned by the issues before the meeting.

I also urge that all of the monetary authorities, particularly the Federal Reserve and the Federal Open Market Committee, have adequate representation at the meet-

ing. It is also essential that the Attorney General be represented. As you know, the Attorney General is conducting a full-scale investigation of the last prime rate increase for possible antitrust violations by the very banks you have invited. It is important that nothing be done at this meeting which might prejudice the Attorney General's case. I also urge you to make a full transcript of the meeting available to facilitate investigations being carried out by the Attorney General and the House Banking and Currency Committee.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
*Member of Congress.*

## EMPLOYMENT OF NATION'S PEOPLE ESSENTIAL TO FUTURE GROWTH AND STABILITY OF OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, adequate employment of the Nation's people has been held to be essential to the future growth and stability of our economy. Only when our valuable labor resources are employed at their full potential can the goal of eliminating poverty in this great land of ours be attained.

Today I am introducing the Human Investment and the Federal Government and Private Employers Partnership Act of 1969. This bill provides for a two-pronged attack on the problem of hard-core unemployment.

First, the Human Investment Act would provide a 15-percent tax credit of all allowable training expenses, with a maximum of $100,000 plus 50 percent of the taxpayers' tax liability in excess of $100,000. This act would be aimed at business with income in excess of $500,000 per year.

Second, the Federal Government and Private Employers Partnership Act of 1969 would provide a 50-percent subsidy on the wages paid to any person receiving on-the-job training provided that the wage being earned is equal to the Federal minimum wage. This act would be aimed at businesses with incomes below $500,000 per year.

The reason for two-pronged attack is simple. Large businesses with its sophisticated accounting departments would be better able to handle a training program which was initiated at the inducement of the tax credit. The idea behind this tax credit is similar to that which was used in the highly successful 7-percent investment tax credit.

On the other hand, the subsidy approach has proven to be very successful in inducing small businessmen in service industries to provide on-the-job training. The JOBS program which is administered by the National Alliance of Businessmen use this approach and it has been highly successful in the few cities in which it has been operating.

The underlying philosophy behind this concept is that American business must be brought into the fight against poverty. Recently, assistant to the Presidential Assistant for Urban Affairs, Daniel P. Moynihan stated:

> Finally it is also reasonably clear that we must begin getting private business involved in domestic programs in a much more systematic purposeful manner. Making money is one thing Americans are good at, and the corporation is their favorite device for doing so. What aerospace corporations have done for getting us to the moon, urban housing corporations can do for the slums. All that is necessary, one fears, is to enable enough men to make enough money out of doing so.

I agree with Mr. Moynihan's observation and believe that my bill gives businessmen the incentive to invest in job training. As the 7-percent investment tax credit guaranteed the prosperity of the 1960's, my bill could guarantee employment for the unemployed and underemployed of the 1970's.

The basic provisions of the Human Investment Act provide that allowable employee training expenses shall be the following:

First, the wages and salaries of employees who are appprentices in an apprenticeship program registered with a State apprenticeship agency or the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training;

Second, the wages and salaries of employees who are enrolled in an on-the-job training program pursuant to section 204 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Third, the wages and salaries of employees who are participating in a cooperative education program involving alternate periods of academic study and employment in cooperation with a secondary school, college, university, business school, trade school, or vocational school;

Fourth, tuition and course fees paid by the taxpayer for the instruction of any individual by a college, university, business school, trade school, or vocational school in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer;

Fifth, home study course fees paid by the taxpayer for the instruction of any individual by a college, university, or accredited home study school in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer;

Sixth, expenses to the taxpayer of organized job training—including classroom instruction—including expenses for the purchase or lease of books, testing and training materials, classroom equipment, and instructors' fees and salaries, incurred in training any individual in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer; and

Seventh, expenses to the taxpayer of organized job training provided by a business or trade association, joint labor-management apprenticeship committee, or other similar nonprofit association.

Title II of my bill is the Federal Government and Private Employers Partnership Act of 1969. The basic purpose of this measure is to provide training and employment opportunities for those individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage. By means of subsidies to employers on a decreasing scale in order to compensate such employers for the risk of hiring the poor and unskilled in their local communities, I hope to decrease the number of hard-core unemployed.

America's unemployment rate is lower than it has ever been in our history. However, businessmen have constantly reported that trained skilled workers are needed and our domestic industries are suffering shortages of these workers. The main thrust of my bill is to provide on-the-job training to unemployed persons who could be productive citizens if they had proper skills.

The small, service-oriented and oft-times one- or two-man controlled operation would find small advantage in the tax credit approach. This leaves a large segment of the business community, that is the small business venture, particularly in the service-oriented industry without financial incentive to engage in training programs. I firmly believe that the greatest opportunity for the greatest numbers of trainee-employees lies in this business area; thus I propose this measure.

The large corporations should be involved in job training, however, I would like to point out that there is a need for skilled workers in occupations such as barbershops, automobile repair shops, cobbler shops, plumbing establishments, and homebuilding concerns. These are the small individual businesses which cannot effectively utilize the 15-percent tax credit provided in the Human Investment Act.

Recently the Office of Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the National Alliance of Businessmen, established the JOBS—job opportunities in the business sector—program. This program has some characteristics which are similar to mine, in that it does provide wage subsidies for businessmen who engage in on-the-job training. While some, including myself, question the legal authority for OEO—which is using some of the broad language under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act—for this venture, yet, those who suggested this program are to be complimented on their innovation and imagination. I personally await keenly to learn the results of this program so that this experience can be fully utilized in implementing the legislation which I now propose today.

I think it appropriate to briefly outline the mechanics of the operation of the proposal which I make today. Under my proposal an employer will be certified by the Administrator of the Wage, Hour, and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor provided that:

First, he will abide by the minimum wage provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938;

Second, the employer has not raised his hiring requirements in expectation of or after passage of the act;

Third, despite reasonable recruitment efforts, no adequate supply of qualified workers is available;

Fourth, there are no strikes, lockouts, or other abnormal labor conditions at the employer's establishment;

Fifth, the employer agrees to afford each certified employee opportunity for continued employment after expiration of the certificate for a period equal to the duration of the certificate. Such employee could still be fired for any reasons

which would justify firing a noncertified employee;

Sixth, the employer's on-the-job-training program is one to which admission is based in part, on aptitude tests, and which provides not less than 3 nor more than 12 months of training reasonably calculated to result in the qualification of trainees for suitable employment at or above the minimum wage;

Seventh, the refunds to the employer will not have the effect of depressing the wages, working standards, or opportunities for full employment of existing employees; and

Eighth, to insure that the funds for this program will be directed into small business, the employer in business receiving a refund under this act must not have gross receipts in excess of $500,000 per year.

The refund granted to a certified employer shall be an amount equal to, first, 50 percent of the statutory minimum wages paid to all certified employees for the first half of the employee's certification period; and, second, 25 percent of the wages paid for the second half of the certification period.

No more than 25 percent of an employer's labor force may be certified employees.

This measure contains a provision to authorize the appropriation of $72 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and authorization for $144 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. It is estimated, based upon the Department of Labor's research, that the first year's authorization would provide job training opportunities for approximately 100,000 persons, and the second year authorization will provide job training for 200,000 persons.

My bill provides a system of priorities be established to guide the Administrator in certifying employers:

First. Great weight will be given to early certification of employers in areas containing a high concentration of unemployed and underemployed.

Second. Those employers who have the greater need for the greatest numbers of those persons having low job skills, where opportunities for increasing job skills during the course of employment at the greatest rate will be given a high priority.

Third. Those business concerns having gross receipts of less than $250,000 would enjoy a high priority.

The main thrust of title II is to encourage the small businessman to take an active hand in helping to retrain America's hard-core unemployed. Small business provides much-needed service upon which each individual community depends. I feel that the small businessman's contribution to the war against unemployment could be of utmost importance.

The effect on the individual is a very important aspect of this legislation. One of the major faults of past programs is that after the individual is trained, there is not any gainful employment available for him. My program insures that a trainee will have employment after he is trained. Further, the trainee is receiving the minimum wage and is able to care for his family. This program helps restore the dignity of the individual.

I would also propose that trainees under this program have their training supplemented by formal lectures on job attitudes, punctuality, dependability, and other basic qualities so necessary if any employer-employee relationship is to be long lived.

After the Watts riot of 1965, Los Angeles established a management council for merit employment, training, and research. This council employs a program which is similar to the one that I am proposing today. At the present time, the council is working with approximately 1,267 companies in the Los Angeles area and has reported the placement of 17,903 individuals in full-time employment.

Mr. H. C. McClellan, head of the council, stated in a U.S. News & World Report interview:

> This man cannot go back to the traditional school. He is a dropout, so he has to be accommodated in some surroundings that to him appear to offer promise—something he can see that will justify his effort and doesn't require several years.
>
> Such a man needs a subsistence allowance to enable him and his family to live while he is learning.
>
> To motivate this kind of man, he must be able to see that the man who preceded him in training got a decent job and kept it.

Furthermore, the Watts program has shown that most trainees stayed on the job and progressed at a rapid rate.

I believe that my program will provide the needed employment incentives while helping small businessmen obtain the needed skilled workers.

## FAIR FARM PRICE ACHIEVEMENT ACT

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress, in its role as spokesman for the people of this country, is quickly approaching the point where it will no longer accept farm programs which rely primarily on Government price supports and subsidy payments. The recent action by this body in adding the $20,000 limitation per farm for farm subsidy payments is indicative of the present public sentiment. I think it fair to say that this public attitude demands a complete change in the means used to compensate farmers for production.

Those of us in this body who give the matter adequate reflection will agree that farmers deserve sufficient gross income to cover their expenses as well as a modest profit. The whole fabric of capitalism, to which most of us subscribe, is based on the profit principle—and farmers have just about been squeezed out of the profit picture altogether by rising costs and constant prices. However, no matter how much we may want to help the farmer, no one—including the farmer—wants to be forced to accept a handout from the Federal Government or anyone else.

I am introducing today a bill that would virtually end subsidy payments and save the Federal Government millions of dollars while helping farmers achieve modest profits on a businesslike basis. Many farmers are operating on a deficit basis today, a fact which will one day keep us from maintaining our position as the world's most efficient and largest producer of food and fiber if the situation is not speedily rectified.

Although we would like to put the farmer on a more businesslike basis, the farmer deals in nonunique, fungible goods which require governmental regulation of pricing and marketing. Farmer Jones in Kansas cannot get a higher price by refusing to sell No. 2 wheat at an artificially low price, because the buyer could probably get No. 2 wheat at his asking price from a poor farmer in Oklahoma who needed the money. Thus, without governmental regulation, the farmers would be at the mercy of the buyers or wholesalers. Most of our Nation recognizes and accepts this need for the regulation of fungible goods pricing.

More important, however, than the protection of the farmer is the protection of the public in the commodity pricing program. The need for food and fiber continues beyond the normal seasonal supply and demand for the consumer. This renders the normal supply and demand formulas useless, for present demand cannot anticipate a drought the following season any more than it can anticipate a bumper crop. Our national policy has been, and ought to continue to be, to keep farmers on the land to produce in these fat years of apparent abundance a store of commodities for those lean years that inevitably come. If the consumer is to be protected from fantastic price increases in time of drought, there has to be enough food and fiber stored up now to take up the slack in those lean years.

Mr. Speaker, my bill goes to the heart of this problem. Although seemingly a radical approach, my bill would cost the Government and hence the consumers less money while putting the farmers on a profitable, and therefore more businesslike, basis. Called the Fair Farm Price Achievement Act, my bill would return prices to parity levels while simultaneously reducing Federal subsidies and total Federal agricultural expenditures. Essentially, the bill guarantees full parity to wheat and feed grain farmers in return for voluntarily withholding a modest acreage from production. A key feature is that the farmer receives a price only for what he produces. Money may be expended under this bill only when the farmer tills the land and raises the crops; thus no one is paid for not doing anything.

I have detailed figures to back up my claims of savings for the American people. The large size of these benefits is startling, and the first question is: Why did someone not point this out before? The figures are even more startling when you realize that they are actually on the conservative side. I will present these figures and explain the various complex features of this bill, such as payments in kind, cross-compliance and foreign import requirements, in detail in a later report. However, just as an example of

the tremendous benefit to the American people, the $2.16 billion in payments to farmers which would have been eliminated in fiscal year 1968 if my bill had been in effect then or the estimated $2.56 billion for fiscal year 1969 would more than pay the total cost of the whole poverty program in either of these years or in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1970. The savings to this program just in terms of interest on the national debt alone is staggering.

Obtaining a fair price from the marketplace is far superior to pouring Federal tax dollars into programs that fail in their objective of adequately supporting our vital and necessary farms. However, the time to act is now while there is still time to solve the problem. It would be well for us to remember that our country has always gained in periods of prosperity by tenaciously tackling the most difficult problems and thus accomplishing what seemed like almost impossible solutions. And to solve the farm problem now would put us far on the road out of inflation and on to national economic stability.

## COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today adding my name to the growing list of Congressmen who are deeply concerned about the quality of our lives as we move into the last 25 years of this millennium, by submitting legislation which would create a Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President.

In doing so I become cosponsor of H.R. 12549, originally introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan. Congressman DINGELL, as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and its Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, has performed an outstanding service for the people of the United States and their Congress. The hearings which he has conducted and which he is continuing to hold, have brought the enormous problem of environmental pollution to the attention of Congress and the American public.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer ignore the warning signals of the environmental cancer which threatens our very existence. Like men everywhere who only fully appreciate their health when they have lost it, we take for granted the air we breathe, the water we drink, and even the land on which we walk.

But as the inhabitants of the European banks of the Rhine discovered in the last few days, there are silent, often invisible, but very deadly, toxicants which have been loosed in our water and air. These agents, whether they be insecticides, pesticides, phosphate and nitrate effluents, gases, or the exhaust from automobiles and jet aircraft, threaten to poison us in hundreds of subtle and unrecognizable ways.

While scientists are not unanimous in their predictions of what this ever-increasing pollution portends for mankind, they are in agreement on one thing: without preventive action immediately, we are going to face what Secretary-General U Thant recently called a crisis of the human environment.

Is it really possible that, as Alfred Hulstrunk of the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center suggests, the next generation will never see the sun? Will we face a new ice age because the excess carbon dioxide in the upper atmosphere reflects the sunlight away from the earth? Or will the radiation from the earth's surface, unable to escape through that same carbon dioxide, turn this planet into a gigantic hothouse? Will our children and their children be required to wear gas masks as part of their everyday attire?

Absurd, you say. And yet these are precisely the terms in which scientists are now thinking. Despite their persistent warnings, our factories continue to spew forth smoke and soot, our industries continue to upset the ecology of rivers and streams with chemical and heat pollution, and every single human being contributes about 5 pounds of garbage to the environment daily. When you combine this with the projected doubling of the earth's population by the end of the century, it is truly frightening.

Mr. Speaker, I commend President Nixon for the interest and concern he has shown by his creation of the Cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council; but I must agree with Helmut K. Buechner of the Smithsonian Institution that—

> This intergovernmental council is to a large extent subject to the traditional modes of action that have evolved within and between federal agencies over a long period of time. A separate council, free from the constraints of governmental processes is needed to provide objective reviews, evaluations, and recommendations from the private sector of our society as a counterbalance to governmental approaches.

H.R. 12549 provides such an independent body of environmental advisers, charged with no other responsibilities, and with the power to review the environmental picture and to recommend action and legislation. This must be the first step in a nationwide effort to control the pollutants that would poison us.

Mr. Speaker, I call on our colleagues in the House to join me in rising to the support of this urgently needed legislation. It is the duty of Congress to "stand on the shoulders of giants" in order to foresee the perils facing this Nation and take preventive action.

Surely the fantastic technology which this country has exhibited in its triumphant journey to the moon can be put to the task of saving this globe from environmental disaster.

## NIXON'S WISDOM IN REFUSING TO APPOINT KNOWLES

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John H. Knowles' recent actions and statements, following the failure of the President to appoint him as Assistant Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary, has clearly demonstrated President Nixon's wisdom in refusing to appoint him. Knowles' petulant, spoiled, crybaby attacks on the President shows him as a man totally lacking in the qualities of fairness, capability, dedication, and objectivity so necessary to this important post.

## COUNTERVAILING DUTIES ON IMPORTED DAIRY PRODUCTS

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that section 1303 of United States Code 19, is not being enforced as it applies to dairy producers. Under this law, duties on imports subsidized by foreign countries are to be increased, in addition to the regular duty, by the amount of the subsidy. The law is mandatory, not permissive.

I have written a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable David M. Kennedy, drawing this problem to his attention, a copy of which I will place in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., July 2, 1969.*

Hon. DAVID M. KENNEDY,
*Secretary of the Treasury,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been brought to my attention that the U.S. Treasury is not imposing countervailing duties on imported dairy products. As I understand the Tariff Act of 1930, you are required to impose countervailing duties whenever it is determined that a bounty or grant is paid on any commodity imported into the United States which is subject to duty. The law is mandatory and the problem exists in the dairy industry.

Subsidies are being paid on butter and non-fat dry milk in some of the European Economic Community countries as high as 67¢ a pound on butter and 9¢ a pound on non-fat dry milk. It is reported that surplus butter production amounts to approximately one billion pounds and surplus non-fat dry milk amounts to five-hundred million pounds in the E.E.C. nations. With excess production of this magnitude, these countries will be seeking markets abroad for these commodities.

I have no objection to this if it is on an equitable basis with U.S. producers and within the quota. As you know, under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, quotas on dairy products are now in force. We are watching closely that these quotas are not circumvented by changing the composition of products so that the new item is not defined within the quota limitations.

The price support law is designed to benefit domestic producers. If excess imports are allowed, either above the quota or within the quota but by some means unfair to American producers, the U.S. taxpayer then is placed in a situation of supporting the world market which I expect he is unwilling to do.

Since the Tariff Act of 1930 requiring countervailing duties is being enforced on other commodities, I believe that it should be enforced on dairy products as well.

If there is some reason why it should not be enforced, an amendment to the law should be submitted for Congressional consideration and the reasons for such change documented. It should only be through Congress changing the policy as laid down in the law that the law should ever not be enforced as it is now written.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. Speaker, failure to enforce the law is an invitation for importation of large quantities of dairy products in a way which will prove costly to the Treasury, the U.S. taxpayer, and the U.S. dairy industry.

## PLUMBERS, NOT DOLLARS, IS LATIN AMERICAN NEED

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, South American countries need American know-how, not dollars, says Richard L. Maher, politics editor of the Cleveland Press. Maher visited South America this year and in a series of articles for his paper said that a couple of American plumbers would be of more help to Latin American countries than handing out dollars or lectures from professors on their theories.

Some good American technicians to teach South Americans how to do practical things would be far better United States aid than throwing money around on impractical programs. Maher writes.

Mr. Maher has long been recognized by associates in the newspaper field and the reading public as the foremost political editor in Ohio and recognized nationally for his political acumen.

Included in my remarks are the last three of a series of four articles by Mr. Richard L. Maher. I commend the reading of these articles by my colleagues and members of the Department of State and the administration:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Apr. 10, 1969]

SOUTH AMERICA NEEDS U.S. KNOW-HOW MORE THAN IT NEEDS OUR AID IN DOLLARS

(By Richard L. Maher)

The best kind of aid the United States could send to South America—in fact to all Latin America—would be a couple of good American plumbers.

Everywhere in South America, even in the best hotels, the plumbing is horrible. Faucets drip, toilets don't flush properly, shower water fluctuates in temperature.

It isn't safe to drink the water—even in such big cities as Buenos Aires and Rio. The same is true in most of Mexico.

In much of South America, sanitary conditions are bad. Water is contaminated by leaking sewers, which are old and deteriorating. Some must have been laid by Cortez.

Here is where those American plumbers could do a great job. They could teach the people how to do things right, to make plumbing work and teach the local craftsmen how to maintain the installations.

The average fellow on the streets is unaware that the United States has been pouring billions in aid into the countries. Those who do know are cynical about it.

There was the bright young woman in Uruguay who remarked:

"American aid! Too much sticks on the way down from the top."

In Ecuador, where I found American embassy officials more understanding than any other place outside Mexico City—an aide told me:

"What these people need is not a handout, but some education." And Ecuador, small, weak and poor, gets very little aid.

A corps of agricultural advisers, not theorists, but successful farmers, to tell the Ecuadorian how to get more crops out of his land, a corps of technical advisers, just ordinary craftsmen, bricklayers, plumbers, electricians—there is the need of South America today.

The need is not for money to be handed out indiscriminately; not for professors of theory who can't put their ideas into practice. The need is for good, practical down-to-earth education in how to do things.

It is difficult, of course, to do business with heads of South American republics. They are not republics as we know them. Most are dictatorships. Governments change fast, and diplomats walk a tight rope.

Natural resources abound in these countries, particularly oil. They don't have the money, nor the know-how to develop those resources. American business interests have moved in to do the developing. They have been guilty of playing politics; also they have been at times the victims of government greed.

Peru has seized an American oil company. Chile is badgering American fishermen. The United States has suspended aid to Brazil, which has been running $250,000,000 to $300,000,000 a year. It is threatening to suspend aid to Peru because of its seizure of American owned property.

In Ecuador, Texaco and Gulf have discovered a rich, untapped oil supply. It will take $200,000,000 to develop and build a pipeline to get the oil out. Still the Ecuadorian government is threatening to seize the oil property, though it hasn't the money or the technical knowledge to get the oil out of the ground and to the market.

On the top governmental level in Ecuador, there is little regard for the United States. There is a simmering antagonism growing out of a land incident of 25 years ago. Powerful neighbors of Ecuador seized and occupied one-third of its territory.

The United States, beset by a war in the Pacific and in Europe, sided with the aggressor nations. Thus the small, weak nation of Ecuador lost a lot. Her leaders have never forgotten.

In Brazil we had no ambassador for months Only last week the President finally named one. The attitude of government officials is that the United States doesn't care about their country, that the failure to name an ambassador for so long was a snub and indicates a contempt for them.

And what is the United States doing about her plunging popularity in South America? Nothing—at least nothing that can be seen and noted.

The largest and most powerful nation in the world, which has given 13 billions in aid since 1949 to South America, has failed to let the little people know how they have received aid from this country.

No one, least of all the U.S. embassies, tries to get across the story of what we have done, tries to blow our own horn. Yet the people are eager to hear, are friendly and like Americans. An illustration:

On a Sunday morning in Quito, Ecuador, my wife and I attended Mass in the downtown area, some distance from our hotel. We took a cab and thought it would be easy to get a cab to return. Leaving church, we could find but one.

The driver indicated he was not for hire, pointed to the church. Soon two women emerged, an elderly senora and her daughter. In my meager Spanish and their equally meager English, we were able to communicate.

They graciously agreed to have the driver take us to our hotel. They were most cordial and pleased to meet someone from the United States and to be of help.

---

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Apr. 14, 1969]

GERMANS NUMEROUS IN BRAZIL, GIVE UNITED STATES STIFF COMPETITION

(By Richard L. Maher)

In Rio de Janeiro nearly every car on the streets is a Volkswagen.

In Buenos Aires, the Ford Falcon seems to be the popular car.

I asked an American embassy official in Rio why so few American cars on the streets and why so many Volkswagens. His answer was that American built cars can't compete with the German made cars.

I pointed out that Ford seemed to be able to compete in Argentina, asking: "Why not Brazil?" I didn't get a good answer.

A little digging developed that a Volkswagen sells for $3300 in Rio. Much of this is government tax. A small American car runs close to $6000.

Volkswagen maintains an assembly plant in Brazil. Also Germany seems to have much better rapport with the Brazilian government than we do.

I gathered that the preference for Volkswagens was due in a large part to the aggressiveness of the Germans. Germany has put its stamp on South American republics with a big thump.

Germans have moved into Brazil in large numbers. They are everywhere. There has been inter-marriage, and the second generation is growing up. They are more German than Brazilian.

I asked a blond tour guide where she got her light hair.

"From my mother. She's German," she replied. This young girl, scarcely 20, spoke Portuguese, English and German.

Rio is doing much building, particularly roads and modern streets within the city with complicated interchanges. The hands of German engineers are evident in this.

With all their ingenuity, the Germans can't overcome the manana atmosphere that pervades all of South America. Many in the U.S. complain about building tradesmen and featherbedding practices. They ought to see Brazil. Here they say the average bricklayer lays 16 bricks a day—on a good day.

Labor is cheap. Often one would see four men doing what one man in the United States would do—and do it more efficiently. The hotel in which the Ohio touring group was housed was undergoing a major remodeling.

It was to have been finished in January. Already it was two months behind schedule. The management blamed American suppliers and the East Coast dock strike for the delay. But what I saw laborers doing had nothing to do with any equipment delay. The delay was right there with the workmen. One took a whole day to plaster the archway at the main entrance to the lobby.

Rio and Buenos Aires are not South American cities. They are oriented to Europe. They ape Paris with their sidewalk cafes and hotel and restaurant food.

U.S. officials seem to think they can't fight this.

But the young people are not oriented to Europe. Their music comes from the United States. They play hit tunes from America all the time.

Their mini skirts aren't from Europe. They are American and quite popular with the young girls.

I saw few hippies. I did see many young men and women strolling hand-in-hand as one would see on the streets of any U.S. city. The old Spanish and European custom that a duenna must accompany a girl on her dates no longer prevails. Argentinian and Brazilian youths want the same freedom to date and love as their American cousins have.

Youths in South America are looking to the United States—but here again, it was obvious we are making no effort to woo these folks who in a few years will be running their governments.

U.S. propaganda machines should be tuned into these young people.

Brazil is an interesting country—but not one where living could be entirely pleasant.

President Costa e Silva apparently runs a democratic government. But in fact it is far from democratic. Costa e Silva is pretty

much a dictator. Though the government is not a military one, it is militarily oriented. Soldiers, in pairs, patrol the streets everywhere.

There are no civil rights in Brazil. Use of habeas corpus has been suspended. Protestors against the regime just disappear. Every day some one disappears, and isn't heard from again.

There have been some student riots—but the leaders were quickly picked off and whisked away—to where no one knows.

Eighty members of Congress, including two former presidents, have been removed from their seats by executive order of Costa e Silva. Another 15 are due to get the axe soon. Congress is in "recess," sent home by the president.

It's a crime to send a nasty card or letter to a government official. One citizen sent a Christmas card to an official. The official regarded it as objectionable. So the sender wound up in jail for 30 days.

The government has clamped down on money exchange to keep Yankee dollars in the country. You can't, for instance, get more than $30 in U.S. money if you try to cash a check or a traveler's check. For a $100 check, you get $30 American and $70 Brazilian.

But if you want to spend the $100 for Brazilian goods, you can. That way the entire U.S. $100 stays in Brazil. Brazilian merchants often will take a personal check from a tourist. That way, too, American dollars stay there.

All this gives one an idea of how hard it is to deal with South American republics. But Germany, which gives no foreign aid, does it well. The United States, which has passed out billions, does it badly.

---

URUGUAY IS FULL OF AGED U.S. CARS

(By Richard L. Maher)

The streets of Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay, abound with American cars—old ones, that is.

An old car buff would have a picnic in this South American city.

I saw 20-year-old cars in use. They were dated, looked pretty well beaten, but the motors purred well.

I even saw a Model A Ford that was still running.

I rode in an English bus that was 30 years old. It was a bit noisy, I must admit.

I was puzzled and amazed by the number of old cars still in use. On inquiring I learned that there are in Uruguay young mechanics who can do miracles with old American cars. They keep them running long beyond the time they would have been in a junk heap in the U.S.

They have an advantage so far as weather goes. There never is snow in Uruguay; hence no salted streets. So bodies don't rust out.

If one could get his old car down to Uruguay he could sell it for a good price.

However, obsolescence is catching up with the operation of the old cars. The Uruguay mechanics complain cars are not being built the way they once were.

Uruguay is one of the poorest of South American countries. Ten per cent of its population work for the government—including the army. Another 10% is unemployed.

They have forms of social security, medicare and other such benefits—but there is a complaint that workers who retire don't get much in benefits. Some told me they run to about $15 a month.

It is weak, like Ecuador. Argentina has occupied an island in the 140-mile-wide river which separates the two nations. Uruguay will do nothing but protest since Argentina is too big and powerful to oppose more violently.

Of all South American countries I have seen, Uruguay is the poorest. Its shops pretty generally are shabby and merchandise is shoddy.

Its unemployment problem is evidenced by the numbers of men who appear to be just loitering on the downtown streets at mid-afternoon.

The Uruguayans were the least friendly of all South Americans I encountered. Here again the average person has no idea that aid has come to the nation from the United States. Those who do know seem cynical about it.

Uruguay's government has been dictatorial like most others, although the president has relaxed many of the tight regulations.

Like in other nations of the South American continent, the United States needs to do a massive propaganda job.

The opportunity for Americans is there in South America—but it is rapidly slipping away through indifference, apathy and failure to grasp it.

---

## THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby transmit the third annual report on the implementation of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. The report contains information with respect to the United States-Canada Automotive Products Agreement, including automotive trade, production, prices and employment in 1968. Also included is other information relating to activities under the Act.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 7, 1969.*

---

## LEGAL PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1835, Alexis De Tocqueville wrote:

The power vested in the American courts of justice of pronouncing at statute to be unconstitutional forms one of the most powerful barriers that have ever been devised against the tyranny of political assemblies.

That statement is pertinent to America today.

Ours is a nation of laws. It was founded by men who believed their own legal rights had been taken away by the Government. In order to insure that a system of just laws guaranteeing the rights of the individual was made available to all, the United States of America was declared a free and independent republic.

On last Friday we celebrated the 193d anniversay of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. We have come a long way on the road to justice and equality for all. Our forefathers had to turn to violence and revolution because there was no other machinery available to redress the grievances. But that is no longer the case today. There is in the law today a solution for every conceivable grievance an American might have and it is available through the orderly process of judicial review.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for citizens to turn to violence for redress of their grievances, if the full machinery of our judicial system is made available to such citizens.

Mr. Speaker, 22 years before he became President of the United States Abraham Lincoln reinforced this belief in his statement on American law in a speech at Springfield, Ill. He said:

Let reverence for the law, be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles in her lap. Let it be taught in the schools, in seminaries, and in colleges.

In short, let it become the political religion of the Nation and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes, tongues, and colors, and conditions sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

Throughout the decades since the early days of our Nation, the Congress and the separate States which entered the Union, enacted laws to protect and benefit all American citizens. Those laws have been challenged and changed as time passed and as the conditions of the time required new interpretations of existing law.

Now, in the last third of the 20th century, we are encountering problems in our legal system; problems which could be solved with a fresh approach and a new outlook. Problems that could be solved if the citizen—every citizen—could have recourse to the advice of an attorney even if he could not afford to retain such an attorney with his own resources.

To do this we will need more lawyers.

The method of educating lawyers in America today could, I believe, be speeded up to provide the needs of our communities.

Our population has increased substantially in recent years. Our society as a whole is more and more concerned with helping those less privileged and less fortunate to obtain what is rightfully theirs in a democratic system.

This has placed an overwhelming burden on our courts and upon individual lawyers. As a result, the backlog of cases has contributed markedly to the unrest and the violence that has all too tragically characterized the petitioning for redress of grievances on the part of many Americans.

In order to reinforce confidence in our legal code and the legal system itself, I am today introducing legislation which I hope will help solve the crisis in our courts. This legislation would be known as the Legal Professions Development Act of 1969.

My bill would amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide a comprehensive program for the training of attorneys and related personnel in order to improve legal services available to the people of the United States.

I hope a companion measure may soon be introduced to enlarge and improve the judiciary in America to handle the increased caseload my legislation would generate.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to accelerate the training of lawyers and, through a series of grants

provide them with clinical experience that will train them and, at the same time, benefit the community at large.

Education is costly; it costs the student and it costs the society. I believe it is possible to reduce the time of formal education and place the purpose of education in perspective with the needs of our society.

Dr. Levi, president of the University of Chicago, pinpointed this problem when he said recently:

> We must find a way to shorten this period (of formal education), to provide easier means for entrance and exit from the system with time out for doing, and we must find a way to give it renewed seriousness.

Dr. Levi proposed a 4-year course for lawyers and I believe there is great merit in his proposal. My legislation is designed to implement Dr. Levi's suggestion.

The bill I am introducing today does indeed give renewed seriousness to the problem of legal education and training.

The bill provides for an accelerated legal training program. This program would include 2 years of liberal arts, 2 years of intensive law studies, and 2 years in a neighborhood legal clinic.

Most law schools today admit only those students who have successfully completed 4 years of undergraduate work in liberal arts. The law school curriculum itself consumes another 3 years. Thus, a total of 7 years is spent in training a young man or woman to practice before the bar.

By accelerating the training and requiring only 2 years of liberal arts, followed by 2 years of intensive legal studies, I believe the law student benefiting from such an experience could—with hard work—equal today's student who has had 7 years of study before encountering any actual legal experience.

Under the provisions of my bill, through a system of grants supported by the Federal Government, a student would be accepted into this accelerated legal training program.

At the end of his 2 years of liberal arts and 2 years of law studies and upon successful completion of the bar of his State, he would enter a neighborhood legal clinic for a period of at least 2 years at a salary to be determined by the Commissioner of Education.

These 2 years of actual clinical experience would constitute repayment of his obligation for his earlier formal education in the law. It would result in thousands of young attorneys being made immediately available for service to the community through legal aid programs, the legal services program under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the clinical experience program carried on in this title—title XI of the Higher Education Act—or in any program operated by a public or private nonprofit agency to provide legal services to the community.

Americans today, too many of them, have become cynical about the law.

The neighborhood legal clinics which I propose as part of this legislation would make available to the citizen who otherwise cannot afford legal advice and legal assistance—such legal advice. These clinics would in no way compete with legal services now provided by the legal profession.

Mr. Speaker, we have medical clinics, dental clinics, optometric clinics, and we even have birth control clinics in some communities of America available to the citizens to take care of their needs. Why not a neighborhood legal clinic to help a citizen get legal help to correct his grievances?

I propose a network of legal neighborhood clinics which would make available to the citizens the very things he needs, advice, so that he can seek his redress in the orderly process of judicial review instead of turning to violence and turmoil because he becomes disenchanted with the avenues of relief that are available to him.

Many of our citizens believe that laws protect other people. I contend that our American system of law is sound and workable and enduring.

There is recourse in our laws for full redress of grievances on the part of every American citizen. Our problem in this mobile, technocratic, and increasingly impersonal society is to provide circuits of communication between the aggrieved petitioner and the courts.

A Supreme Court Justice wrote recently:

> How wonderful it is that freedom's instruments—the rights to speak, to publish, to protest, to assemble peaceably, and to participate in the electoral process—have so demonstrated their power and vitality. These are our alternatives to violence; and so long as they are used forcefully but prudently, we shall continue as a vital, free society.

Writing further, the Justice said:

> *Procedure* is the bone structure of a democratic society; and the quality of procedural standards which meet general acceptance—the quality of what is tolerable and permissible and acceptable conduct—determines the durability of the Society and the survival possibilities of freedom within the society.

It is because I agree wholeheartedly with this point of view that I propose this legislation today.

This bill would provide a mechanism whereby accredited law schools could work together in planning for, developing, and carrying out accelerated legal training programs.

A participant in the program would be required to obligate himself to accept and engage in the legal employment arranged for him by the institution of higher education for a period of not less than 2 years.

This principle of requiring young people whom we educate to devote some of their time to the service of their Government is not a new principle. We now do this with doctors. We train many doctors at Federal expense, under one condition—that whatever time we supply them in education, they furnish back to the Government by service in the Armed Forces medical units. Many of our fine doctors today worked in the Armed Forces for the number of years they had been paid while being educated in the medical schools at the expense of the Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a precedent for a program like this, but more important there is a need. I submit that these neighborhood legal clinics could perform an impressive service to the individual citizen. I am not talking about services such as we saw recently as part of the Economic Opportunity Act. I, myself, 2 years ago severely criticized a group of young lawyers, graduates from eastern law schools, who came to Chicago as part of the legal service program of the OEO, and then proceeded to instruct young high school students on their rights against prosecution for participating in a rebellion and their constitutional rights to participate in strikes against their teachers. This is not the kind of service I am talking about. I am talking about legitimate legal services to citizens, citizens who for instance are being taken advantage of by local businessmen who charge them usurious interest rates on loans they make on purchase items on credit; citizens who are being exploited by an unscrupulous landlord, or citizens whose rights are being denied in the pursuit of their livelihood.

My proposal here is an extension of the very limited legal aid program we have in many cities operated by local bar associations and charitable organizations. These legal aid societies have done an excellent job but with the rapid growth of our urban areas, their limited facilities cannot even begin to tackle the enormous job.

These are the kind of things that I believe neighborhood legal clinics could provide, legal aid for citizens, and in that way make a contribution toward the orderly process of seeking redress under the law.

This accelerated legal training will provide a method and an avenue to reach out to the people of this Nation who are sorely in need of legal assistance, but who have no access to information that might solve their problems without resorting to endless litigation or needless violence.

Our younger generation is sincere in looking for ways to help society grow and develop. America should constantly be in a state of "becoming." Our Nation should never be complacent and self-satisfied, for our very striving to improve our system has made us the foremost government in the world.

The law grows as we mature as a people and as a republic. We have in this Congress done more to enrich the lives of our fellow Americans in recent years than most of the Congresses that preceded us.

Our Supreme Court has proved in the last 15 years that the rights of the individual American, regardless of his birth or station in life, are precious. Those rights and the protection of them largely determine the sort of people we are.

There is a majesty in the law which transcends generations.

By introducing this bill today it is my hope to encourage greater numbers of young people to seek a career in the law, if you will, and to render their talents in service to their community.

In an earlier day Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote of his vocation to the law thus:

> If a man has the soul of Sancho Panza, the world to him will be Sancho Panza's world; but if he has the soul of an idealist, he will make—I do not say find—his world ideal.

The law is the calling of thinkers. But to those who believe with me that not the least godlike of men's activities is the large survey of causes, that to know is not less than to feel, I say that a man may live greatly in the law as well as elsewhere; that there as well as elsewhere his thought may find its unity in an infinite perspective; that there as well as elsewhere he may plunge himself into life, may drink the bitter cup of heroism, may wear his heart out after the unattainable.

By augmenting the very worthwhile legislation that has already been enacted providing for legal services and legal clinics, my legislation would speed up the process of educating young attorneys and help to provide them with the best education of all—practical experience in a legal office.

This bill provides a means whereby educational institutions which seek to be relevant to the turbulence of our modern times can serve, not only the students who yearn for the challenge of hard and practical experience, but the community at large, which can only benefit from having greater access to the law and to lawyers.

I urge my colleagues to read this legislation carefully and to give it their support, for indeed we are now at a juncture in time when many Americans are losing confidence in the nobility of our democratic cause—Americans who do not believe that they can find recourse, redress for their grievances, Americans who become easy prey for those who would try to tell them that this great Republic does not offer an American the protection he is entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I think despite the impressive job the legal profession already has done, much more needs to be done, and I believe neighborhood legal clinics, available to every citizen, young or old, for whatever may be his grievance, may indeed be our answer to the violence and to the temptation by citizens to take the law into their own hands. I honestly and sincerely believe that there is redress for every single grievance that any citizen might have in this country, but it is in the orderly process of court and judicial review.

I believe one reason why people turn to violence is that they do not have access to the machinery of our law, simply because either there are not any lawyers available in a community, or if there are, the lawyers are busy in other pursuits. I certainly do not intend for this legislation in any way to compete with existing lawyers. I believe there is enough work in this country, with the growth of population and the growth of the complexity of our society, for all present lawyers and all future lawyers.

Obviously, under this program those who can afford legal counsel will continue to take advantage of such private counsel.

But those who cannot, for whatever reason, afford legal counsel, will have access to professional legal advice as to their rights, within the neighborhood legal clinics. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I hope this proposal will get careful consideration and study by the legal profession itself, by the bar associations of the various States, and the American Bar Association, and by the responsible law schools of this country.

I have great confidence in Dr. Levi who recently proposed that we ought to consider seriously a 4-year course for lawyers.

My bill goes one step further. We require that the first 2 years after graduation and after successfully taking the bar examination, the fledgling lawyer would give those 2 years of his service in the neighborhood legal clinic. This would give him vast experience and at the same time would give the people of that community the knowledge that if they have a grievance, and if they do not understand some aspect of the complex structure of our society, they can indeed get legal counsel in such a clinic to clear up the situation for them and to advise them whether they should pursue their grievance any further, or whether they have exhausted their rights under the law.

Of course, those eligible for military service upon graduation would not be excused, but they could serve in the adjutant general's office to fulfill their 2-year requirement of 2 years of legal service to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, unless we provide this kind of assistance for the citizens of this country, we will see turmoil flourish, we will see more and more violence in the cities. There is no need for violence in America today if every citizen will have access to the majesty of the law.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of the Legal Profession Development Act follows:

H.R. 12617

A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide a comprehensive program for the training of attorneys and related personnel in order to improve the legal services available to the community and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That title XI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE XI—LEGAL PROFESSION DEVELOPMENT

"PART A—ACCELERATED LEGAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1101. There is authorized to be appropriated for making grants to enable institutions of higher education to carry on accelerated legal training programs as provided in this part, the sum of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and there is authorized to be appropriated for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary for making such grants.

"DESCRIPTION OF ACCELERATED LEGAL TRAINING PROGRAM

"SEC. 1102. To qualify for assistance under this part as an accelerated legal training program, a program shall—

"(1) be carried on by an institution of higher education which has as a constituent part thereof a law school which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose,

"(2) admit as participants in the program only students who have successfully completed at least their secondary education,

"(3) provide participants with a program of education, consisting of courses at the undergraduate level and of courses in law, which is designed to provide them with the education and training necessary to qualify them to practice law in the States, after passing whatever examinations the State may require as proof of competency,

"(4) provide the participant, upon successful completion of his accelerated legal training program and his admission to the bar of the State, with employment as an attorney in a legal aid program, a legal services program carried on under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, a clinical experience program carried on under part B of this title, or in any other program operated by a public or private nonprofit agency to provide legal services to the community.

"QUALIFICATIONS FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 1103. Grants may be made by the Commissioner under this part to institutions of higher education to assist them in planning for, developing, and carrying out accelerated legal training programs described in section 1102. Such grants shall be made only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve an application unless it—

"(1) provides that while a participant is pursuing his program, he will be paid a stipend at the rate fixed by the institution, but not higher than the rate of $2,000 per academic year, plus $500 per academic year for each of his dependents,

"(2) requires each participant in the program to obligate himself (in such manner as the Commissioner may prescribe) to accept and engage for not less than two years in the legal employment arranged for him by the institution of higher education,

"(3) provides that during his two-year period of required legal employment, the participant will be compensated for his services at a rate prescribed by the Commissioner,

"(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part, and

"(5) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"PARTICIPANT'S FAILURE TO MEET OBLIGATION

"SEC. 1104. If a participant in a program assisted under this part fails to fulfill the obligation described in paragraph (2) of section 1103 to provide legal services, he shall be liable to the United States in an amount equal to the stipends paid him during his participation in the accelerated legal training program.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR ADMISSION TO PRACTICE

"SEC. 1105. No grant shall be made under this part to an institution of higher education which is located in a State which will not permit persons who have successfully completed an accelerated legal training program assisted under this part to practice law in that State, even after they have, through regular bar examination procedures, demonstrated their professional qualifications.

"PART B—LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

"PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 1121. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into contracts with accredited law schools in the States for the purpose of paying not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of establishing or expanding programs in such schools to provide clinical experience to students in the practice of law, with preference being given to programs providing such experience, to the extent practicable, in the preparation and trial of cases.

"(b) Such costs may include necessary expenditures incurred for—

"(1) planning;

"(2) training of faculty members and salary for additional faculty members;

"(3) travel and per diem for faculty and students;

"(4) reasonable stipends for students for work in the public service performed as part of any such program at a time other than during the regular academic year;

"(5) equipment; and

"(6) such other items as are allowed pursuant to regulations issued by the Commissioner.

"(c) No law school may receive more than $75,000 in any fiscal year pursuant to this part.

"(d) For the purpose of this part the term 'accredited law school' means any law school which is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose.

"APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 1122. (a) A contract authorized by this part may be made by the Commissioner upon application which—

"(1) is made at such time or times and contains such information as he may prescribe;

"(2) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part; and

"(3) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall allocate contracts under this part in such manner as will provide an equitable distribution of such contracts throughout the United States among law schools which show promise of being able to use funds effectively for the purposes of this part.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1123. There are authorized to be appropriated $7,500,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, and each of the nine succeeding fiscal years to carry out the purposes of this part (and planning and related activities in the initial fiscal year for such purposes).

"PART C—LEGAL INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

"ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 1131. The Commisisoner shall establish and carry out a legal internship program under which persons who have recently been admitted to the bar are provided with employment as legal interns providing legal services in a legal aid program, in a legal services program carried on under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, in a clinical experience program carried on under part B of this title, or in any other program operated by a public or private nonprofit agency to provide legal services to the community.

"REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAMS

"SEC. 1132. The program provided for under the preceding section shall be carried on through grants or contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies. Persons shall receive compensation as legal interns at rates prescribed by the Commissioner. No person shall serve as a legal intern for more than two years. The Commissioner, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, shall develop employment opportunities for persons who have completed their participation in the legal internship program.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 1133. There are authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this part $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $10,000,000 for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years.

"PART D—COOPERATIVE LEGAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 1141. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $10,000,000 for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants pursuant to section 1142 to institutions of higher educations for the planning, establishment, expansion, or carrying out by such institutions of programs of cooperative legal education that alternate periods of full-time law school study with periods of full-time public or private employment that will not only afford students the opportunity to earn through employment funds required toward continuing and completing their legal education but will, so far as practicable, give them work experience related to their future professional activities. Such amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall also be available for planning related activities for the purpose of this part.

"(c) Appropriations under this part shall not be available for the payment of compensation of law students for employment by employers under arrangements pursuant to this part.

"GRANTS FOR PROGRAMS OF COOPERATIVE LEGAL EDUCATION

"SEC. 1142. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of section 1151, and for the purposes set forth therein, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education that have applied therefor in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, in amounts not in excess of $50,000 to any one such institution for any fiscal year.

"(b) Each application for a grant authorized by subsection (a) of this section shall be filed with the Commissioner at such time or times as he may prescribe and shall—

"(1) set forth programs or activities for which a grant is authorized under this section;

"(2) provide that the applicant will expend during such fiscal year for the purpose of such program or activity not less than was expended for such purpose during the previous fiscal year;

"(3) provide for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for the keeping of such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(4) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part; and

"(5) include such other information as the Commissioner may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

"(c) No institution of higher education may receive grants under this section for more than three fiscal years.

"(d) In the development of criteria for approval of applications under this section, the Commissioner shall consult with the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students.

"PART E—NEW CAREERS PROGRAM

"SEC. 1151. The Commissioner shall develop and carry out a new careers program under which persons are provided with jobs leading to career opportunities in the legal profession, including new types of careers, in programs designed to make legal services more readily available in the community being served, which (1) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, (2) give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs in the legal profession and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and (3) provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement. Programs carried on under this part shall be of an experimental or demonstration nature, and shall be conducted on such terms and conditions and with such persons, organizations, and agencies as the Commissioner may determine."

SEC. 1152. Section 202 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Of the sums appropriated to carry out this Act for a fiscal year, not less than 5 per centum shall be used only for the construction of law schools."

SEC. 1153. Section 522 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Not less than 5 per centum of the fellowships awarded in any fiscal year shall be awarded for study for persons who are pursuing or plan to pursue a career as a law school teacher."

## NO LOGICAL ALTERNATIVE TO ABM DEPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. POLLOCK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the moment of truth when we must decide whether or not this Congress will authorize the funding of the defensive Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. The naked issue for decision is simply this: Shall the United States develop a capability for defending itself against an attack by an offensive intercontinental ballistic missile?

There is much confusion in thinking and many conflicting opinions voiced by self-styled experts on President Nixon's proposed anti-ballistic-missile program—ABM. From some of the statements that are made, it is obvious that many persons voicing emotional opinions do not understand one fundamental point that should be unmistakably clear in the mind of everyone. The ABM is a defensive and not an offensive missile system.

I have just received a letter signed by a group of educators asking that all public-spirited citizens exert every democratic procedure to discontinue the ABM system. The letter went on to say:

> The use of these weapons in war can inflict massive and indiscriminate destruction far exceeding the bounds of legitimate defense.

This is utterly ridiculous. Once an enemy ICBM is launched for a target in the United States, there is no way to call that offensive missile back to its launching pad. It continues on its lethal way to bring death and destruction to a selected target area here in the United States. Either this lethal offensive weapon is destroyed en route to the target by an antimissile missile—ABM—or it will reach its target and indeed inflict massive and indiscriminate destruction.

Currently there is an undeniable vulnerability of the United States, because we do not have any defense against an enemy ICBM attack. Soviet Russia decided long ago that an ABM system was essential for its overall military posture,

so it already has installed one. Of course, nobody either in Russia or the United States opposed the move as a threat to peace. The weakest argument offered by opponents of the Safeguard antiballistic missile is that such a defensive system against a nuclear "first strike" by the Soviet Union would be "provocative." This is sheer nonsense. Why should the Soviet Union care whether America has a defense against a nuclear first strike—unless it is planning one?

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, recently said:

> If there is one thing about our dove-minded popoffs which never ceases to amaze me, it is how they excuse everything the Russians do and sneer at the very idea that the Communists are a threat.

I could not agree more. I would add that I am also continuously amazed that these same people never utter a comment of criticism when Russia engages in provocative warlike activities or accelerates the arms race by constructing more and more offensive weapons of holocaust and destruction, but these individuals are poised to vigorously criticize our efforts to merely defend the United States by developing the capability of destroying attacking missiles, not enemy nations.

The anti-ballistic-missile system that has been proposed by President Nixon and which is now before the Congress is the so-called Safeguard system, which is essentially a modification of what used to be called the Sentinel system as proposed by President Johnson. It is defensive, not offensive.

Initially, I think a few comments on the history of this program may be in order. It has long been recognized, ever since the advent of long-range ballistic missiles, that the greatest danger this country faced was a possible attack with ballistic missiles by another country, more particularly the Soviet Union. To meet the earlier bomber threat we had gone to great effort to provide an air defense of this country by aircraft and with missiles. While these defenses against bomber attack could not be expected to be perfect, they could contribute substantially to the defense of this country in the event of an air attack.

With the advent of the intercontinental ballistic missile in the late fifties—some 10 years ago—it became apparent that this country would become increasingly vulnerable to missile attack. Accordingly, we initiated a high priority research and development effort to produce some sort of a weapon system to defend this country against attack by ballistic missiles. For a number of years we worked to develop what was called the Nike-Zeus system, building on the experience of the earlier Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules, antibomber defense systems. The Nike-Hercules, in fact, is still an important component of our present defenses against attack by aircraft.

In the development and testing of the Nike-Zeus system, the general concept of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system was proved out. We proved that it was possible—as the saying goes—to hit a bullet with a bullet. However, the Zeus system had very serious limitations, and was never actually put into operation. I should mention, in this connection that the ABM system that has been deployed around Moscow by the Soviet Union—about which I will say more in a moment—is generally thought to be roughly comparable to our old Nike-Zeus system. The principal weakness of the system is that it has what is referred to as a mechanically slewed radar—with the kind of revolving antenna you normally picture when you visualize a radar. And the trouble with this kind of a radar is that it is inherently incapable of handling enough targets simultaneously to cope with a heavy attack. There were other shortcomings in the Zeus system, but it was this radar problem which made it inadvisable to deploy the system.

To get around this problem and others, a new research and development project was undertaken to replace the Nike-Zeus. This was the so-called Nike X system. I will not dwell on the differences between the two systems, except to say that instead of the one Nike-Zeus missile, the Nike X system called for the use of two missiles. One is known as the Spartan missile, replacing the old Zeus missile, which had a longer range and which was intended to engage the incoming enemy nuclear warhead at great altitude, outside the atmosphere. The other is the so-called Sprint missile, which as the name implies, can be fired at great speed to engage warheads which get by the Spartan for one reason or another. In the case of the Sprint, however, the engagement takes place at relatively low altitudes, within the atmosphere. In effect, this amounts to a last-ditch defense—almost a last-second defense—which explains why the Sprint is such a high-speed missile, and must accelerate rapidly after firing to reach the point of intercept. If you will just imagine a missile firing at the speed of a bullet, you will have a general picture of the Sprint.

The other great difference between the Nike X and the old Nike-Zeus system is that instead of the mechanically slewed radar, the Nike X employs what amounts to an electronically slewed radar—the so-called phased array radar. Instead of a revolving antenna, this radar can search for and acquire potential targets by electronically scanning the sky. This can be done at high speed, and the radar is capable of handling a great many targets simultaneously. This marks a great advance over the Nike-Zeus radar, where each radar could handle only one target at a time.

Now it was from these basic components—the Spartan and Sprint missiles and the new phased array radar—that it was proposed to construct the so-called Sentinel system, as recommended by the Johnson administration. Similarly, the Safeguard system now proposed by President Nixon builds on these same developments. There are, however, rather distinctive differences between the Sentinel and Safeguard systems with respect to their purposes. And it is important that these differences be understood.

Perhaps the best way to illustrate these differences is to put the matter in perspective by indicating the alternatives visualized for the Nike X system from the early stages of its development:

First, it was generally recognized that there was no feasible way, with known technology, of providing the United States with such a strong defense against missile attack as to provide a high degree of protection against an intense and highly sophisticated missile attack, of the kind that the Soviet Union was capable of delivering against this country. It was felt that any attempt by the United States to defend our urban areas could easily be negated by the Soviet Union simply by expanding their offensive capabilities and by using penetration aids so as to saturate the defense. Moreover, it was believed virtually certain that the Soviets would react in this way in order to preserve their deterrent against the United States. It should be noted that there were some who did not accept this assessment as a foregone conclusion. They believed that the Soviet Union would find it very difficult, for a variety of reasons—military, technological, and economic—to easily overcome such a missile defense of this country; and so they favored deployment of the Nike X to defend our population centers because it might save many lives if war should come. On balance of considerations, then—notably the great cost for such a conjectural gain—the deployment of the Nike X system for a city defense of this country did not appear the prudent course.

Second, while this kind of heavy or thick ABM defense of this country did not appear warranted, it was believed that the Nike X could provide a meaningful level of defense for our population against the kind of less intense attack that the Chinese Communists might be capable of mounting at some time in the future—say in the 1970's. Initially, it was felt that we had not yet reached the point where this prospect was so discernible as to require that we proceed immediately with deploying the Nike X system. It was felt that there was sufficient time to defer this decision for at least a time because it would take the Chinese Communists longer to develop and deploy an ICBM than it would take us to put in an ABM defense if later developments should warrant. Accordingly, we could defer this decision for some period. However, by September 1967, it was decided that we should go ahead with a system to provide a defense against the possibility of Chinese attack in the 1970's, and it was on this basis that the Johnson administration proposed and the Congress supported the so-called Sentinel system to provide what was characterized as a "thin" defense of this country against the kind of low-level attack which the Chinese Communists might be capable of launching by the mid 1970's. It was believed that the Sentinel system could afford a high degree of protection to our population against this kind of attack, for at least an interim period. And it was also thought that the system could be improved through time to provide a substantial defense of this country as Chinese Communist capabilities were improved. It is for these reasons that the Sentinel system was commonly referred to as being China-oriented. There were some who also believed that the Sentinel would introduce additional complications for the Soviet Union should they ever decide to attack this country.

And finally, of course, the Sentinel would provide protection against the possibility of an accidental missile attack from any source.

A third possible role for an ABM—beyond those of providing either a thick or thin defense of our population—was that of protecting our land-based ICBM's, especially the Minuteman, in the event they should become vulnerable to attack by Soviet missiles. It had long been recognized that Soviet weapons might become so powerful and so accurate, that our Minuteman might some day be threatened with destruction, despite the protection afforded by the concrete silos in which they are emplaced. It was not believed that this danger was so imminent as to require immediate steps to provide an ABM defense for Minuteman. But at the time the Sentinel system was announced, and thereafter, this option was always preserved against the day when it might become necessary to provide such a defense.

These, then, are the factors which have long entered into the consideration of this whole ABM question: First, a thick defense to protect our population from a heavy attack—a course judged to be infeasible with present technology; second, a thin defense to protect against a light attack, whether deliberate or accidental—a course judged to be feasible; and, third, protection of our retaliatory force as a means of strengthening deterrence—an option that it might become necessary to exercise at some time if the Soviet threat were to develop in ways which might threaten the survibability of our Minuteman ICBM's. In the Sentinel proposal, it was decided to go for the thin defense of our population against a Chinese Communist attack, and to preserve the option of later extending the system to protect the Minuteman force. Moreover, the actual deployment proposed for the Sentinel would have provided the basis for subsequently thickening the system so as to provide a higher level of protection for our urban centers against a heavy attack.

It is against this background that we can better understand exactly what is involved in the ABM system now proposed by the present administration; that is, the so-called Safeguard system. What it amounts to is that with the passage of time and our altered perception of the Soviet threat, it is now proposed that we pick up the option of deploying an ABM system to protect our Minuteman force, with this purpose now becoming a primary justification for the system. The Safeguard system will retain that purpose which was the primary justification for the Sentinel proposal; namely, protection of our population against a light attack from any source, more particularly Communist China. And finally, the Safeguard deployment is designed so as to avoid the suggestion that the system has been designed as the first stage of thicker defense of our urban areas against a heavy attack by the Soviet Union, an option built into the Sentinel system as it had been proposed. In this way, it is believed that the U.S.S.R. is less likely to misinterpret the intent of the Safeguard system, and react accordingly by increasing their own offensive capabilities.

What this all amounts to is that there are real differences between the Sentinel and Safeguard systems, but they are principally a matter of emphasis, timing, and atmospherics. The Safeguard proposal, for example, is visualized as a phased, and measured deployment, depending upon developments in technology, changes in the Soviet threat, and progress in the expected talks with the U.S.S.R. on limiting strategic arms. The first phase, as you know, is the deployment of ABM defenses to protect the Minuteman forces centered at Great Falls, Mont., and Grand Forks, N. Dak. If necessary, later phases of the deployment would be intended to provide protection for additional Minutemen missiles, for our strategic bombers, for the command and control system of our strategic forces, and finally for the thin defense of our entire population. Sentinel, on the other hand, was visualized at the outset as a complete system, although further construction could obviously have been terminated at any time, if conditions had so warranted.

Another conceptual difference between the two systems should be noted. The difficulty with trying to provide a defense for our cities is that to be effective, the defense must be perfect. Cities are soft targets, and it is not enough to knock out—say 90 percent of the incoming warheads. If the enemy attacks you with 10 weapons, and you knock out nine but the 10th one gets through, the defense has not really provided a meaningful protection. In the case of hard targets, however, such as our Minuteman silos, we have a very different story. Here, you have contributed to the protection of your deterrent force in direct proportion to your success in destroying enemy warheads before they impact.

Now, I have gone into this rather substantial background with respect to the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system because the issue now before the country is so little understood, and because there is so much misinformation. The real question now before us whether we should go ahead with this ABM deployment at this time, when there are so many demands upon available resources. Concretely, we are talking about a system which in this and the next fiscal years would amount to an estimated cost of $1.7 billion. The entire Safeguard system, if deployed in all its phases, would represent an investment on the order of $7 billion. We would, of course, be deceiving ourselves if we took these estimates too literally. From past experience we know full well that military hardware turns out to cost much more than we had originally anticipated. We should not be surprised that this is the case, particularly if we are to take advantage of new technological developments as the project goes forward. But it nonetheless is a fact.

Now, I think our constituents are entitled to know where their representatives in Congress stand on this most important issue. After long and careful study, I have concluded that President Nixon's proposal to deploy an ABM system for the primary purpose of protecting our retaliatory forces merits the support of the Congress, and I mean to cast my votes accordingly. I have not arrived at this conclusion lightly, and I fully respect most of the contrary opinions of others. As Mr. McNamara stated in September 1967, at San Francisco when he announced the original decision to deploy the Sentinel system, it was a marginal decision. Clearly, it is still a marginal decision. But if there is any chance that this decision could make the margin of difference as to whether or not this country is ever subjected to nuclear attack, then I for one have no difficulty in deciding where I stand. If the administration is wrong and we deploy Safeguard, all that is lost is money. On the other hand if the opponents of ABM are wrong and we do not deploy Safeguard then the United States faces outright destruction or nuclear blackmail. And it is because I can conceive of circumstances in which this deployment could represent that margin of difference, that I will support the Safeguard system when it comes up for a vote in the House of Representatives.

Time does not permit me to describe all the reasons why I have arrived at this judgment. Let me only say that the most important reasons have to do with the growing threat represented by Soviet strategic forces. I also believe that a thin ABM defense of this country against Communist China will be important if the United States is to be able to conduct what President Nixon has referred to as a "credible diplomacy" in East Asia and the Western Pacific.

But it is the developments in the Soviet Union which give me principal concern. This is where the real threat to our security is to be found. Quite apart from political developments in the U.S.S.R., which can only be described as disquieting—notably a quality of "unpredictability" since the Czechoslovakian invasion of August 1968—it is possible to view military developments in the Soviet Union with equanimity. The present and growing strength of the Soviet navy and merchant fleet, along with other developments, can only be interpreted as portending a new and expanded capability on the part of the Soviet Union to project its influence around the world in ways which are almost certainly calculated to endanger U.S. national interests. The Soviet Union knows from all prior history that this Nation is not going to attack them. So why do they keep arming themselves? Why do they keep building bigger and deadlier missles, nuclear subs, supersonic jets? The ominous reason should not be too hard to figure out.

It is the threat presented by Soviet strategic forces which is of most immediate relevance for the ABM decision facing this country, and it is on this aspect of Soviet military strength that I want to focus. First, let me briefly summarize some of the information made public in recent weeks in the course of the ABM debate. At the present time, the Soviets either have in place or under construction more ICBM's than we do; you may recall we have a total of 1,000 Minuteman and 54 Titan missiles. Secretary of De-

fense Laird recently announced that the Soviet Union has "about 1,000" ICBM's in hardened silos, along with 140 older ICBM's on exposed launchers. Even more significantly, he indicates that at the rate they are building missiles now, the Russians, by the mid-1970's, could have as many as 2,500 missiles in hardened silos. How many more ICBM's they will actually deploy, we have no way of knowing. That is fact No. 1.

Fact No. 2 is that something over 200 of these Soviet ICBM's are the so-called SS–9 missile, which is capable of carrying a very large payload—much larger than in the case of our own ICBM's. That payload can either be in the form of a single warhead, estimated at 20 to 25 megatons, or a number of smaller warheads, estimated to be three or four warheads of about 5 megatons each. We can have every expectation that these multiple warheads will in time be independently targetable. Here again, we have no way of knowing where this SS–9 program will level off. But they clearly have the capability of building a force of 500 such missiles by the mid-1970's, if they elect to do so, and if each one could launch three warheads accurately against separate targets, they would have a capability with the SS–9 force alone—not counting other ICBM's such as the SS–11's and SS–13's—of launching up to 1,500 warheads against our ICBM force of 1,054 missiles. It is this possibility that has led the President to conclude that this Nation must make a start now to safeguard our ICBM's against such a danger, and proceed with the program as may be necessary to cope with whatever Soviet ICBM threat may evolve. There are limits to the protection that can be provided by further hardening of our missiles. We could, of course, build more strategic missiles of one kind or another, but we are hopeful that we can arrest, through arms control talks, an additional substantial deployment of offensive weapons. This leaves us only with the option of protecting our Minuteman missiles with an ABM defense to the extent judged necessary to insure the survival of a sufficient force so as to deter the Soviet Union from ever gambling on a first strike against this country.

But in addition to the great and growing Soviet ICBM capability, we now know that they are going ahead with a massive program to build Polaris-type submarines, each with 16 missile tubes, just as in our own. They are reported to have built seven of these vessels this past year, and to be capable of building at the rate of 12 a year. Secretary Laird has noted that the Russians could, by the mid-1970's, pass the United States in Polaris-type submarines. At present, we have no plans to go beyond the current force of 41 submarines, for a total of 656 Polaris missiles. Programs are going forward to convert 31 of these submarines to the Poseidon missile, which is commonly credited with a design capability of 10 independently targetable reentry vehicles, or MIRV's.

We have no way of knowing just how far the Soviets may proceed with their program, but it is obvious that if they were to build to their full capability, it would not be many years before they would exceed our present strength in submarine-launched ballistic missiles. Moreover, there is no reason why the Soviet Polaris-type missiles could not have multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles—or MIRV's—just as we are planning for our own Polaris boats as they are converted to the Poseidon missile. These current developments in Soviet ballistic missile submarines are quite apart from the continuing growth of the Soviet attack submarines force, which it is also feared might come to present a serious threat to our Polaris force.

One could go on to describe other potential developments in the Soviet strategic forces, such as the possibility of their deploying what is called a fractional orbiting bombardment system—or FOBS—a system which they have apparently been testing for some time, and which might come to threaten our bomber forces.

Of particular importance is the long-standing Soviet interest in developing an ABM defense. At one stage they deployed a first-generation system around Leningrad, and then abandoned it. More recently they have been deploying a system around Moscow—the so-called Galosh system. It is believed that this system called for the establishment of some 100 missiles sites around Moscow which could defend not only the city itself but which could also provide a substantial missile defense for a rather large area in European U.S.S.R. At the present stage of construction, apparently 67 such sites are in place, but it is believed that further construction has been held up. The reason for this slowdown is not known, but it is widely suspected that the reason is to introduce a more sophisticated radar, presumably of the phased array type, to overcome the weaknesses of the mechanically slewed radar to which I referred earlier. If this should prove to be the case, the modified Galosh system would obviously acquire a capability significantly greater than that with which it is now credited.

Then there is the so-called Tallinn system which is widely deployed throughout the Soviet Union. There has long been a division of opinion as to the purpose of this system. The majority view is that the Tallinn system is designed for defense against bomber aircraft and air-launched missiles. Others believe that the system has a growth potential that could give it an ABM capability. If the minority view should prove to be correct, it could represent a significant shift in the overall strategic balance. In any event, we know that research and development on the ABM, is proceeding at a pace in the U.S.S.R. According to Secretary Laird, the Soviets could by the mid-1970's deploy anywhere from 200 to 2,000 ABM missiles.

Now I do not believe that out of all these developments in Soviet strategic forces we can conclude that the leadership of the U.S.S.R. is very likely now, or in the future, to conclude that a first strike against the United States could be undertaken at acceptable cost. We have heard a lot of debate in recent weeks over whether the Soviet Union may be attempting to achieve such a first-strike capability. Personally, I find this whole question highly irrelevant. I know of no way to divine what their intentions may be.

But even if one assumes that the Soviet strategic forces are being built up as a second-strike deterrent—which I believe to be their fundamental purpose—the fact remains that this essentially second-strike force could be used in a first-strike role if circumstances should ever seem to warrant. Moreover, the evolving character of the Soviet offensive forces, including especially the SS–9 missiles to which I have referred, are admirably suited for a counterforce strike against our ICBM force if such an option should ever be adopted by the Soviets, for whatever reason. It is against this possible danger that I feel we have no alternative but to move now toward providing additional protection for our Minuteman missiles, so as to strengthen this component of the deterrent against the possibility that other components may become increasingly vulnerable in ways which we cannot now clearly foresee. I do not find this a happy choice. But I cannot in good conscience take a stand which might produce a "deterrence gap" somewhere in the mid-1970's and conceivably bring on a nuclear war.

In summary, several points should be emphasized: the proposed Safeguard system is a defensive system, not an offensive system. Once fired, an ICBM cannot be recalled. It either has to destroy or be destroyed. An offensive ICBM in our arsenal cannot be used to seek out and destroy an incoming enemy offensive ICBM. It is not designed as an antimissile missile. It is an attack and retaliation weapon of destruction. Without an ABM defense the United States faces outright destruction with reliance only on retaliatory measures. With the development of an effective antimissile system the Russians have the capacity for an all-out first strike and a shield at home against U.S. missiles, so that they could probably absorb U.S. retaliatory efforts with little damage.

One final comment in closing. I would hope that we might find it unnecessary to move on to later phases in the proposed Safeguard system, either because the Soviet threat does not materialize to the extent that now seems possible, or because we are able through arms limitation talks with the U.S.S.R. to stabilize the strategic balance at lower levels, to include both offensive and defensive weapons. It is most important that we proceed with such talks as rapidly as possible.

But we would only be deceiving ourselves, it seems to me, if we proceed on the assumption that these talks have a high prospect for producing a successful outcome. At the very least, they are likely to be long drawn out. We simply cannot accept, unilaterally, a moratorium on whatever strengthening of our strategic forces may be necessary to preserve the deterrent balance, simply in the hope that the strategic arms talks will result in the desired outcome. And in my opinion there is a better chance that such talks will be successful if we do not neglect our strategic ramparts while the negotiations go forward.

I have tried in these remarks to explain the reasons why I have come to the conclusion that the ABM system pro-

posed by the Nixon administration merits public support, and why it will receive my vote in Congress. I would not expect that everyone would agree with these views, for there is clearly a large element of subjectivity in this kind of a judgment. I would much prefer that the economic resources be used in getting on with other important aspects of the Nation's business. But I must be concerned first of all that the Nation stays in business. In my judgment, this additional element of insurance is well worth the cost, if there is any danger that the alternative could prove fatal. I, for one, will not take that chance.

## DAN SMOOT—AMERICAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last night the New England Rally for God, Family, and Country meeting at Boston, Mass., honored Dan Smoot of Dallas, Tex., founder and publisher of the Dan Smoot Report, "for a life of dedication to America and her liberty."

I think that our colleagues will find the remarks of this highly respected constitutionalist of great interest, so I include a short biography on Dan Smoot and the full text of his speech in the RECORD:

DAN SMOOT

Dan Smoot, author, lecturer, historian, and patriot, was born on a farm near East Prairie, Missouri. Although as a small boy he had little formal education, his father taught him to read and to love reading even before he entered the one-room country schoolhouse near their place. Because his parents died when he was very young, he found himself as a young man in his early teens traveling the length and breadth of America working at one type of job after another. He shined shoes, mined coal, chopped cotton, rode fence, and even stirred mash for a Kentucky moonshiner, and while he worked, he saw and learned to love America. He finally settled in Dallas where he married his lovely wife Mabeth. The Smoots now have two children.

In Dallas he started his academic career earning first a high school diploma and then a Bachelors and later a Masters Degree at Southern Methodist University. In 1941 Dan Smoot was granted a Teaching Fellowship in English at Harvard where he began work on a doctorate of philosophy in American Civilization. At Harvard he first became aware that not everyone shared his love for America and American principles. "Some of my friends in the graduate school and associates on the faculty at Harvard had an attitude toward America which I had never encountered before," he writes. But his career at Harvard was cut short when Pearl Harbor shocked the nation, and putting aside everything to come to the aid of his country, he took a leave of absence to join the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Dan Smoot began his nine and one-half years with the FBI as an agent working on a variety of cases. Then for three and one-half years he worked solely on cases involving communist investigations. It was then that he became acutely aware of communism and its advance in the United States. He calls the experience a shattering one. His last two years, he worked at FBI headquarters in Washington, D.C. as administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

In 1951 he resigned from the FBI to join the Facts Forum of Dallas. He was to choose important national issues and to present both sides of these issues on broadcasts carried on 350 radio stations and 80 television channels. But Dan Smoot is a political constitutionalist and a fundamental Christian and to him issues could only be looked at and presented from their moral and constitutional side. To this end, he resigned from the Facts Forum to begin his own publication, "The Dan Smoot Report."

Resolving to rely completely on the free enterprise system, Dan Smoot and his wife used their entire savings to send out the first trial issue of his report. The overwhelming response of Americans grateful for what he was doing encouraged them to continue and today not only does he present his report as a fine publication, he broadcasts a condensed version over national radio and television. In addition to "The Dan Smoot Report," he has written three excellent books: *The Hope of the World, America's Promise,* and *The Invisible Government.*

Tonight we gather to honor Mr. Dan Smoot, founder and publisher of "The Dan Smoot Report" and courageous patriot, for a life of dedication to America and her liberty.

---

SPEECH BY DAN SMOOT IN BOSTON, MASS., JULY 7, 1969, BEFORE THE NEW ENGLAND RALLY FOR GOD, FAMILY AND COUNTRY

It would be unrealistic of me to wish I were worthy of your tribute; but I do wish I were adequate to the task of thanking you properly.

I am very grateful—to Colonel Bunker and Mrs. McKinney and all the others, for their enormous expenditure of time, talent, energy, and money to provide us this exhilarating Fourth-of-July occasion every year.

I am grateful that there are so many of us, from every corner of the land, who share an unabashed pride in rallying to honor God, family, and country.

I am grateful that our lives have been enriched by dedication in a Cause to which we can rally with honor.

I am grateful to Pat Manion for that eulogy which made me long to get acquainted with the unique fellow he was talking about.

And, of course, I am grateful to all of you for this exciting moment in my life.

We are supposed to be living in an age when the generation gap is a yawning chasm, and youth has no respect for age.

I have not found it so in my personal experience. In fact, I have been around so long I have become venerable.

On my last speaking trip, I had an experience that is commonplace with me nowadays. I met a young lady—in her middle-thirties—who looked at me searchingly and spoke to me—in respectful tone, I thought. She told me that when she was a kid in school, her parents used to make her watch my television program.

Young parents reared in non-permissive homes often become even sterner disciplinarians than their own parents were. I don't know whether this is because they learned the value of discipline, or whether, subconsciously, they are retaliating against their children for what their parents did to them. At any rate, this one now makes her youngster read my Report.

Many prerequisites go with age. One is the fun of giving advice, whether solicited or not.

The young woman I mentioned (like many other parents), wanted my advice on a college for her son, where he would not be exposed to liberal-socialist distortions of history and debasement of learning.

I suggested she equip him with a suit of armor and let him go where he please. If we parents wait for the colleges to form the character of our children, it may be too late to expect anything worthwhile. I believe a youngster whose home life gave him a sufficient exposure to love of God and country, who has enough native intelligence to understand liberty, and who was endowed with enough courage to value it, will be impregnable to the asininities and stupidities of liberal professors.

If he *has* an appetite for Galbraithian swill dished up as higher-learning, I don't think his parents will make a major contribution to civilization—or do him much good either—by pauperizing themselves to keep him in college. I'd suggest they take him off the dole. Let him get a job and pay for his own brainwashing.

Young people dedicated to our noble cause of restoring the American constitutional Republic often ask me what they ought to do about liberal professors and the socialist propaganda assigned as required reading. I suggest they listen to the professors and read the required books—if they want to get passing grades. The broad-minded objectivity that liberal intellectuals boast is not something they practice. It's something they talk about when condemning us constitutionalists for being narrow and prejudiced.

Some of our fine youngsters, of course, feel obligated to try to convert their liberal professors. I don't recommend that. If he's old enough to be a professor and is still a liberal, he's probably hopeless and possibly retarded.

My own son Larry has had some experience with liberal teachers. Because Larry has grown up in an environment of books and writing, most people *assume* he is a scholar.

That is not entirely accurate. Larry has an allergic condition which textbooks seem to aggravate.

Nonetheless, he was selected in his school last year to take an advanced course in World History. His mother did not think he was ready, at age 15, for an *advanced* course in anything; I didn't either; but I reckoned he was about as ready as he would ever be. So, he took it.

About the middle of the first semester, Mrs. Smoot suggested I look at Larry's report card. I didn't want to do it. I don't believe in compulsory education. I don't think it should be forced on anyone. It's a privilege that should be available to all those who value it enough to asume the responsibility that goes *with* privilege.

But I've been married to Mrs. Smoot 36 years, and I have learned that when she *suggests* something to me—well, I looked at Larry's report card. He was doing all right in other subjects, but was on the ragged edge of failure in World History.

Mrs. Smoot suggested I have a talk with him. I didn't want to do that either; but I did. I cornered him in the backyard where I found him building a complicated cage to trap a racoon painlessly and simultaneously trigger my best tape recorder so he could learn the vocal-emotional reaction of a trapped coon.

I asked him how he built the contraption. He said he just used his head. That gave me a pretty good opening. I asked him why he wasn't using his head in World History. He replied: "My teacher is a nut."

I was prepared to believe that, because he had been relaying some of his teacher's ideas to me—about how we needn't worry over the national debt, because we just owe it to ourselves; and about our war in Vietnam being imperialistic aggression against women and children and agrarian reformers.

But I thought I ought to be broad-minded and ask for more evidence. Larry produced it. He told me about the teacher's recent lecture on the theory of evolution—the biblical account of creation is a fable, because man obviously descended from the primates, and so on. I'd never really discussed that subject with Larry; so, I asked him how he felt about it. He said:

"Well, it doesn't make much sense to me, because if we all came from monkeys, I can't understand why the monkeys are still around."

And then he added:

"I'd think all the monkeys would be evoluted into World History teachers."

I did not feel that my discussion with Larry about his World History grade was taking exactly the course his mother had in mind.

I told him it did not matter how idiotic his teacher was: he had a textbook, and it was his responsibility to study it. Larry said:

"The book's nutty, too."

I sometimes think the late W. C. Fields was partially right: Any man who hates kids and dogs can't be *all* bad.

Seeing that it was impossible to have a productive discourse with the boy, I did what all sensible parents eventually learn to do. I stopped the discussion and gave him a lecture.

I thought I did a good job, too. One line I hit upon—though it did not seem to dazzle Larry—pleased me enormously. I plan to use it when giving advice to other kids:

"Integrity in clinging to your high principles as a patriot and a constitutionalist is no justification for sloppy work and failing grades."

The privilege of saying something like that without having to listen to a lot of back-talk is one of those perquisites of age I mentioned.

Though I have been around long enough to see the elephant and hear the owl, I missed one experience that would have been worth circling the globe to enjoy: I never got to see what my Aunt Blanche would do if some pubescent semi-literate tried to push her out of a pulpit and deliver obscene extortion demands to her congregation.

Aunt Blanche was a spinster, a biblical scholar, and a traveling evangelist.

I did not have the privilege of being around her after I was about 9 years old; but she is still vivid in my memory. When I was a very small child, I spent one entire summer traveling with her while she preached. Occasionally, we stayed for a week at a city church; but mostly, we made one-night stands at tent meetings, country churches, and village meeting places.

All that summer, we went up and down the Mississippi, from as far north as St. Louis to as far South as Memphis. Once, we ventured eastward, toward the land of Sodom and Gomorrah. We got as far as Cincinnati. I still remember quivering on the back row of a country church, listening to the powerful voice of Aunt Blanche, delivering devastating assault on sin and sinners.

She was not merely persuasive; she was terrifying. The fires of hell never burned more brightly than when she described them. The moaning of lost souls echoed in her wake.

Her image of God's heaven was simple and beautiful: it was the *only* Utopia; and no *easy* roads led to it.

Aunt Blanche did not compromise or have *dialogues* with the devil. She *smote* him front and rear, took him on both flanks, and drove him from the field.

She was not objective; she was *prejudiced*. She did not have tolerance; she had *conviction*.

What a magnificently healing experience it would be to hear Aunt Blanche thundering from some major pulpit today.

When Aunt Blanche died, she did not have much of an estate; but she had a will, and I was in it. She left me her Bible. I remembered her well enough to realize why: she figured I needed it.

I have derived much pleasure from thumbing through Aunt Blanche's *Bible*, examining the passages she had heavily underscored, and reading her marginal comments.

Recently, I found a passage which gave me a clue to what Aunt Blanche's attitude would have been toward the young neo-Neanderthals now blackmailing the churches, the government, the colleges, and telling us that America is a worn out failure that must bow down to their demands.

The passage is in Job. Elihu, a young man, is berating Job, who is very old. Elihu says:

"I am young in years, and you are aged; therefore I was timid and afraid to declare my opinion to you.

"I said, 'Let days speak, and many years teach wisdom.'

"But it is the spirit in a man. . . . that makes him understand.

"Therefore I say, 'Listen to *me*; let *me* also declare *my* opinion.' "

Aunt Blanche had circled that passage; and in the margin, she had written: *"Smart Aleck."*

Aunt Blanche lived in a world rather well attuned to her. That was fortunate, because, otherwise, there would have been jarring disharmony.

I, on the other hand, seem to have some capacity for being right at the wrong time. For example, jogging has been a universal fad the last two or three years. I was running five miles a day on the streets of Dallas nearly forty years ago. I was not acclaimed a pioneer; I was considered a lunatic. I was not put on the President's physical-fitness commission, but I came perilously close to being put in the Dallas city jail.

It was a fine spring day in 1932. Bonnie Parker and Clyde Barrow (Dallas' two most heralded celebrities) were at large and at the peak of their career. The night before, on the outskirts of Dallas, they had murdered a couple of men just for the fun of it, and were believed to be still in the area. I was taking my daily run.

Suddenly, a prowl car screeched to a stop in front of me. Two police officers leaped out with guns drawn. Before I could ask what it was all about, they had me in the car with my hands cuffed behind me, and we were headed for police headquarters with sirens screeming. They later told me, apologetically, that I was a dead-ringer for Clyde Barrow.

The sins of the father are sometimes visited upon the son, in strange ways. We have two sons, you know. The older boy looks like Billie Sol Estes.

The world of Aunt Blanche has gone with the wind. In that yesteryear of history, the United States was a nation on the North American continent, contiguous to only two other nations—Mexico and Canada. Now, thanks to foreign aid, every other nation on earth *touches* the United States. This must be what liberals mean when they say the world is shrinking so fast that we can no longer survive as an independent nation. We can carry the world on our backs, but we cannot stand alone.

I first became acquainted with the complicated rationale and semantics of totalitarian liberalism, and of the new values and attitudes they were producing, when I came up here to study and teach at Harvard. I bring this in to remind you of my badge of respectability.

As a boy, I had spent a great deal of time making a living in an occupation which, today, would have me classified both as a Child Laborer and a Migrant Farm Worker. I did not find out until years later when I went to Harvard that rich people like the Roosevelts and the Rockefellers and the Kennedys, and learned intellectuals like Justice William O. Douglas, the Court jester, felt sorry for folks like me. They considered us a shameful blight on the American scene, and wanted to improve us.

Yet, I did notice, then and later, that wealthy liberals who want to uplift us downtrodden never want to do it with their own money.

I will not deny that I probably needed some improving and uplifting when I went to Harvard. There *were* advantages I had been denied. Having been a Child Laborer and a Migrant Farm Worker, I had never enjoyed enough leisure to become a juvenile delinquent. I never had an opportunity to join a communist youth group. I never even had the privilege of associating with communists and fellow-travellers: there weren't any among the black and brown and medium white farm hands and the truckdrivers I worked with.

I was so disadvantaged I didn't even know four letter words were literature.

I had so much to learn and so far to go that my Harvard indoctrination in the complexities of liberalism was not altogether easy and painless.

At a faculty tea one afternoon, I fell to talking with a great scholar who was writing a dissertation for his doctorate on what he called "A Societal Study of Latin Americans in the United States."

So, I tried to tell him about an old Mexican friend of mine in Dallas. I was not trying to show off, really. I knew I was not competent in this scholar's special field of study. In fact, I could hardly pronounce the *name* of his special field. But from listening to him, I did feel that, by living and working among Mexicans, I had acquired certain information which his research had overlooked.

He did not appreciate my contribution to his learning. He looked at me as if I were something laundered in Brand X.

Oh, he might have welcomed my help, if I had gone about it correctly. He was, as all modern liberals say of themselves, *open-minded*—which means he would gladly accept any new idea or information which reinforced a prejudice he already had.

My effort to add a point to "A Societal Study of Latin Americans in the United States" was wrong, because I used what the Harvard Scholar called hate-inciting language: that is, I called Mexicans *Mexicans*—which is what Mexicans called themselves in Dallas. I learned from him that that is a term of contempt, and that I ought to say "Latin Americans."

It was hard for me to keep such subtle distinctions in mind, because I had grown up in a free and friendly America where *healthy* people had little sensitive, self-consciousness about race and creed—where the class-conscious hatreds of the old world had not yet taken roots.

Now times are altered.

Old Stephen Foster melodies must be rewritten, because their affectionate commentaries on darkies are considered hateful.

Those that cannot be revised to suit the homogenized taste of modern liberalism must be banned. Old Black Joe has to go, because no one has found a way to preserve the melody and the rhythm after Old Black Joe has been translated into Ancient Afro-American Joseph.

But why did they banish *Little Black Sambo?* I liked that intelligent, brave little African; and I hated to see him leave. The contradictions of totalitarian liberals dumbfound me. While angrily demanding something they call Black Culture studies, they suppress a delightful children's classic about a little Negro boy. It doesn't make sense. *We* are supposed to be the book burners?

As you know, I left Harvard to go into the FBI.

There is much interest in the FBI and wonder about the glamour of service in it. Since this is a relaxed gathering of friends, I will tell you about an important case I worked on. In fact, it was my first case.

From training school on the Marine Corps base at Quantico and in Washington, I went directly to my first office of assignment—Portland, Oregon. When I arrived, I found that a case had already been assigned me. They wanted *me* to find a man the FBI had been hunting, in vain, for five years. He was *mean*. He was wanted not only by the FBI but by police departments all over the United States, for everything from bigamy to bank robbery.

I was pleased that my first Special Agent in Charge had assigned me such a case. I supposed he had read my personnel file and

perceived my true worth as a sleuth. Later, I learned that that is just the kind of dog-eared case to give a new agent. There is so little he can do with it that he will have minimum possibilities of doing something wrong.

But I had luck. Before I had finished reviewing the old file, the Portland FBI toffice got an anonymous telephone call from someone who had seen the fugitive's picture on an FBI wanted notice and who knew the man. He had worked with him just a few months before, at a logging camp way back in the heart of the Willamette National Forest.

I set out to find him. My hardest job was finding the logging camp.

But I did; and as I drove in, I rehearsed some of the lessons I had learned in training school—especially the proper use of credentials so that the person interviewed would have no doubt about who I was.

I was careful, and rather elaborate about it. When I found the foreman of the logging camp, I handed him my FBI credentials and let him examine them while I was talking.

The FBI credentials fold, like a wallet. FBI is displayed in large blue letters. There is text telling briefly what an FBI agent's duties are. There are signatures of J. Edgar Hoover, of the U.S. Attorney General, and of the agent himself. And there is a *picture* of the agent.

While I was explaining my mission to the foreman, he was staring at my credentials. I thought he was reading all that stuff about my duties. But when I paused and gave him a chance to say something, he pointed at my picture on the credentials and said: "yes, that's the varmit right there. I could tell from lookin' at him he was no good."

Reminiscing instead of making a speech is another one of the perquisites of age. I promise, however, to skip a few episodes—though none of the really important ones.

After nearly ten years, I resigned from the FBI and went into my present line of work. In 1955, Mrs. Smoot and I started the *Report;* and in that same year, we bought a home: something I had been dreaming about for years—a house and a little piece of earth that belong to us.

We found a sprawling, aging, two-story colonial, sitting back from a wide lawn, protected from the Texas sun by giant elms and oaks, pecan and crabapple trees, a silver maple and a magnolia—and one little sweetgum that turns brilliant yellow in the autumn.

Certain freeloading tenants went with the place, all with inalienable squatters' rights: a colony of squirrels, a family of raccoons, a few vain cardinals, a brace of mourning doves, some raucous blue jays, a bevy of mockingbirds, and one possum.

I wanted the whole package: wildlife and all—especially after we examined the old blueprints and found that the foundation of the house rested on solid rock. It would endure, for *us and* our posterity.

We have modernized it a little through the years; but we haven't altered the basic plan, or tinkered with the foundation. It is by no means a perfect dream house. I know its weaknesses and its strength.

But I do sometimes wonder whether I own the place or it owns me.

I guess I thought, if I thought at all, that it was sturdy enough to take care of itself. The paint would always be gleaming white, the grass forever neat and green, and the trees would flourish unattended as they apparently had done, many of them for more than a hundred years.

I have learned a lot about the responsibility that comes with the fulfillment of a dream—and about some other things too.

I now know, for example, why you never see an *old* tree surgeon: before the age of 40, they all retire rich.

I have discovered that every October—precisely in the month when I get one year older—everyone of those trees sheds 10 million leaves.

I found out about a mysterious, invisible, voracious bug which, overnight, can kill a wide swath of grass across the lawn, and leave your front yard looking like Sherman's march to the sea.

I have learned that upstairs plumbing always erupts in the middle of the winter night, or when you have guests for dinner. All expensive household appliances collapse the day after the warranty expires.

If we leave town for the weekend, squirrels burrow into the attic, ivy clogs the rain spouts, aphids, attack the roses, and the possum scatters garbage in the alley.

But I have to leave town every once in a while, to get some rest. Yet—when I return—when I round the corner and see my home—the great trees towering over the old house, still standing tall and straight and proud—I get a lump in my throat.

As I see it, this land—this place of infinite variety (from the Bering Strait to the Florida Keys; from the potato farms of Maine to the silent, sun-baked beauty of El Centro—this beloved America is not unlike my home. This Republic was the culmination of a dream—not of one man, but of many.

Its foundation rested on the solid rock of the Constitution; and the superstructure seemed sturdy enough to take care of itself. So, it was neglected and taken for granted.

Today it is plagued with human parasites; it is flooded with lawlessness.

A foreign fungus blights it with unholy ideology.

Its streets—the halls of its institutions—are ravished with the flames of destruction.

Its proud banner is despoiled by scavengers.

Corruption eats at its moral fiber.

But it is still our land.

We must protect it, defend it, rescue it. If necessary, we must rebuild it.

It is our country! We *have* none other! We *want* none other! Anything else for us is unthinkable.

Not one of us will rest until this Republic stands straight and tall and proud on its firm foundation once again.

*That* is the price of freedom!

God bless you!

## FEAST DAY OF STS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS—1100TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on July 5, the 1100th anniversary of Sts. Cyril and Methodius was observed by Slovaks throughout the world. In recognition of that event I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter I received from Dr. V. Stephen Krajcovic, president of the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia, a concurrent resolution that I introduced in the second session of the 82d Congress, and an article entitled "The Martyrdom of Slovak Catholicism," by Thomas J. Veteska, which appeared in Triumph magazine in the July 1969 issue. The material follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 26, 1969.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: To you belongs the great merit for having introduced in the 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, the enclosed H. Con. Res. 238, House of Representatives, July 3, 1952, to demand for the Slovaks already then, what the Slovaks reached only this year, i.e. 16 years later, when in the spirit of the liberalization of Alexander Dubcek the Slovak right for self-determination and Slovak right to be governed by their own consent culminated in the federalization of Czecho-Slovakia early this year 1969.

Since the world ought to be reminded of your prophetic vision of the year 1952, I am enclosing a most excellent article concerning the Martyrdom of Slovak Catholicism, published in the July issue, 1969, of the Triumph Magazine, which most perfectly sums up the history of the Slovaks, not only to the Catholics. Each member of Congress should read it and each member should be reminded of how right you have been all along, when in the most crucial days of that Slovak Martyrdom you have valliantly stood by the Slovaks.

As the date for the insert I would propose July 5, because that is the day when the Slovaks throughout the world—from the Tatra Mountains in Slovakia across Europe, in Rome and Munich, and in Chicago, Cleveland and Pittsburgh, even in Sidney, Australia—will celebrate the feast day of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, who caused the * * * * * * in 869, the Holy Father recognized the OLD SLOVAK language as the fourth liturgical language of the Church, after Hebrew, Greek and Latin. Hence, this is a 1,100 years anniversary of that great event in the history of the Slovaks.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

Dr. V. STEPHEN KRAJCOVIC.

---

H. CON. RES. 238

(Introduced by Mr. FLOOD on July 3, 1952, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs)

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the Congress hereby reaffirms the historic friendship of the American people and the Slovak peoples, with whom we share innumerable ties of kinship as well as mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice deeply felt by the American people because of the fact that the United States was founded and largely built by oppressed peoples from all countries.

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the Slovak peoples have the right of self-determination and the right to be governed by their own consent based on the free expression of popular will in free elections, and that no nation may deprive them of their territory by force or threat of force or keep their territory by force.

(b) The Congress further expresses the firm conviction of the American people that the Slovak peoples have the right to the basic freedoms for which they have long struggled and for which, together with other free peoples in World War II, they shed their blood.

SEC. 3. To give meaning to our historic friendship for the Slovak peoples, the Congress of the United States hereby expresses the strong hope of the American people for the early liberation of the Slovak peoples from their Communist enslavement. To assist in bringing about this liberation at the earliest possible date, the President is requested—

(1) to demand that free election be held for the Slovak peoples, under police supervision of the United Nations, in order that they may, without pressure, organize their own government founded on such principles as may seem to them most likely to effect their safety and happiness and secure for themselves the blessings of liberty; and

(2) to explore the methods whereby the American people, through their Government and by private means with Government assistance, and otherwise, may offer aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the Slovak peoples and other Communist-dominated countries.

[From Triumph magazine, July 1969]

THE MARTYRDOM OF SLOVAK CATHOLICISM

(By Tomas J. Veteska)

For almost a year now, world public opinion has been mourning the crushing of "Czech liberalization" by Soviet tanks. And yet there is another dimension to the tragedy, one that has been unfolding for centuries within what is now called Czechoslovakia. While the Czechs are now in the position of victim, they have for decades themselves played the oppressor and persecutor of their fellow Slavs, the Slovaks. Russian tanks crushed not only the libertine Marxism of the Czechs, last August, but, more tragically, the genuine resurgence of freedom in Catholic Slovakia, which had just begun to assert again its national aspirations and to cast off the twin fetters of atheistic Communism and Czech domination.

Slovakia, one of the old Christian nations of Central Europe, has often been ignored in the West. In literature and the press, the name "Slovak" is often used interchangeably with "Czech." Professor Kurt Glazer, a noted expert on Central Europe and author of the book *Szecho-Slovakia, A Critical History*, who for long years studied the internal problems of this state, described the confussion well:

More wrong information has been spread concerning Czecho-Slovakia than almost any other country. Misstatements of fact have not been limited to newspapers and speeches, but have crept into history books and encyclopedias. There is an entire "Czechoslovak legend," originated by Masaryk and Benes during World War I and then elaborated and propagated over thirty-five years by the government they founded, which appropriated millions of dollars for public relations. With secret funds the Czecho-Slovak Foreign Office bought reporters and professors, and sometimes entire newspapers. During World War II, key positions in [the U.S.] Department of State and the Office of War Information were held by adherents of the "legend," which became the basis for United States policy in Central Europe. . . The fully developed "Czechoslovak Legend" has numerous facets. It includes, among other things, the following propositions, none of which is true: That there is a "Czecho-Slovak nation"; that the Slovak language is a dialect of Czech; that a Czecho-Slovak state existed in the early Middle Ages. . .

Slovaks, who inhabit the eastern part of Czecho-Slovakia, are an independent nation in terms of language, culture, history, religion, political convictions, folklore and mentality. Out of a total membership of 1,700,000 in the ruling Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia, there are only 125,000 Slovaks; the Czechs have a membership of 1,400,000 and the balance is accounted for by the national minorities, largely Ukrainians and Magyars. Proportionately, the Slovaks have the smallest Communist Party behind the Iron Curtain while the Czechs have the largest. Out of fourteen million inhabitants of Czecho-Slovakia, there are five million Slovaks and eight million Czechs; the remaining million is composed of Germans, Magyars, Poles and Ruthenians-Ukrainians.

The arrival of the Slovaks in Central Europe is not precisely recorded in history. The first written report of the Slovaks is found in Greek sources of the year 548. The Slovaks received Christianity from Irish and German missionaries during the 8th century. The first historically known church on the territory of Slovakia was built by the Slovak prince Probina in Nitra in the year 830.

In those remote days the territories inhabited by Slovaks were under the jurisdiction of German bishops, who were not only Christianizing the Slovaks, but also Germanizing them. To counteract this, the Slovak ruler Rastislav in the year 863 invited two apostles from Byzantium, the brothers Sts. Cyril and Methodius, to proselytize among his people. They translated Holy Scriptures and the Catholic liturgy into the native langauge, and thus Old Slovak became the fourth literary language used in Church liturgy.

SLOVAKS CONTRA BARBARIANS

About the year 1000, Slovakia was annexed to Hungary. In the following centuries, Slovakia was a bastion of Christianity against barbarian invasions from the east by Tatars and Kumans. In the 15th century, Catholic Slovakia was often attacked, burned and devastated by the heretical Czech Hussites. During the Turkish occupation of Hungary in the 16th and 17th centuries, Slovakia remained unconquered. In 1848 the Slovaks declared their independence from Hungary, but the revolt was ultimately unsuccessful. During the second half of the 19th century the Magyars went so far as to declare the nonexistence of the Slovak nation. They eliminated Slovak national institutions and schools. The intelligentsia was imprisoned or persecuted and its great majority escaped abroad, particularly into the United States. Among the educated, only the clergy remained to stand up for the defense of national and religious rights of the Slovak nation. In those times a priest was often also doctor, judge, mayor and teacher.

During World War I, the eminent Slovak scientist, statesman and general, Dr. Milan R. Stefanik, organized a movement to gain independence from Magyar rule. When he found no support among Western European nations, General Stefanik conceived the idea of a temporary alliance with the Czechs in jointly seeking independence from Austria-Hungary. He introduced to the West two little known Czechs, Tomas Masaryk and Eduard Benes. However, there were frequent disputes between Masaryk and Benes on the one side, and Stefanik on the other. Stefanik was an anti-Communist and a deeply religious man, while Masaryk and Benes were "free-thinkers" and Marxists.

On May 30, 1918, Masaryk signed an agreement with the representatives of the Slovak League of America in Pittsburgh, Pa. This agreement guaranteed political and cultural autonomy to Slovakia in a new bi-national Slovak and Czech State, but Stefanik refused to sign it, because he believed that the Czechs would not keep their promises. On May 4, 1919, after long years of exile, General Stefanik flew from Italy to Slovakia to mobilize the Slovaks against the Hungarian Communists who had just invaded Slovakia and to warn his compatriots of Czech duplicity. His airplane crashed; some have charged it was shot down by secret order of Masaryk and Benes.

After the death of Stefanik, the Czechs imposed colonial rule over Slovakia. They dismantled Slovak industry and transferred it to Bohemia. Thousands of Czechs were placed in key positions in Slovakia. At the same time about 300,000 Slovaks were forced to emigrate abroad. Then began an attack against Catholicism. Crosses were removed from schools, churches were desecrated and priests ridiculed. Masaryk renewed the Hussite heresy, which he called the "Czechoslovak Church." The slogan of the New Church was "Away from Rome—for Rome must be indicted and sentenced." About three hundred Czech priests and over a half a million Czech Catholics joined the new Church, but in Slovakia there were no gains, not even from the ranks of Slovak Lutherans.

This situation lasted until October 5, 1938, when all the Slovak political parties, with the exception of a tiny Communist Party, proclaimed the political autonomy of Slovakia in the framework of Czecho-Slovakia. On March 14, 1939 the Slovak Parliament unanimously proclaimed the independent Slovak Republic, which was recognized by 31 states, including Great Britain, France, the Vatican, Sweden, Switzerland, and even the USSR. Special Report No. 8 of the Select Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Eighty-third Congress, second session, stated that the Slovak State "corresponded to the aspirations of the Slovak people for freedom and the principle of self-determination and self-government. . ."

During the existence of the Slovak Republic there was not a single political execution in Slovakia. Slovak leaders resisted both Nazi and Communist influence. Independent foreign observers designated this state as an island of peace, prosperity and order within the sea of Nazism. However, in the year 1945 Eduard Benes, with the help of domestic Communists and Soviet guns, recaptured power and renewed the colonial, but now Communist rule over Slovakia.

In 1945 all Catholic institutions, associations and schools became institutions of the State. The Catholic press was severely restricted. Slovak newspapers from America were banned. From 1945 until 1949 fully 10% of the Slovak population was imprisoned.

In 1945 the Czech Catholic clergy issued a tragic Memorandum—"Under the protection of the brotherly Russian nation a happy future is being opened to Slavs"—in which they praised the Red Army and Stalin. This Memorandum was signed by, among others, the late Cardinal Beran and two representatives of the Czech Catholic Party, members of the Benes Government, Msgr. Sramek and Msgr. Hala. Msgr. Sramek was quoted in the press as having said that "it is necessary for Russia to take over permanently the management of European policy." At the time of these declarations, two Slovak Catholic bishops and 170 Slovak priests were arrested.

SLOVAKS CONTRA COMMUNISTS

In the year 1946, during the only free elections ever held in Czechosolvakia, the Slovak nation, of which one third was disenfranchised, cast its votes in absolute majority against Communism. The elections were secret and free, even in spite of the fact that only such political parties were allowed to exist were approved by Prague. Slovak Catholics (85% of the population) were not allowed by the Czech government to form their own party, so they concluded an agreement with the Democratic Party, as a result of which that party obtained 62% of all Slovak votes. During the same election 56% of the Czechs cast their votes for the Communist bloc. Thus the Czech nation, on a national scale, ratified the Stalin-Benes pact of 1943.

After the 1946 elections, the Catholics in Slovakia began to organize themselves, and to demand their political rights. But in September of 1947 Moscow and Prague agreed that the Slovak Democratic Party should be eliminated. Under the pretext of having discovered a conspiracy against the national government, Prague decided to liquidate the Party. Several deputies of the Catholic wing of the Party were imprisoned, as were several thousand Slovak patriots. By November of 1947, after considerable parliamentary maneuvering, the Democratic Party was relegated to minority status in the government of Slovakia, and by February 1948 the Czech Communists were able to consolidate their hold over the entire country into a full-scale Communist dictatorship.

In August and September of 1949 Slovakia experienced a wave of anti-Communist revolts, caused by the mass arrest of Catholic priests. In hundreds of Slovak villages the peasants resisted the military might of the Red forces. In 1950 four Slovak Catholic bishops were arrested and the Greek Catholic Church, with 305,000 faithful, was formally suppressed and forcibly merged with the Orthodox Church and subordinated to the Patriarchate of Moscow. As a result of this a Slovak Underground Church was born, with hundreds of secret priests and nine secret bishops. Also in 1950 the government at Prague purged the Slovak Communist Party. Several members were sentenced to death and many more to long years in prison. In the meantime, Archbishop Beran was confined to a castle outside of Prague, and many Czech

bishops and priests were imprisoned. As a result of such measures as these, the Faith began to erode among the Czech people; the majority of Czech children went unbaptized. Yet in Slovakia, where the Faith could not be professed publicly, baptisms, weddings and confessions were administered by secret priests and confirmations by secret bishops. Even at this time of most bitter persecution, 98% of all children born in Slovakia were still being baptized.

In the period of 1950–51 the management of the Communist Party in Slovakia was taken oven by Czechs and by members of national minorities in Slovakia, especially Magyars and Ruthenians-Ukrainians, who as non-Slovaks ruled the Slovaks.

From the year 1945 up to 1963 Slovakia was ruled by a most oppressive regime. A change came about only after the discrediting of Stalin, during 1963, when Slovak intellectuals and journalists demanded de-stalinization of Slovakia. These were the actions that were responsible for the rise of Alexander Dubcek. The arrests stopped, criticism of the government and of the Party was allowed and the Slovaks gained more and more power. This process culminated in January 1968, when the combined Slovak-Moravian forces succeeded in the removal of Czech Stalinists within the Communist Party.

In May of 1968 Slovakia witnessed one of the greatest political manifestations in its history. Over 150,000 Slovaks gathered at the foot of the Stefanik Monument, where they demanded free elections, their own statehood, and a full democratization of Slovakia. Shortly thereafter, the suppressed Greek Catholic Church was freed from subordination to Moscow's Patriarchate. Priests and bishops were openly allowed, and the Moscow trained Orthodox priests were suspended and even recalled from the parishes. The Church as such began to re-emerge as a force in public life.

It was the progress of such reforms as these, and not simply the "liberalization of Communism," that was interrupted when the occupational armies of the Warsaw Pact marched into Czecho-Slovakia last August. From the Christian and anti-Communist point of view, the fate of Catholic Slovakia was the deep tragedy of that invasion.

## INTER-AMERICAN IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, INC.

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Inter-American Improvement Association, Inc., is a nonprofit California organization seeking to improve educational opportunities for a group of young people in Jamaica.

The genesis of this dream began with the group's founder and present president, Rev. Moses L. Mayne, of Richmond, Calif., in my district. I have watched and participated to a limited degree in the unfolding of the promise of Reverend Mayne's vision and have seen this effort move from a beautiful idea to a conscious reality.

Much yet needs be done to assist this worthy project, but I call it to your attention as an example of what individuals who are strongly and selflessly motivated can do in the private area to accomplish social reform.

Reverend Mayne recently wrote me outlining progress of this worthy effort to date, and I include his letter with my remarks. I also include a letter from E. Frederic Morrow, vice president of the Bank of America, who has visited the Jamaican school. The material follows:

INTER-AMERICAN IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, INC.,
*Richmond, Calif., Jnue 24, 1969.*

Hon. JEROME R. WALDIE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: I herewith express my thanks to you for the help you have given our Association as a Member of our Board since we contacted you in early 1966.

From the "dreams only" with which we started, I am happy to report a quick growth especially since I gave up my profession to concentrate on its development. The following things have been accomplished as you are aware.

1. Start of the school in Jamaica, W.I. on the small grants of $15,500 which were given us.

2. Acquisition of 25 acres of good land and an old hotel as a gift from Kaiser Bauxite Company, a subsidiary of Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corp., for the school site.

3. Transportation of school furniture by the said Kaiser Bauxite to Jamaica, free of charge, in addition to free engineering and supervisory service.

4. Enrollment of 267 students with present attendance of 230 grateful students.

5. Increase of the teaching staff from two to five.

Please bear in mind that all of this has been done on the $15,500.

Since that time we have purchased at tremendous savings 450 chair-desks, have been given about 300 more, and 2500 volumes of books for the school library. 475 of these chair-desks, the 2500 volumes of books and 9 cartons of used clothing have been crated and are now on their way to Baton Rouge, Louisiana via Southern Pacific at half-rate prices, from which point Kaiser Bauxite will again trans-ship these 29 large containers to the school at no expense.

Our great needs now are for classrooms, additional teachers, and industries for these students so that they may secure education not only academically, but also industrially and at the same time provide revenue for the school to keep it on a self-sustaining basis. This is a self-help school doing much for Jamaica's underprivileged youth and will profit these United States abundantly as the preparation of these young people for life gainfully will foreclose the possibility of this country's Foreign Aid to what would or could be another area of desperate need.

The accompanying letters testify to our success. Again, I am happy for your participation with us in this tremendously important "Pilot Program" in a developing nation.

Sincerely yours,

MOSES L. MAYNE.

---

BANK OF AMERICA,
*New York, N.Y., March 4, 1969.*

Mr. JOSEPH R. MIXER,
*Gifts and Endowment Officer, University of California, Berkeley, Office of the Chancellor, Berkeley, Calif.*

DEAR MR. MIXER: I too have been very impressed by the great energy and dedication with which Moses Mayne has endeavored to establish a school in Jamaica. Two years ago, when he was sent to me by an officer of the Bank in California for my appraisal and decision as to whether I would be interested in helping him, I had no knowledge of the man nor his project. However, his zeal intrigued me, and I promised to serve on his Board on a trial basis.

My trip to Jamaica to inspect the school was a very rewarding one. The need in the island for education is great, and if Jamaicans are to enjoy any of the efforts of self-determination, thousands who are now denied opportunities for education must be brought under some kind of umbrella where they can secure the rudiments of learning.

There is a great deal to be done on this school that Mr. Mayne and his colleagues have founded, but the ground is there, the spirit is there, and the obvious hunger for education of the two hundred-odd students who are attending the school is deeply appealing.

I was encouraged by the fact that Kaiser Bauxite is interested to the extent of having provided an old building and ample ground, and that the executive officer of the company in charge of the plant in Jamaica is the treasurer of the local governing board. Dr. N. E. Gallimore, a prominent member of Parliament, has given his blessings to the project and it is my understanding that the government looks with favor upon the effort. What meager funds were available have been used wisely in trying to strengthen the rather dilapidated structure already provided for classrooms, and plans call for additional classrooms as soon as there are enough funds to safely go ahead with the work involved.

Mrs. Morrow and I returned from Jamaica with a sincere hope of trying to give more than lip service to this ideal and to try to seek friends and financial assistance for the project wherever we could.

I am sure you can appreciate the fact that, with similar problems obtaining in our own country as regards our Negro citizens, heavy demands are also made upon me to use whatever influence available to see that funds are collected for similar projects here in the United States. This adds to the difficulty of trying to assist Mr. Mayne in his program.

However, as a member of the Board of the Inter-American Improvement Association it would please me to know that you are contributing whatever efforts you can in helping foster this school. Anyone sharing the experience I had of looking into the eyes of these hopeful, eager young people assembled at the school would be impelled to make some effort toward giving them a hand.

I feel certain that Mr. Peterson would be interested in your observations with regard to this project, since Mr. Mayne was originally referred to me by Mr. Frank Young, who is Mr. Peterson's assistant.

When I am next in California, which I hope will be in the next month or two, I would like very much to have the opportunity to talk with you personally about this project of mutual interest.

Kind regards.

Sincerely,

E. FREDERIC MORROW,
*Vice President.*

## NEED FOR NEW LOOK AT COST-BENEFIT RATIOS

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the vital parts of public works considerations is the method of determining the relative benefits of a particular project against its costs. Each dam, canal, ship channel, for example, that is studied by the Congress for funding has its own cost-benefit ratio.

With interest rates skyrocketing and new elements of cost and benefit to be taken into consideration, mainly ecological, there is a crying need for a new look at cost-benefit ratios.

The Natural Resources Policy Center at the George Washington University has prepared a study on this matter entitled "Federal Natural Resources Development: Basic Issues in Benefit and Cost Measurement."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this study inserted into the RECORD for the edification and enlightenment of Congress:

FEDERAL NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT: BASIC ISSUES IN BENEFIT AND COST MEASUREMENT

(By Jack L. Knetsch, George Washington University; Robert H. Haveman, Grinnell College, on leave with the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Congress; and Charles W. Howe, John V. Krutilla, and Michael F. Brewer, Resources for the Future, Inc.)

(NOTE.—The views are those of individual economists and not necessarily those of their organizations.)

For well over one hundred and fifty years now, the federal government has undertaken expenditures to develop the nation's natural resources. Federal spending in these areas currently totals over $3.5 billion per year and accounts for some of the nation's largest physical structures.

Water resource installations have productive potentials similar to those of industrial investments generally. These projects absorb inputs and produce outputs. Among the primary "products" which these installations produce are irrigation water, the reduction of flood hazards, the provision of transportation services, hydroelectric energy, and the provision of municipal water supply. The inputs which they use are similar of those used in common industrial enterprises: skilled and unskilled labor, steel, cement, bulldozers, and complex electrical generating equipment.

The fact that these projects absorb valuable inputs and produce valuable outputs provides the opportunity of measuring the benefits from such government undertakings as well as the costs which they entail. The comparison of the resulting benefits and costs is necessary if prudent public expenditure policy is to prevail.

Interest in procedures to determine the contributions of natural resource projects to the nation's economic welfare is not a new one. Indeed, explicit efforts to account for the expected benefits and costs of projects have been made for over 30 years. The basic criterion for determining the worth of proposed projects was formally outlined in the Flood Control Act of 1936, which stated that the federal government was prepared to undertake such investments "if the benefits to whomsoever they accrue exceed the costs." This criterion still guides evaluation efforts in the natural resources development area.

Both the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Senate Public Works Committee have stated that: "The economic analyses of projects should reflect the broadest scope of potential benefits and costs," and that project evaluations "should accurately reflect all primary direct and indirect benefits as well as secondary benefits." We share this concern. It is our *special* concern, however, that current deliberations to broaden the concept of project benefits not take place in isolation from some basic principles pertaining to appropriate economic concepts of social benefits and social costs.

In both the private sector and the public sector, decision-makers who strive to develop good policy for their organizations evaluate uses of funds to insure that the expected returns exceed the costs. While the basic notion of benefit and cost evaluation is similar for both the private and public sectors, there is one basic difference. When decision-makers in the private sector, say in a private business, evaluate the benefits of investing in a new production facility and compare those benefits with associated costs, they are concerned only with the gains and losses which accrue to their firm. Because any other gains and losses which may accrue to outside parties do not show up in the revenues and costs of their firm, they are typically ignored in private investment evaluation. On the other hand, a responsible decision-maker in the public sector cannot adopt so restricted a view. He must conceive of his investment project in a more comprehensive way so that all of the costs and gains associated with the undertaking are accounted for in the investment decision whether or not all appear as receipts of, or disbursements by, his particular agency. Indeed, it is just because market-governed private organizations cannot charge for third-party benefits or be held liable for third-party costs that the public sector must undertake so many resource development activities.

But even when some agency of the public sector undertakes a resource devleopment or management project, it is not clear that all impacts on third parties will be accounted for. First it is necessary the the "project" be defined so that all physical impacts are included in the scope of the "project." For example, a hydro power project must be defined to include all downstream effects of the dam's storage and release cycle, as well as effects on the quality of water in the reservoir and downstream from the project. An irrigation project must be defined to include the downstream effects of quantity and quality diminution as well as all drainage facilities which will be needed to keep the project in operation—even if they will not be needed for some period following initial project construction.

The second difficulty which can stand in the way of a complete evaluation of a project's impacts even when undertaken by a public body is a jurisdictional one, namely the "accounting stance" or geographical scope of concern assumed by the decision-making body. The "accounting stance" may or may not incorporate all of the effects of the project (properly defined). As an example, downstream impacts of waste treatment may lie entirely outside the jurisdiction of the city responsible for the treatment plant. If a project induces significant changes in market prices, regions quite remote from and possibly even non-contiguous with the project site may incur significant benefits or costs, especially if there are problems of chronic unemployment or immobility of human and capital resources. If, for example, a proposed Bureau of Reclamation irrigation project located in Nevada is evaluated from the state's point of view, it is likely to have an enormous benefit-cost ratio. Clearly, most of the benefits from the project in the form of increased farm incomes will accrue to residents of Nevada. Because of existing repayments (pricing) policies for federal irrigation projects, much of the costs are federal government costs and only a small proportion of them will fall on people living in Nevada. If the increased agricultural production in Nevada lowers farm products prices and displaces agricultural output in other regions with subsequent temporary or long term income losses (a real national cost), the vast majority of the losers are likely to be in other parts of the country. Thus, if evaluation were made from a broader perspective, the benefit-cost ratio obviously would be reduced. Evaluated from this broader view, the project might or might not be in the national interest. When the project is evaluated from the national point of view, gains to all the beneficiaries and losses sustained by all the cost-bearers will be included in the calculation. It is, therefore, not necessarily true that what is good for Region X is good for the United States.

One elemental principle for benefit-cost measurement of *federal* natural resource development expenditures derives immediately from this discussion of accounting stance. By definition, federal natural resources development is sponsored and financed by the national government, which represents all of the people of the United States. For this reason, we conclude that:

I. *Federally-financed investments require a national accounting stance in evaluating social benefits and social costs:* While citing this as a basic principle, we are not arguing that analyses of the benefits and costs accruing to more localized regions should not be estimated. We are arguing, however, that federal natural resource agencies have a *primary* obligation to weigh the costs and benefits of projects from a national point of view and a significantly smaller responsibility to weigh the impacts of projects on regional economies where such local impacts are in fact offset elsewhere in the economy.

While this definition of an appropriate federal accounting stance is a primary principle in establishing a correct benefit-cost criterion, it does not provide many clues to the accurate measurement of these national benefits and costs. To address this measurement problem, we require some notion of the basic underlying characteristics of the economy.

In large measure, the U.S. economy relies on the freely-arrived-at decisions of consumers and producers in getting private goods and services produced. Under these market arrangements, the economy has repeatedly shown a fluid response to changed conditions and has demonstrated an enormous potential for growth. Changing demands elicit a changed pattern of supply with little time lag, without the need for some central authority first to recognize the existence of the new demands, and then convey them to the production managers in the form of new production orders. Similarly, changes in technology or in resource availability are usually quickly recorded by the market through altered relative prices.

This mechanism of conveying information about changes in tastes, technologies, and resource availabilities throughout the rest of the economy is a simple one. If parties with altered demands place additional orders for a commodity, producers will be faced with decreasing inventories or a backlog of unfilled orders. Viewing these as opportunities for increasing sales and profits, producers will increase their output. If, in the process of generating these increased outputs, profits rise, an added inducement to producers to increase production will be provided. Resources are thus diverted from producing other things to the production of the commodity with an increased demand. This response is accomplished without central guidance.

Such output responses occur fairly quickly and will usually yield outputs confronting to the patterns of demand at minimum cost. Naturally, the facility with which such responses are made is dependent upon quick communication of market information and the push of effective competition.

It is on the basis of this reasoning that we conclude that an economy which has well-functioning markets as the mechanism to allocate resources produces maximum national output (and income) for the society.

The economic efficiency characteristic of a smoothly functioning market economy has implications for public investment policy in the natural resource area. It suggests that the outputs of public investments should be evaluated by the actual or simulated market demands of users in terms of their willingness to pay, that is, to forego other products, and that the costs must measure the value of the opportunities foregone by diverting inputs to the public investment from other uses. Were public sector inevstments to be chosen on other grounds, they would be employing resources which could be producing a greater value in other uses. Such public undertakings, by diverting resources from a higher to a lower valued use would cause a decrease in society's economic well-being. Indeed, if it is assumed that the market system is operating smoothly, it follows that the federal government should not consider a proposed project as adding to the nation's

economic well-being unless the observed or simulated willingness to pay for the output exceeds the social value of the resources required to produce the output. These concepts of benefits and costs correspond to what are commonly known as primary benefits and primary costs. We therefore conclude as a second basic principle that:

II. *Unless there are serious market failures and obstacles to the smooth functioning of the market system, total national economic benefits equal the real outputs of a public project valued at observed or simulated market prices and total national economic costs equal the real inputs employed in a project valued at observed or simulated market prices:* Having set forth a definition of relevant economic benefits and costs for a market economy without serious imperfections, we would do well to state the conditions which must prevail if Proposition II above is to be logically valid. The conditions which must be met in the economy are:

1. Reasonably full employment of labor and capital;

2. Labor and capital mobility, i.e., the ability of units of labor and capital to shift to new jobs and uses;

3. No significant economies from large-scale production of pertinent commodities; and

4. Generally competitive conditions.

If these conditions are met to a reasonable approximation, then any *secondary* beneficial impacts by a project on market-related activities are simply local or regional in nature with *offsetting effects* occurring elsewhere in the economy. If funds are diverted from the private sector for purposes of public investment, not only are primary impacts of the foreclosed private investment foregone, but so are any net secondary impacts. If we wish to credit public investments with their own secondary benefits, we must also take into account the net secondary impacts which would have been experienced through the foregone private spending. There is no more reason to anticipate positive *net* national gains from secondary impacts than to expect negative net changes.

Suppose, for example, that a federal irrigation scheme producing water for various crops is constructed. Certain regional industries will expand, both to supply fertilizer and machinery to the irrigation scheme, and to process and merchandise the crops. If the economy exhibits efficient operation characterized by the above-stated conditions, competition and mobility will provide additional labor and capital to these industries which will eliminate whatever temporarily higher profit rates they experience from the expansion. After the influx of labor and capital stimulated by the temporarily higher profit rates, profitability will fall to a normal rate in short order, and before long, this capital will be earning approximately what it had earned elsewhere prior to the project.

The people newly employed in these activities were bid away from other jobs, implying the existence of higher wages and incomes, but again, competition among mobile workers will tend to reduce and ultimately eliminate wage differentials. Therefore, in the absence of significant departures from the four above conditions, secondary gains, if significant at all, will be temporary.

In the context of a national accounting stance and assuming that the economy can be characterized as a smoothly functioning market economy, relevant national secondary impacts will be negligible on both the benefit and cost side. This leads us to a third principle:

III. *If the conditions for a smoothly functioning market economy prevail, there is no justification from a national point of view for the recording of secondary benefits which would accrue to the region of project location, nor for the recording of secondary costs which are experienced elsewhere in the economy due to the financing of the public project:* The logic of the two preceding principles also generates the conclusion that where serious market imperfections are present, there may be secondary effects which do entail changes in the nation's net income and which will require either the measurement of secondary benefits and costs or adjustments to the observed values of primary benefits and costs. For example, when serious and intractable regional unemployment exists or when the nation as a whole is confronted with unemployed resources, or where a region with immobile labor and capital is confronted by a loss of some vital resource base, then a natural resources development project may result in secondary local income gains which are also net national gains. Adjustments to observed market prices of project inputs and outputs may also be required.

As an example of how secondary effects which accrue to a region may represent changes in national income, consider the case of immobile labor and capital. If labor and capital cannot (or do not) move quickly out of industries which are forced to contract as a result of the construction of a natural resources project (e.g. the displacement of non-irrigation agriculture by irrigated acreage), they will experience a decrease in their net incomes. This decrease in net incomes represents a reduction in national output over the period of the unemployment of these resources. Because a loss in the nation's income is experienced as a result of this immobility, federal planners should legitimately account for the loss in estimating project costs.

A second example of how secondary effects may lead to national increases in income relates to the existence of increasing efficencies of large-scale production in some pertinent production sectors. Assume that because of a natural resources development project, certain industries expand while others contract. If the expanding industries experience decreasing unit costs while the industries experiencing contraction have constant product costs, and if the degrees of expansion and contraction are approximately equal, then a similar volume of output will be produced at a smaller total input cost. The reduction in input cost constitutes a net national benefit and, like the above examples, represents a case in which real *secondary* economic gains occur for the nation.

An example of how an imperfectly working economy may require an adjustment of observed market values of project inputs and outputs can be cited in terms of the impact of, say, a dam building project whose construction period coincides with substantial unemployment of labor. If the on-site labor used would otherwise have been unemployed, its true social cost will lie below the apparent market cost. If off-site procurement requires production which utilizes otherwise unemployed labor, even in far-away regions, the cost of those off-site procurements must be reduced. Appropriate techniques for these adjustments have been developed.

From these examples, a further basic principle of benefit-cost measurement is derived. This principle, which is a corollary of the previous principle, can be stated as follows:

IV. *When the economy is characterized by unemployment, resource immobility, decreasing costs, or a lack of competition, it is appropriate to investigate net national benefits and costs which derive from secondary effects. Such benefits, when found and quantified, should enter the benefit-cost analysis:* Having offered this principle, however, we would also emphasize a few *caveats* which relate to it. First, it should be pointed out that the unemployment relevant to the existence of real national secondary benefits generated by project construction must be long-term, structural unemployment, and not just that from a temporary recession. The planning-construction period and the operating life of natural resources projects each will exceed the duration of cyclical unemployment.

Second, we would also emphasize that labor and capital immobility should not be presumed to be a permanent feature of the social landscape. It is often on the basis of such immobility that "rescue operations" are proposed to bring water to established agricultural areas to replace exhausted ground water supplies. Because business complexes which specialize in agriculturally related activities as well as agriculture itself would be left idle if the area were forced to revert to dry farming or to abandon farming altogether, the existence of substantial net secondary benefits for such investment has often been claimed. Surely over the period when capital and labor would otherwise have remained idle, the newly generated capital and labor income should be counted as a net national gain, as should any difference in land rent. It must be pointed out, however, that units of capital and labor will be immobile for a far shorter period than the life of the project. For this reason the incomes from avoided unemployment should be attributed as benefits to the water supply project only over the appropriate periods of immobility. The fact that technological and market changes would be inducing changes in employment and capital structure independent of matters of water supply makes it doubly difficult to apply the "with-without" criterion.

A third caveat pertains to longer term growth which might be induced by the project and the relationship of this growth to national gains. Clearly, the question of the contribution which such growth makes to national economic gain hinges on the possible advantages which exist for, say, processing primary products in that region relative to other areas. It is not warranted to assume that any particular project will automatically generate such related investments or that the incomes generated by such investments represent net additions to the national income. What is needed is a careful analysis of the extent to which the project creates in the region a comparative advantage relative to other regions in terms of basic raw materials, power, process water, or transportation. Moreover, if it is concluded that project, induced investment is likely to occur in the project area, the portion of the incomes created by this new activity representing net additions to the national income and the portion representing transfers from other areas must be determined. Only the net additions are countable as benefits.

Any such analysis of project-induced investment should be approached with care in the case of presently depressed area, since it is reasonable to presume that the conditions which have resulted in a declining area's depressed economic condition will continue to inhibit further investment. It is unlikely, for example, that the provision of flood-free land or an improved water supply will suffice to make private investments profitable.

Finally, if the federal government is interested in inducing development in a particular region or set of regions, it should not be restricted in its choice of instruments to water resource or, more generally, natural resource development investments. Indeed, there is no presumption whatsoever that natural resource investments are more likely to be significant employment or investment generators than labor training programs, housing programs, recreation programs funded by the federal government, or federally subsidized private investments in the region, or federal investment in programs to relocate population groups presently immobilized in low potential regions. In appraising any particular natural resource investment as an instrument for regional development, the analyst should be fully aware of the other alternative policy measures, and

should recognize that, while some development impacts derive from the project, the same or even greater effects may be attributable to other types of public (or publicly-encouraged private) investments.

While there exist, then, conditions under which secondary benefits can legitimately be included in benefit-cost calculations, or under which project costs may have to be adjusted to reflect deviations from social cost, it must be realized that the knife which cuts on the benefit side also cuts on the cost side. When the necessary conditions for the existence of secondary benefits hold, it is equally likely that project financing or project output will induce secondary costs. Consider the impact of the reclamation of arid lands on the remainder of agriculture. It has been demonstrated that the reclamation program in the western states by encouraging increased western cotton production has displaced a significant portion of the cotton production previously grown in southern states. Indeed, it has been estimated that the result of the western program has been to displace one out of every twenty farmers remaining in southern agriculture*. The displaced southern farm family not only remains unemployed for some period (a national income loss), but, like other displaced laborers, migrates to the city. If providing opportunities in the West to permit rural families to remain in the countryside or to permit urban families to leave the cities is to be attributed as a (non-quantifiable) benefit, then providing the inducement for rural families in other regions to migrate to the cities must be tallied as a cost.

The point of this example, then, is a clear one. Namely:

V. *If market imperfections cause projects to generate secondary benefits which coincide with national income gains, they also generate secondary costs. The existence of market imperfections requires that both secondary benefits and costs be accounted for in benefit-cost calculations.* The importance of this principle, then, is that it points up the need for the development of information on both the secondary benefits and the secondary costs of natural resource development projects if market imperfections are present.

Next, it must be noted with emphasis that natural resource development projects have some real impacts, both beneficial and detrimental, which are of social concern and which are not in practice included in the measurably primary and secondary benefits and costs discussed above nor even described in the typical project report. The most important of these impacts might be:

1. types of benefits or costs which, while conceptually belonging in the national income accounts, are not at present quantified. Examples might be the benefits from water quality improvement beyond those associated with changed municipal and industrial water costs, the values from preserving a scenic stretch of natural river, or the preservation or destruction of fish and wildlife.

2. regional income impacts which, while not reflecting net national gains, reflects the regional distribution of project benefits and costs. If the gains and losses to all regions were fully accounted for, their sum would equal the project's net national benefits. Such information should clearly be of interest to decision-makers concerned with regional progress and matters of equity among regions.

3. impacts on the inter-personal distribution of income and other effects on human well-being such as the saving of life and the reduction of risk and uncertainty.

Non-marketed outputs of the first type have economic values to society no less than do irrigated crops or transportation cost savings. Attempts should continue to develop methods for stimulating values for such outputs in the absence of markets. When such values cannot reasonably be computed, full descriptions of these impacts should be included in the project report. The same can be said for the other classes of beneficial and detrimental impacts.

Because quantifiable economic benefits still predominate among the outputs of natural resource developments, it is argued here that primary emphasis in the design and selection of natural resource projects should still be placed upon the national income impacts. At the very minimum, if projects whose national income costs exceed their national income benefits are to be undertaken in order to serve these other social goals, the corresponding *national income benefits and costs should still be carefully assessed.* No attempt should be made to allocate any part of the national income costs of the project to the attainment of other social goals, for such a partitioning of costs would leave the national income benefit-cost comparison meaningless. It might be helpful to note in the project report approximately what portion of the project cost was attributable to "over-design" as a means of achieving other goals, but provision of such information must not be permitted to obscure the comparison of *total* national income benefits and costs.

On the basis of these considerations we conclude that:

VI. *The basic economic rationale justifying public sector responsibility for natural resource development requires that the criterion of national income enhancement serve as the primary criterion for choice among investment alternatives, and that the extent to which natural resource investments contribute to the attainment of other social objectives be expressed in side displays of information and analyses. There should be no allocation of national income costs to the attainment of other objectives.* Within the framework of these basic economic principles, there exists a great deal of room for improvement in the procedures and methods for evaluating benefits and costs. By way of conclusion, we would offer two suggestions consistent with the above principles on which future efforts for improving benefit and cost measurements should be concentrated.

First, it was noted above that there is a need to account more fully for the direct or primary consequences of natural resource investment projects. Mentioned, for example, were scenic amenities, recreational opportunities, and the preservation of fish, wildlife, and free-flowing streams, all "outputs" which have value, even though they are not priced in the market. Surely the fuller evaluation of these direct, identifiable outputs represents a better application of the limited research resources available to agency planning staffs than probing for much less obvious and difficult-to-measure secondary effects.

Reasonably good methods are continually being developed for the evaluation of these important but difficult-to-quantify primary benefits. Examples are the methods now available to estimate recreation benefits and procedures for the measurement of flood damage reduction in the case of flood control installations. We would urge renewed efforts to develop and gain consensus on appropriate methodologies for the estimation of values for these nonmarketed outputs. In our judgment, this is the first order of business.

Second, it is recommended that policies covering the pricing of outputs of national resource projects and other aspects of cost-sharing by benefited parties and regions be reconsidered. The objective should be greater efficiency in the design and use of resource projects and their outputs by imposing appropriate cost on the users. Since all costs must be borne by someone, such a policy will probably be not only more efficient than current policies but substantially more equitable.

*George S. Tolley, "Reclamation's Influence on the Rest of Agriculture," *Land Economics*, May 1959, pp. 176–80.

## PETITION PROTESTING OUR AID TO COMMUNISTS

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, there are many citizens of the United States gravely concerned today because of our insistence on giving U.S. aid to our Communist enemies who have vowed to bury us.

Recently I was presented with 1,229 petitions containing 20,017 original signatures of concerned citizens from all over the United States, protesting our aid to the Communists. Each of the petitions reads as follows:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

We respectfully urge every Senator, every member of the House of Representatives, and both the Senate and the House as a whole, to exert their authority and use their influence in all honorable ways for the following purpose:

To have this Administration stop, promptly and completely, giving aid in any form, directly or indirectly, to our Communist enemies.

In support of this petition we submit the considerations listed below. The examples and the documentation given to substantiate these statements are only tiny fragments, by way of illustration, of those that are available.

1. We are at war: Our President himself has said "this is war." In actual fact, when measured as to costs, as to the number of our men engaged in the combat area, and as to the current rate of casualties, it is already the third largest war in American history—and is steadily getting larger. (*See article by Clayton Fritchey,* Boston Globe, *October 12, 1966.*)

2. Our enemy is the total Communist bloc of nations: Our Congress has not declared war against any nation. No nation has declared war on us. But the fighting is taking place between North Vietnam and the United States. The officials of Soviet Russia and of one Communist regime after another have repeatedly declared their complete solidarity with North Vietnam. So that, for all practical purposes, we are at war in Southeast Asia with Soviet Russia and its satellites all over the world. (*See* World Marxist Review, *November, 1965*; U.S. News and World Report, *January 30, 1967*; Congressional Record—vol. 112, pt. 20, pp. 27154–27158.)

3. At least eighty percent of the sinews of war are being provided North Vietnam by Soviet Russia and its European Satellites: On May 24, 1965, Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam said: "We shall defeat the Americans with Soviet weapons." (*See,* National Guardian, *January 28, 1967.*) It was not an idle boast. Our Air Force Chief of Staff has called the Communist defenses in North Vietnam "the greatest concentration of anti-aircraft weapons that has ever been known in the history of defense of any town or any area in the world." These installations, and the training and supervision to make them effective, have been provided by Soviet Russia. (*See* New York Times Magazine, *October 16, 1966.*)

"The North Vietnamese war machine runs almost entirely on Russian oil. In the past eighteen months the Russians shipped 300,-

000 tons. The Chinese provided almost none. Last month alone, the Soviets shipped nearly 25,000 metric tons of gasoline and oil into Haiphong." (*See* U.S. News and World Report, *January 30, 1967, Page 28.*) During the last months of 1966 the Soviet Union shipped one hundred new MIG jet fighters to Hanoi, thus doubling the size of North Vietnam's airforce. (*See* New York Times, *December 13, 1966.*) A full list of similar items would be almost endless.

4. This help to North Vietnam has been made possible almost entirely by our help to the Soviet Union and its satellites.

On October 7, 1966, a speech by the President to the National Conference of Editorial Writers included the following statements:

"We intend to press for legislative authority to negotiate trade agreements which could extend *most-favored nation* tariff treatment to European Communist states. (The emphasis is ours.) And today I am announcing the following steps:

"We will reduce export controls on East-West trade with respect to hundreds of non-strategic items.

"I have just today signed a determination that will allow the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to four additional Eastern European countries—*Poland* (emphasis ours) and Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia . . .

"The Secretary of State is now reviewing the possibility of easing the burden of Polish debts to the United States . . .

"The Export-Import Bank is prepared to finance exports for the Soviet-Italian Fiat auto plant . . ."

This was not mere oratory. With regard to just one part of such comprehensive assistance to our enemies (who have vowed to bury us), the *New York Times* reported, one week later, on October 13:

"The United States put into effect today one of President Johnson's proposals for stimulating East-West trade by removing restrictions on the export of more than four hundred commodities to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe . . .

"Poland and Rumania have been given special treatment, and in general, the result of today's measure will be to extend such treatment to the Soviet Union, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and Mongolia.

"Among the categories from which items have been selected for export relaxation are vegetables, cereals, fodder, hides, crude and manufactured rubber, pulp and waste paper, textiles and textile fibers, crude fertilizers, metal ores and scrap, *petroleum* (our emphasis), gas and derivatives, chemical compounds and products, dyes, medicines, fireworks, detergents, plastic materials, metal products and machinery, and scientific and professional instruments."

And two weeks later, on October 27, 1966, the *Times* informed us that "The Soviet Union and its allies agreed at the conference of their leaders in Moscow last week to grant North Vietnam assistance in material and money amounting to about one billion dollars. . . . Poland's contribution will be thirty million dollars, it was said. . . ." The Soviets had correctly interpreted all of this contemplated additional *trade* with the United States as simply a subterfuge for *aid* to themselves—through loans by the Export-Import Bank, the repeated scaling down or cancellation of previous loans of all kinds, and a general subsidization in the usual wide variety of forms. And they were quick to show their appreciation by promising to pass on to our enemies in North Vietnam this additional help which our aid to themselves would make possible.

Again this is but a sample. We believe that with adequate space it could be demonstrated that many of these Communist regimes would not even be able to maintain themselves in power, and much less to do their part in sustaining worldwide Communist aggression, but for the constant transfusion into their systems of economic aid from the United States. (*See continuous information on this subject in various issues of* The Review of The News *throughout 1966.*) Yet hundreds of our boys are now being killed in Vietnam every week, supposedly to prevent the aggression and advance of this Communist octopus.

5. And "none dare call it treason": At least, we do not, because we are in no position to identify the traitors. But the Constitution of the United States clearly does. (*Article III, Section 3.*) And regardless of the wide variety of specious excuses and deceptive double-talk which are advanced to justify such criminal folly (or worse), we urge that this constant flow of "aid and comfort" to our normal enemies be cut off completely, and at once.

Respectfully but emphatically,

(Signature.)

Mr. Speaker, the above is signed by 20,017 concerned American citizens and their signatures are available for inspection in my office.

## BACALL VERSUS ABM

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1969, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., published an excellent editorial in the Hearst newspapers in defense of the ABM. Mr. Hearst wrote the article in response to a rally staged at Madison Square Garden the last week in June by opponents of President Nixon's proposed anti-ballistic-missile program.

I think the comments of Mr. Hearst should be read by every American. As we in Congress finally come to grips with the ABM issue, we have a critically important decision to make, and, in my humble opinion, the security of the United States hangs in the balance. In my view we have no logical alternative to deployment of the ABM, and I never cease to be amazed at those who excuse every offensive activity of the Communists, but sneer and protest at a defensive plan of the United States that would protect us from those who have continuously sworn to destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, I will address this body more fully later on the vital need for ABM defense. Meanwhile, I respectfully submit the following editorial and call it to the attention of my congressional colleagues and to all of America:

BACALL VERSUS ABM

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK, June 28.—A rally staged here this week by opponents of President Nixon's proposed Anti-Ballistic Missile program (ABM) causes me to return again to that subject. It's much too important a topic to let the tom toms being pounded by these people go unchallenged.

Naturally the whoop-it-up was staged in Madison Square Garden, where "anti" rallies almost inevitably are held. Following the traditional pattern of such gatherings it featured speeches by a number of public officials and professors and—of course—had the usual array of screen and stage personalities as drawing cards.

Among the latter who joined in lambasting our military establishment in general, and the ABM in particular, were such military authorities as Paul Newman, Dustin Hoffman, Tony Randall and Lauren Bacall. Which leads me to pose a pertinent question:

I ask you, in a matter which involves the basic security of this nation, whose advice would you be more inclined to follow—Lauren Bacall's or Richard Nixon's?

It is to laugh. Lauren Bacall's qualifications to pass unbiased, informed judgment on the Safeguard ABM system, of course, are totally non-existent. Yet those of the two principal speakers of the evening—Mayor Lindsay and Sen. Albert Gore—are hardly much better.

Lindsay, for example, filled the air with a lot of high-sounding oratory about how the money needed for military expenditures "belongs in the streets, the homes and the hopes of the cities." I maintain that this witness, as mayor of the largest and most money-hungry city of them all, is quite naturally and quite obviously prejudiced by self-interest.

And so is Sen. Gore and a third speaker, Prof. George Wald of Harvard. The highly doubtful objectivity of the lawmaker from Tennessee is demonstrated by the fact that he is one of our senators most frequently quoted by Hanoi, Prof. Wald, quite simply, is an expert in physiology and medicine—not military matters.

Thus, none of the big guns at the rally have any rightful claim to speak with unbiased expertise on a subject of vital importance to 200 million Americans.

All they have in common is the notion that further development of our national defenses—and especially the ABM program—is unnecessary and somehow a threat to peace.

Soviet Russia decided long ago that an ABM system was essential for its over-all military posture, so it already has installed one. Needless to say, nobody either in Russia or the United States stood up on his hind legs and opposed the move as a threat to peace.

If there is one thing about our dove-minded popoffs which never ceases to amaze me, it is how they excuse everything the Russians do and sneer at the very idea that the Communists are a threat. This attitude was reflected time and again at the Garden rally.

My answer to that is—if Russia were not a threat to us, then we could do a lot more besides scrapping our ABM program. We could go ahead and scrap our Army, Navy and Air Force as well. We wouldn't need them.

The fact is that the Soviet Union and its minions are our only real enemy. Red China can't get at us. So who else IS there? Uruguay? Somaliland? Luxembourg? Tibet?

And here's another question. Why, do you suppose, Russia backed down in the Cuban missile crisis? Was it because President Jack Kennedy was so persuasive with idealistic arguments? Just read Bobby's hair-raising book on what really happened.

We were forced to go to the brink of war to avoid war. If we had not met the Communist challenge Cuba would be a bristling armed camp today, with nuclear Big Berthas pointed at our vitals. Or maybe, by this time, we wouldn't be here at all.

What stopped the Russians was one thing and one thing only—fear of and respect for the military might of the United States. They knew they were not being called with cap pistols.

Now since the Soviets can pull a chilling showdown like the Cuba test, the whole question of how we spend our money around this country for social improvements becomes secondary. Improvements will mean nothing if we do not have the military means to protect them from international bandits.

The United States is the richest, most desirable piece of real estate in the world. It is simple-minded nonsense not to believe that the Communists would like to take us over. All you have to do is listen to them. They have said often enough that our destruction

is their fondest dream—and the main thing they are working for.

At the same time they know that this nation is not going to attack them. So why do they keep arming themselves? Why do they keep building bigger and deadlier missiles, nuclear subs, supersonic jets?

There can be only one reason, and I think you're smart enough to figure it out for yourself.

The nearest thing to truth to ever come out of the mouth of a Soviet diplomat was said to Henry Cabot Lodge in 1950 when this country went into Korea to stop a would-be Red takeover.

The Russian ambassador to the UN, Jacob Malik, was genuinely astonished at our reaction. He plaintively asked Cab "how come?", pointing out that our secretary of state had said that our sphere of vital interest in the Far East did not include the mainland. Our action, he implied, was a violation of the rules.

What could be clearer? Under the Communist code, it is perfectly proper to take over any country the Russians want so long as they think we are not concerned. And that most certainly wouldn't stop them if they thought we didn't have the strength and will to call a halt.

In his typical speech at the Garden, Sen. Gore said flatly that the ABM is not needed. "By stimulating the arms race," he added, "it makes us less rather than more secure."

There are two points to be made here.

First, who is Sen. Gore to say the ABM is not needed? When the plumbing goes on the fritz you call a plumber. If the roof leaks you call a carpenter. And in a matter of military need you had better call an experienced military man, not a pacifist politician.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—There is a curious bond between editors and military men. For some obscure reason, almost everybody thinks he can do the highly professional work required in each case without any training whatever.)

The second point about Gore's remarks is that they are what I will call a bare-faced misstatement, although there is a shorter word for it. He must know he's not telling the truth when he says that by doing what Russia already has done "we will stimulate the arms race."

Where was Gore and all the rest of his ilk when the Communists were deploying their ABM's? That was the time for them to say stop—but who heard a peep out of any of them? Nobody, that's who.

The greatest force for peace in the world has been and is today the superior armed might of America. It is the only thing the Communists respect; the only thing that keeps the free world free, and the only guarantee of our own safety.

In this divided world of ours the second strongest nation is like the second best hand in poker—it loses.

On re-reading the above, the thought occurs to me that I am possibly unduly exercised about these anti-ABM voices.

Their arguments can't be too persuasive. Only 4,000 showed for their Garden rally. By contrast, some 20,000 packed the place the night before to watch a punk prizefight.

Besides, I guess there really is nothing to worry about, anyway.

Lauren Bacall says so.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous request, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today through July 9, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. MOSHER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for July 7, 8, and 9, 1969, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLLOCK (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON), for 1 hour, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RARICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 60 minutes, on July 9.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DONOHUE to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 4246 and H.R. 4247.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. POLLOCK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. POWELL in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.

Mr. PODELL in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. CONYERS in three instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 853. An act to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12167. An act 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.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 2, 1969, present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11069. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12167. An act 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.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 8, 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:

917. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to amend section 401 of title 37, United States Code, to include parents-in-law in the definition of dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Armed Services.

918. A letter from the assistant to the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia to change the method of calculating each year's appropriation for the teachers' retirement fund; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

919. A letter from the assistant to the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Street Readjustment Act, and eliminate guarantee clauses in pavement construction contracts for streets in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

920. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the effectiveness and administration of the community action program in Carroll, Chariton, Lafayette, Ray, and Saline Counties, Mo., under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

921. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the effectiveness and administration of the Wellfleet Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, South Wellfleet, Mass., Department of the Interior, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

922. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

923. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the improvements needed in Army supply

management and stock fund activities in Korea, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

924. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the savings attainable through improved application of the economic order principle in the procurement of military supplies, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

925. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on savings in shipments of printed matter from Japan to points in the Pacific, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

926. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on opportunities for better service and economies through standardization of pharmacy items and consolidation of bulk compounding facilities, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

927. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the activities of the office of the government comptroller of the Virgin Islands fiscal years 1966 and 1967, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

928. A letter from the Chairman and the Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to secure bulk power supplies adequate to satisfy the mounting demands of the people of the United States, consistent with environmental protection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

929. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

930. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States under the provisions of section 212(a) 28(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

931. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a prospectus proposing construction of a Federal correctional center and Federal parking facility at Chicago, Ill., pursuant to section 7a of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 480), as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

932. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Mortgage Interest Rates, transmitting an interim report pursuant to Public Law 90-301 (82 Stat. 115); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 12085. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to extend the program of research relating to fuel and vehicles; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 12597. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide that young men serve 1-year memberships on local boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H.R. 12598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs, and to provide training and employment opportunities for those individuals whose lack of skills and education acts as a barrier to their employment at or above the Federal minimum wage, by means of subsidies to employers engaged in small business on a decreasing scale in order to compensate such employers for the risk of hiring the poor and unskilled in their local communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12599. A bill to provide for the equalization of the retired pay of members of the uniformed services of equal grade and years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12600. A bill to make certain revisions in the retirement benefits of District of Columbia public school teachers and other educational employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12601. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, with respect to charges for certain census records, compilations, and surveys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 12602. 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. FASCELL:

H.R. 12603. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide for the establishment of a Council on Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12604. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants for local education programs designed to dissuade young people from using narcotic drugs; to the committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12605. A bill to amend section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 12606. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 12607. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide full parity price supports with respect to wheat, corn, barley, oats, rye, soybeans, flax, and grain sorghums, and reduced production of such crops by voluntary participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12608. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property situated in the State of Hawaii to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. BURTON of California, and Mr. COHELAN):

H.R. 12609. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12611. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require foreign air carriers to file policies of insurance with the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12612. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12613. A bill to permit State agreements for coverage under the hospital insurance program for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 12614. A bill to provide that the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower shall appear on the quarter dollar; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12615. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12616. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12617. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide a comprehensive program for the training of attorneys and related personnel in order to improve the legal services available to the community; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 12618. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12619. A bill to amend section 11 of an act approved August 4, 1950, entitled "An act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 806. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September 1969 as "Bible Translation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINN:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

233. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to enactment of legislation providing for a substantial increase in social security payments to elderly persons, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 12620. A bill for the relief of James B. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12621. A bill for the relief of Lt. Robert J. Scanlon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12622. A bill for the relief of Russell L. Chandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12623. A bill for the relief of Julian G. Carr; 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:

162. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the 21st Saipan Legislature, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Marianas Islands, relative to assignment of Peace Corps volunteer attorneys to assist the people of the municipality of Saipan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

163. Also, petition of the 21st Saipan Legislature, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Marianas Islands, relative to enactment of an official plebiscite for the people of the Marianas not later than June 30, 1972; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

164. Also, petition of the American Legion, Washington, D.C., relative to a resolution of the national executive committee assembled in St. Louis, Mo., commending Congress for granting educational benefits to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

165. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Santa Cruz County, Calif., relative to a resolution opposing taxation of income from municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

166. Also, petition of the City Council, Harrisonburg, Va., relative to taxation of State and local government obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

167. Also, petition of the Association of County Treasurers of California, Oroville, Calif., relative to retaining the tax-exempt status of State and local government bond issues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

168. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to Charles A. Lindbergh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

# SENATE—*Monday, July 7, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not upon thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct thy paths.* Proverbs 3:5 and 6.

Teach us, O Lord, in the coming crucial days not simply to acknowledge Thee, but in the depths of our nature to trust Thee for wisdom, for judgment, and for strength. Deliver us from the coldness of heart, the indolence of attitude, and the indifference of mind that shuts Thee out, or the busy-ness that will not let Thee in. As we move from this sacred interlude to take up our duties, preserve in us a sense of Thy pervading presence and the assurance of the quiet direction of Thy spirit in the work of this Chamber and in the affairs of the Nation.

Rekindle in all the people the flame of holy living and let the bright light of a glowing patriotism shine throughout the land. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 2, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 1, 1969, the following reports of committees were submitted on July 3, 1969:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1458. A bill to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association (Rept. No. 91-288).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 545. A bill to amend section 9 of the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act (Rept. No. 91-287); and

S. 2185. A bill to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89-774 (80 Stat. 1324) (Rept. No. 91-289).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1072. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended (Rept. No. 91-291).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2546. An original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-290).

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 1, 1969, the following report of a committee was submitted on July 7, 1969:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2547. An original bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (Rept. No. 91-292).

## WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar of unobjected to bills under rule VIII be waived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCLUDE PARENTS-IN-LAW IN THE DEFINITION OF DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 401 of title 37, United States Code, to include parents-in-law in the definition of dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STREET READJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Street Readjustment Act, and eliminate guarantee clauses in pavement construction contracts for streets in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings in shipments of printed matter from Japan to points in the Pacific, Department of Defense, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvements needed in Army supply management and stock fund activities in Korea, Department of the Army, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings attainable through improved application of the economic order principle in the procurement of military supplies, Department of Defense, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on opportunities for better service and economies through standardiza-