cleaned up parts of the river in May to make way for a trip by its members.

Anyone interested in complete information about the project to clean up the Clinton River may stop at the committee's trailer in the Sterling Shopping Center or call 268–1070.

Members of the survey party also saw many drains pouring polluted water into the river and the main outlet from the Sterling Sewage Plant on Clinton River Road. In some areas the river was so clogged with green scum, garbage and rubbish that the water was barely moving although the main current was rather fast.

It was obvious that many Sterling Heights residents considered the river as their own personal dumping ground and didn't hesitate to use it for getting rid of garbage, construction debris, grass cuttings, old car parts and the residue from picnics and backyard barbecues.

Although some of the main obstructions, mostly submerged tree trunks and newly fallen trees, had been cleared away last month, there were still many places where the survey group had a rough time getting through. Recent storms had blown down many trees and moved submerged objects to the surface of the river.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, July 14, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

We do not lose heart because we look not to the things that are seen, but to the things that are unseen; for the things that are seen are transient, but the things that are unseen are eternal.—II Corinthians 4: 16, 18 (RSV).

For our Nation and all she stands for, we give Thee thanks, our Father. Looking about us, we can see that we have been blessed beyond measure.

For our form of government and this body of our Government, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the dedicated men and women who serve here, we are grateful.

In the midst of our material blessings, help us not to forget the unseen spiritual values that have helped to make us great.

Let those who make decisions here, as well as all of us, be inspired to new heart and hope, remembering that love cannot be defeated by hate, nor truth by error, nor life by death. In the name of the Prince of Peace, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 10, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 8, 1969:

H.R. 265. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies; and

H.R. 4297. An act to amend the act of November 8, 1966.

On July 9, 1969:

H.R. 8644. An act to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 6508. An act to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, and high waters.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1075. An act to establish a national policy for the environment; to authorize studies, surveys, and research relating to ecological systems, natural resources, and the quality of the human environment; and to establish a Board of Environmental Quality Advisers.

S. 1686. An act relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; and

S. 2173. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes," approved April 11, 1968.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTEREST RATE BILL, H.R. 255

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, at one time in these United States, there was a money lender who sought to achieve the distinction—and he considered it an honor—of being the richest man in the cemetery. He soon achieved his "distinction" and the good citizens got together and agreed upon an epitaph for his monument.

It was as follows:

Here lies old Sixteen Percent,
The more he got, the more he lent,
The more he made, the less he spent,
He's gone. We don't know which way he went,
But if to heaven his soul has went
He'll own the place and charge them rent.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the calendar lists H.R. 255 as a bill to "deduct interest in advance on installment loans."

Mr. Speaker, we would be more accurate if we retitled this legislation the "Usury Act of 1969" or the "Bankers Poverty Act of 1969" and referred it to the Office of Economic Opportunity for special attention.

These District of Columbia bankers are coming in here asking for 16 percent interest on installment loans obviously because they feel they are suffering—apparently in grave danger of being another statistic in our poverty program.

Only last week, Mr. Speaker, I noted that one of these banks—Riggs National—had a profit increase of 23 percent for the first half of 1969—23 percent more than they made in the first half of 1968.

After paying taxes and stock dividends, the bank had $4,586,000 in profits for the first 6 months.

And another one of these banks—American Security & Trust Co.—reported an increase in net earnings of 12 percent in the first 6 months of 1969—12 percent more than they made in the same period of 1968.

This bank's take-home pay—profit—was a cool $4,214,118 in the first 6 months.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that all of these District of Columbia banks that are poor-mouthing it here today are enjoying similar profits—way up from their 1968 net earnings.

So, unless we are setting some new and fantastic figure on poverty levels, I think it is obvious that these banks do not need this special legislation to protect their earnings. They are raking in a bonanza in profits as it is now without this Congress giving them any more help.

BILL AFFECTS INTEREST RATES NATIONWIDE

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this bill—H.R. 255—affects only a handful of the Nation's 13,000 banks and only a small percentage of the total population. But, Mr. Speaker, what we do here today concerning the interest rates charged in the District of Columbia will affect every citizen in every congressional district across the land.

We cannot stand here today and endorse 16 percent bank interest in the District of Columbia and then tell our constituents that we are for low interest rates.

The banks and the legislatures across the land will interpret our actions here today as a new mandate—a new standard on usury—on interest rates. Passage of H.R. 255—with its 16 percent interest rates—will hamstring any action this Congress might want to take later to control interest rates across the country.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of this House have spoken in strong terms against the commercial banks' latest increases in the prime interest rates. Others have spoken to me privately and expressed deep concern about the prime rate and I have seen many of the letters that Members have written to their constituents pledging a fight for lower interest rates.

Today is an opportunity for the House of Representatives to go on record against high interest—against 16-percent rates for bank loans. It is our first opportunity since the banks raised their rates on June 9.

Mr. Speaker, it is foolish for this Congress to stand up and talk against a national prime interest rate of 8½ percent and at the same time vote for a 16-percent rate under the guise of a District of Columbia bill.

AN ATTACK ON TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that worry me greatly about H.R. 255. In addition to giving congressional sanction to a 16 percent bank interest rate, it is an obvious attempt to gain legal approval of a questionable loan practice. I refer specifically to the so-called discount or add-on method of calculating loan charges to the consumer. These have been the devices used to fool the public—to keep them in the dark about bank charges.

Much is made of the fact that these add ons and discounting are allowed in many jurisdictions. But this is no excuse for the Congress to give national recognition or approval to these practices—practices which are designed only to deceive the public.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress passed the Truth in Lending Act last year and it went into effect only 2 weeks ago—July 1. The House of Representatives approved that act by an overwhelming margin and one of the primary purposes of the legislation was to reveal—and eventually to stop—such practices as add ons and discounting in the figuring of finance charges.

H.R. 255 seeks to reverse the Truth in Lending Act and give sanction—congressional sanction—to the practice of discounting and add ons. Again, I repeat, these devices are nothing but gimmicks to hide true charges from the public and they cannot survive under the revelations that are required in the Truth in Lending Act.

VIOLATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

Mr. Speaker, subsection (c), appearing at the top of page 4 of the bill, appears to be a simple provision which permits the lending institutions to state the interest rates as add on, discount, or otherwise as long as the true rate of interest does not exceed the limit set in the bill. However, the committee report, on which the ink is still wet, states in the last paragraph on page 5 that:

> The Committee considers the interest rates prescribed to be nothing more than a reflection of the true interest rates presently charged on small installment Loans.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Committee may have made a sensational finding. If I interpret this report language correctly, the committee is stating that the banks in the District of Columbia have been charging more than the legal maximum of 8 percent on installment loans.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Code has provided for more than 50 years that any interest charged above 8 percent is usurious. Now the District of Columbia Committee says, according to this report, that the banks have been charging 12, 14, and 16 percent interest—in violation of the District of Columbia Code.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the U.S. attorney's office in the District of Columbia will take due note of this report. Also, it would appear that many consumers in the District and the suburbs would have a course of legal action against these banks if they have been charged more than the District of Columbia Code allows.

H.R. 255, I fear, would give some sort of retroactive sanction to these illegal and usurious charges and possibly destroy the rights of thousands of consumers. I am sure that the District of Columbia Committee did not want to give any such sanction and I am certain that the House would be against approving such lawbreaking by the banks. If these banks have been fixing installment interest rates in violation of the District of Columbia Code, then it is obvious that legal investigations should be launched immediately. Law and order ought to begin right in the banking community. Law and order applies to the big boys as well as the average citizen of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 255 LEAVES TOO MANY UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Mr. Speaker, there are too many unanswered questions about H.R. 255. And frankly, there are too many unanswered questions about interest rates and the banking community nationwide for this Congress to act intelligently at this time on such legislation.

If I understand the language of this bill correctly it would apply only to the interest rates charged by the so-called regulated financial institutions—that is, banks and savings and loan associations. The bill does not touch revolving credit—department store credit—and it makes no mention of the finance and small loan companies. The language of the bill does not appear to affect the tremendous amounts of credit that are extended by dealers and their subsidiaries in the purchase of new and used cars.

And what about credit cards where so much of the credit is extended today? In fact, the District's biggest credit card operation—Central Charge—is a wholly owned subsidiary of Riggs National Bank and is it to escape regulation in this bill?

In short, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 255 is piecemeal legislation that attempts to set charges in only one area of the District's huge credit industry. Mr. Speaker, it would seem much more reasonable and much fairer to look at the entire question of finance charges in the District rather than rushing through this special legislation for the banks.

SECRECY AND BANKING LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia banks that are seeking these favors here today are quite timid institutions—reluctant to speak out publicly in open session and defend their demands. It is my understanding that they sought a closed session to present their case when the legislation was before the District Committee.

This is typical of the banks—they prefer to operate in secret and as far away from the public spotlight as possible.

On February 6, I wrote Mr. Robert C. Baker, chairman of the District of Columbia Clearing House Association—of which all the major District of Columbia banks are members—and asked a series of questions about the loan policies of the banks operating in this area.

The questions I raised in that letter have a direct bearing on what the House is discussing here today. Yet—6 months later—I have not received a reply to these questions.

In June, I sought other answers—concerning the prime rate increase—from Riggs National Bank of Washington, the largest beneficiary of the bill before us today. Riggs had been among the first to raise the prime rate to 8½ percent and I had sought to have its chief executive officer, Mr. L. A. Jennings, appear before the Banking and Currency Committee in an investigation of the prime rate increase.

But, Mr. Jennings informed me he was going to Europe—apparently to the American Bankers Association convention in Copenhagen—and would be unavailable as requested by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is foolish for Congress to rewrite these banking laws and grant special favors when the banks refuse to meet legitimate requests by Congress for basic information.

Mr. Speaker, if the banks cannot defend their position in open session, then Congress has no business trying to pass this legislation.

INVESTIGATIONS UNDERWAY

Mr. Speaker, there is much concern about the banking industry nationwide. Many questions are being asked about excessive profits stemming from high interest rates. The Banking and Currency Committee has an investigation underway concerning the prime rate increase of June 9 and the Justice Department is conducting a full-scale investigation of possible antitrust violations by the banks in the June 9 increase. On the Senate side, there has been much talk of new legislation to control interest rates and there is much pressure on the administration to do something to hold back the banks' demand for more and more profits and higher and higher interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that no action is taken on H.R. 255 until we have more information about the District of Columbia banks and until such time as these pending investigations are completed.

Again, Mr. Speaker, a vote for H.R. 255 would be highly destructive to efforts to bring down interest rates on a national basis. A vote for H.R. 255 is a vote for higher interest rates. It should be rejected.

INTEREST RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, just to set the record straight, I would like to advise the House that the bill which my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), has just mentioned has been misrepresented more than any other bill that has ever been considered by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that we are not asking the House to change the interest rates in the District of Columbia. We are only asking to make legal what the banks have been doing for 61 years.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will admit that he is proposing the doubling of the interest rates? They are 8 percent now and you propose to make them legal at 16 percent. That represents a 100-percent increase.

Mr. McMILLAN. The banks have been charging the proposed interest rate asked for in this bill on small short-term loans for 61 years.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, Congress has not approved it and I hope Congress will never approve it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will state to the gentleman that Woodward & Lothrop and Sears & Roebuck have an 18-percent interest rate on short-term purchases. The reason for this request is the fact that we passed the truth-in-lending bill whereby all lending agencies must state exactly what they are charging. They want to prevent a number of lawsuits on small loans that may come up in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the banks actually do not want these small loans—and are performing a courtesy to the people who want a short-term small loan. The only two banks which I know that will be affected if this bill is not passed are owned and operated by colored people in the District of Columbia. Those two banks are the Industrial Bank of Washington and the United Community National Bank. They make the majority of these small loans. The president and vice president of these banks are colored, and operate two of the finest banks in Washington. I do not believe that banks such as the Riggs National Bank, the American Trust Bank and many other banks, representatives of which testified on this legislation, particularly care to handle these small loans. I am sure that they will cut off such loans of this type unless this bill is passed. In other words, they are not anxious to take a chance on making small loans where they make very little profit, and take a chance of being sued.

THE SINCERITY OF SOVIET "FRIENDSHIP"

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in 1967, the commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Gorshkov, said:

How would Americans like it if rocket launching Russian ships maneuvered in the Gulf of Mexico, 80 miles from New Orleans?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will ask that question now of those who feel that we should stop developing our MIRV, not build the Safeguard ABM, and cease our research into lethal gases and bacteriological warfare.

The maneuvering in American waters by Soviet naval vessels is not an act of friendship. Let there be no doubt about that.

At this very moment there are seven Russian ships in the Gulf of Mexico: one guided missile light cruiser, one guided missile frigate, two submarines, one submarine tender, and two tankers.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should know that the Soviets are sending newer model Soviet Mig's to Cuba, another obvious "friendly" gesture on the part of the Soviet Union.

And there are those who would once again put their heads in the sand and say, "We can trust the Russians. Let us reduce our defense spending."

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read excerpts from the Communist Party Journal of the Soviet Armed Forces, which is once again stirring up hatred against the United States. This Soviet journal said that it was mandatory for young recruits to be "taught hatred for the enemy" and that the leading enemy, so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, is the United States.

Once again, the Soviets are demonstrating their great fondness for America and our way of life. And once again, I would remind the House of that famous expression of George Santayana:

Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

CONGRESS SHOULD REFUSE TO INCREASE INTEREST RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I notice on this morning's calendar that there is a bill by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN) for the purpose of substantially increasing interest rates in the District of Columbia. The Congress of the United States is now requested to put its stamp of approval on this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill does is to seek to accomplish indirectly what cannot be done directly. For example, it allows deduction of interest in advance on loaned money. If an individual wishes to borrow $5,000, and interest is deducted in advance, he then receives that $5,000, less the deducted sum of money. Interest, therefore, is compounded all the more. We have usury rather than lending.

I certainly believe this is a grossly unfair act to perpetrate upon individual borrowers.

This is back-door chicanery. If they wish to increase interest rates, let them seek to do so directly, without attempting to permit such actions indirectly by congressional sanction. Lower and middle income taxpayers would be directly harmed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the last thing this Congress ought to do is to put any stamp of approval on such legislation.

SOVIET NAVAL VESSELS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the remarks made by the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services to the effect that the Russian vessels, which are at present in the Gulf of Mexico, necessitate development of ABM and MIRV weapons systems.

I am just wondering if the conventional torpedo system might not be adequate to the job of sinking these surface vessels in case they did menace this country.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not believe it requires anything like that. It just requires a lot of guts.

Mr. JACOBS. But probably in addition to the guts, it would require some kind of weapon, if they did menace us. And I just wondered if we need a multiple-headed rocket to do this, because we were destroying ships during World War II, and we got them with torpedoes.

Has that situation changed?

Mr. RIVERS. I would say it was just like an overcoat. I would rather have one than want one.

Mr. JACOBS. Why does the gentleman want one if you can do the job for less, say, $30 or $40 billion less?

I just asked that on behalf of the taxpayers of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

JOHN RICHARD RARICK III

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rarick and I are proud to report the birth of our first grandchild—John Richard Rarick III.

John III, was born Friday, July 11 at 1:07 a.m. in Baton Rouge, La., at Our Lady of the Lake Hospital.

It is truly gratifying to watch our young people, reared in the ideals and principles cherished by free men, bring forth another generation to continue their heritage of liberty and independent thinking.

One of the most priceless rewards of a happy and enduring marriage is the realization that one's lineage has been continued and his name perpetuated.

INFLATION

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there has been an understandable continuum of concern over inflation in this country. There have been many nostrums and more medicines introduced designed to cure inflation.

Some of these medicines are going to leave us in the position somewhat like the little country boy who was asked, after he was taken ill, how he was getting along.

He said:

Well, considering all the medicine I am taking, I think I am going to be sick a long time after I get well.

There is understandable concern about many things we are trying to do to fight inflation, but I think there is one thing we have not done. And that is the application of Regulation W, which would require larger down payments on all purchases made on credit. I think this is a far better way to approach our problem than increasing interest rates. Creditors would select buyers based upon their willingness to put more equity into a purchase. This approach would slow down the accumulation of debt-building in this country, and has the added advantage of less risk for the person who is writing the debt or carrying the credit.

It would seem to me that if we adopted this posture that interest rates would move to a lower scale because one of the reasons you establish an interest rate is to buy the risk, and if a person is willing to put in a greater equity, there is lesser reason for interest rates to be so high.

I think in America it is time for us to take a sober look at ourselves and say: There are some things we can do without until we are in a position to establish greater equity and put more of our present earnings into our present buying, rather than to extend far into the future the credit accumulations.

This in itself would slow down the economy in a pattern that I think far better suits the illness we are now in than some of the medicines we have been taking.

FARM PRICES

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Texas, who so ably heads the Agriculture Committee, was speaking about cattle prices and the necessity for new agricultural legislation. I am certainly not speaking in controversy with the gentleman.

The reason we are short in our supply of beef is that for a long time it has been unprofitable for the farmer to raise or feed cattle. Now, as he tries to increase his herd, he keeps on the farm heifers which normally would have gone to market, thus further reducing the animals for slaughter.

But there are a couple of other lessons here, too: First, that the law of supply and demand does operate in the field of agriculture when it is permitted to do so. Second, we must recognize that here is one instance in the entire agricultural field where the price has now reached a point relatively consistent with the rest of the economy of the country. Other farm prices remain in an extremely depressed condition.

The agriculture of the Nation is still in deep trouble, and we must do some things to help bring it up to its rightful place.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. GERALD R. FORD

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in announcing to the House that our minority leader, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, is celebrating a birthday this day. If I recall correctly, it is now his 56th birthday. GERRY has had a most interesting career in the past. He has enjoyed the best of health, and I am sure he has many more enjoyable and interesting days before him. All of us who have the privilege of serving with him and being closely associated with him wish him the very best.

I trust that in the immediate years ahead he continues to enjoy wonderful health, and may continue to serve his country in such an outstanding way. We all wish him the very best in the years ahead.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman in wishing a happy birthday to our great minority leader. I hope he will have many more years of useful service, useful life, and particularly many more years as our distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Illinois for yielding for the purpose of enabling me to extend my congratulations to our distinguished minority leader on reaching his 56th birthday. I cannot help but remark about the fact that this is also Bastille Day in France, and there are those who I think would be so unfeeling as to say that the Honorable GERALD R. FORD was born on Bastille Day. But I would prefer to say that the French people showed great foresight some years ago in storming the Bastille on that great day which would be the birthday of the Honorable GERALD R. FORD. May he have many more anniversaries of this day.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with my friend from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) in extending congratulations and felicitations to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on this, his birthday, and to express with the gentleman the hope that Mr. FORD will continue to provide for many years to come the distinguished service he has always given us.

I cannot quite agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that the service always ought to be in the capacity of minority leader. I have other and higher hopes for the gentleman from Michigan than that, but we would hope he would continue to serve in this body for many years to come.

INVITATION TO SIOUX CITY RIVER-CADE

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great rivers in this hemisphere is the Missouri, originating in Montana, flowing through the Dakotas, forming Iowa's border with Nebraska, and touching Kansas before heading eastward through Missouri toward its confluence with the Mississippi near St. Louis.

This great heartland water course, which proved so essential to the opening of the West, continues to play a vital role in further developing the transportation, industry, and recreational facilities of the area.

I am happy to report to the House that the port of Sioux City will again pay tribute to the unique importance of the Missouri by staging its 1969 edition of the famous Sioux City River-Cade from July 30 through August 3. A full program of events and festivities will be highlighted by parades on both land and water.

The purpose of the River-Cade celebration is to bring together the many people of the Siouxland area to demonstrate and reaffirm the tremendous potential of the mighty Missouri and what continued development of the river's resources will mean to the entire region.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere pleasure to extend a cordial invitation to attend this year's River-Cade to all Members of this House, and through this notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to all Members of the other body. I commend Commodore H. W. Bud Jones and his staff and wish them well in their efforts to make this the most successful of all Sioux City River-Cades.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia might announce to the House certain bills which have been removed from the calendar today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina for that purpose.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, since so many Members of Congress are absent today on account of elections in Virginia tomorrow and for other reasons, I have decided to carry over several bills which may have some controversial elements. We will be carrying over several bills to the next District day. One of them is the bill which has to do with interest rates. I regret there has been so much misinformation sent out on this bill that it could not pass today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, is it also true the gentleman has taken off these bills: H.R. 9551 regarding the Metropolitan Police Band; H.R. 1783, to incorporate Paralyzed Veterans of America; H.R. 6947, to amend grandfather clause regarding chancery locations; H.R. 9553, to amend District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act for hospital employees; and the bill the gentleman just mentioned, H.R. 255, to deduct interest in advance on installment loans;

H.R. 8868, regarding interstate compact on juveniles; H.R. 5967, providing for two auto tags per Member; and H.R. 12671, to permit employment of minors 14 to 16 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from South Carolina, is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, those bills will be carried over until the next District day.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire with respect to the status of the minimum wage bill, is that the bill having to do with picketing?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina if he desires to answer that inquiry at this time.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage bill will go over to the next District day, but the picketing bill is still on the calendar for today.

THE DRUG PROBLEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–138)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Within the last decade, the abuse of drugs has grown from essentially a local police problem into a serious national threat to the personal health and safety of millions of Americans.

A national awareness of the gravity of the situation is needed; a new urgency and concerted national policy are needed at the Federal level to begin to cope with this growing menace to the general welfare of the United States.

Between the years 1960 and 1967, juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose by almost 800 percent; half of those now being arrested for the illicit use of narcotics are under 21 years of age. New York City alone has records of some 40,000 heroin addicts, and the number rises between 7,000 and 9,000 a year. These official statistics are only the tip of an iceberg whose dimensions we can only surmise.

The number of narcotics addicts across the United States is now estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. Another estimate is that several million American college students have at least experimented with marihuana, hashish, LSD, amphetamines, or barbiturates. It is doubtful that an American parent can send a son or daughter to college today without exposing the young man or woman to drug abuse. Parents must also be concerned about the availability and use of such drugs in our high schools and junior high schools.

The habit of the narcotics addict is not only a danger to himself, but a threat to the community where he lives. Narcotics have been cited as a primary cause of the enormous increase in street crimes over the last decade.

As the addict's tolerance for drugs increases, his demand for drugs rises, and the cost of his habit grows. It can easily reach hundreds of dollars a day. Since an underworld "fence" will give him only a fraction of the value of goods he steals, an addict can be forced to commit two or three burglaries a day to maintain his habit. Street robberies, prostitution, even the enticing of others into addiction to drugs—an addict will reduce himself to any offense, any degradation in order to acquire the drugs he craves.

However far the addict himself may fall, his offenses against himself and society do not compare with the inhumanity of those who make a living exploiting the weakness and desperation of their fellow men. Society has few judgments too severe, few penalties too harsh for the men who make their livelihood in the narcotic traffic.

It has been a common oversimplification to consider narcotics addiction, or drug abuse, to be a law enforcement problem alone. Effective control of illicit drugs requires the cooperation of many agencies of the Federal and local and State governments; it is beyond the province of any one of them alone. At the Federal level, the burden of the national effort must be carried by the Departments of Justice, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Treasury. I am proposing ten specific steps as this Administration's initial counter-moves against this growing national problem.

I. FEDERAL LEGISLATION

To more effectively meet the narcotic and dangerous drug problems at the Federal level, the Attorney General is forwarding to the Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal to control these drugs. This measure will place in a single statute, a revised and modern plan for control. Current laws in this field are inadequate and outdated.

I consider the legislative proposal a fair, rational and necessary approach to the total drug problem. It will tighten the regulatory controls and protect the public against illicit diversion of many of these drugs from legitimate channels. It will insure greater accountability and better recordkeeping. It will give law enforcement stronger and better tools that are sorely needed so that those charged with enforcing these laws can do so more effectively. Further, this proposal creates a more flexible mechanism which will allow quicker control of new dangerous drugs before their misuse and abuse reach epidemic proportions. I urge the Congress to take favorable action on this bill.

In mid-May the Supreme Court struck down segments of the marihuana laws and called into question some of the basic foundations for the other existing drug statutes. I have also asked the Attorney General to submit an interim measure to correct the constitutional deficiencies of the Marihuana Tax Act as pointed out in the Supreme Court's recent decision. I urge Congress to act swiftly and favorably on the proposal to close the gap now existing in the Federal law and thereby give the Congress time to carefully examine the comprehensive drug control proposal.

II. STATE LEGISLATION

The Department of Justice is developing a model State Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Act. This model law will be made available to the fifty State governments. This legislation is designed to improve State laws in dealing with this serious problem and to complement the comprehensive drug legislation being proposed to Congress at the national level. Together these proposals will provide an interlocking trellis of laws which will enable government at all levels to more effectively control the problem.

III. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Most of the illicit narcotics and high-potency marihuana consumed in the United States is produced abroad and clandestinely imported. I have directed the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to explore new avenues of cooperation with foreign governments to stop the projection of this contraband at its source. The United States will cooperate with foreign governments working to eradicate the production of illicit drugs within their own frontiers. I have further authorized these Cabinet officers to formulate plans that will lead to meetings at the law enforcement level between the United States and foreign countries now involved in the drug traffic either as originators or avenues of transit.

IV. SUPPRESSION OF ILLEGAL IMPORTATION

Our efforts to eliminate these drugs at their point of origin will be coupled with new efforts to intercept them at their point of illegal entry into the United States. The Department of the Treasury, through the Bureau of Customs, is charged with enforcing the Nation's smuggling laws. I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate a major new effort to guard the Nation's borders and ports against the growing volume of narcotics from abroad. There is a recognized need for more men and facilities in the Bureau of Customs to carry out this directive. At my request, the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted a substantial program for increased manpower and facilities in the Bureau of Customs for this purpose which is under intensive review.

In the early days of this Administration, I requested that the Attorney General form an interdepartmental Task Force to conduct a comprehensive study of the problem of unlawful trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs. One purpose of the Task Force has been to examine the existing programs of law enforcement agencies concerned with the problem in an effort to improve their coordination and efficiency. I now want to report that this Task Force has completed its study and has a recommended plan of action, for immediate and long-term implementation, designed to substantially reduce the illicit trafficking in narcotics, marihuana and dangerous drugs across the United States borders. To implement the recommended plan, I have directed the Attorney General to organize and place into immediate operation an "action task force" to undertake

a frontal attack on the problem. There are high profits in the illicit market for those who smuggle narcotics and drugs into the United States; we intend to raise the risks and cost of engaging in this wretched traffic.

V. SUPPRESSION OF NATIONAL TRAFFICKING

Successful prosecution of an increased national effort against illicit drug trafficking will require not only new resources and men, but also a redeployment of existing personnel within the Department of Justice.

I have directed the Attorney General to create, within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, a number of special investigative units. These special forces will have the capacity to move quickly into any area in which intelligence indicates major criminal enterprises are engaged in the narcotics traffic. To carry out this directive, there will be a need for additional manpower within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The budgetary request for FY 1970 now pending before the Congress will initiate this program. Additional funds will be requested in FY 1971 to fully deploy the necessary special investigative units.

VI. EDUCATION

Proper evaluation and solution of the drug problem in this country has been severely handicapped by a dearth of scientific information on the subject—and the prevalence of ignorance and misinformation. Different "experts" deliver solemn judgments which are poles apart. As a result of these conflicting judgments, Americans seem to have divided themselves on the issue, along generational lines.

There are reasons for this lack of knowledge. First, widespread drug use is a comparatively recent phenomenon in the United States. Second, it frequently involves chemical formulations which are novel, or age-old drugs little used in this country until very recently. The volume of definitive medical data remains small—and what exists has not been broadly disseminated. This vacuum of knowledge—as was predictable—has been filled by rumors and rash judgments, often formed with a minimal experience with a particular drug, sometimes formed with no experience or knowledge at all.

The possible danger to the health or well-being of even a casual user of drugs is too serious to allow ignorance to prevail or for this information gap to remain open. The American people need to know what dangers and what risks are inherent in the use of the various kinds of drugs readily available in illegal markets today. I have therefore directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, assisted by the Attorney General through the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, to gather all authoritative information on the subject and to compile a balanced and objective educational program to bring the facts to every American—especially our young people.

With this information in hand, the overwhelming majority of students and young people can be trusted to make a prudent judgment as to their personal course of conduct.

VII. RESEARCH

In addition to gathering existing data, it is essential that we acquire new knowledge in the field. We must know more about both the short- and long-range effects of the use of drugs being taken in such quantities by so many of our people. We need more study as well as to find the key to releasing men from the bonds of dependency forged by any continued drug abuse.

The National Institute of Mental Health has primary responsibility in this area, and I am further directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to expand existing efforts to acquire new knowledge and a broader understanding in this entire area.

VIII. REHABILITATION

Considering the risks involved, including those of arrest and prosecution, the casual experimenter with drugs of any kind, must be considered at the very least, rash and foolish. But the psychologically dependent regular users and the physically addicted are genuinely sick people. While this sickness cannot excuse the crimes they commit, it does help to explain them. Society has an obligation both to itself and to these people to help them break the chains of their dependency.

Currently, a number of federal, state and private programs of rehabilitation are being operated. These programs utilize separately and together, psychiatry, psychology and "substitute drug" therapy. At this time, however, we are without adequate data to evaluate their full benefit. We need more experience with them and more knowledge. Therefore, I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide every assistance to those pioneering in the field, and to sponsor and conduct research on the Federal level. This Department will act as a clearinghouse for the collection and dissemination of drug abuse data and experience in the area of rehabilitation.

I have further instructed the Attorney General to insure that all Federal prisoners, who have been identified as dependent upon drugs, be afforded the most up-to-date treatment available.

IX. TRAINING PROGRAM

The enforcement of narcotics laws requires considerable expertise, and hence considerable training. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs provides the bulk of this training in the Federal government. Its programs are extended to include not only its own personnel, but State and local police officers, forensic chemists, foreign nationals, college deans, campus security officers, and members of industry engaged in the legal distribution of drugs.

Last year special training in the field of narcotics and dangerous drug enforcement was provided for 2,700 State and local law enforcement officials. In fiscal year 1969 we expanded the program an estimated 300 percent in order to train some 11,000 persons. During the current fiscal year we plan to redouble again that effort—to provide training to 22,000 State and local officers. The training of these experts must keep pace with the rise in the abuse of drugs, if we are ever to control it.

X. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCES

The Attorney General intends to begin a series of conferences with law enforcement executives from the various States and concerned Federal officials. The purposes of these conferences will be several: First, to obtain firsthand information, more accurate data, on the scope of the drug problem at that level; second, to discuss the specific areas where Federal assistance and aid can best be most useful; third, to exchange ideas and evaluate mutual policies. The end result we hope will be a more coordinated effort that will bring us visible progress for the first time in an alarming decade.

These then are the first ten steps in the national effort against narcotic marihuana and other dangerous drug abuse. Many steps are already underway. Many will depend upon the support of the Congress. I am asking, with this message, that you act swiftly and favorably on the legislative proposals that will soon be forthcoming, along with the budgetary requests required if our efforts are to be successful. I am confident that Congress shares with me the grave concern over this critical problem, and that Congress will do all that is necessary to mount and continue a new and effective Federal program aimed at eradicating this rising sickness in our land.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 14, 1969.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON DRUG ABUSE

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the American people are greatly alarmed, and justifiably, over the growing traffic in narcotics and the increasing use of drugs by our youth.

If there is any problem area in which the people want speedy and effective action, it is in the area of narcotics peddling and drug addiction.

I believe the American people are well aware that offenses committed by drug addicts who need money to support their habit account in some areas for a majority of the major crimes occurring there. They recognize too, that this is but one reason why Federal, State, and local resources should be marshaled in a coordinated attack on the narcotics problem.

President Nixon, in the message he has sent Congress today, is pointing the way toward a sorely needed comprehensive action program which must be carried out nationwide and with the greatest possible cooperation at all government levels if the narcotics problem is to be brought under control.

The President's proposals for dealing with the narcotics problem constitute a broad, carefully planned program which should produce the maximum possible

results if it receives the greatest possible support—support it so well deserves.

I urge that the Congress act quickly on President Nixon's legislative proposals as soon as circumstances permit—the revision and consolidation of the Federal narcotics statutes into a single and more effective act, and the funding of administrative actions being taken to step up the fight against narcotics abuse.

Meantime, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the President for the administrative initiatives he has taken to deal more effectively with narcotics trafficking and drug abuse.

I would note that only through the sweeping approach adopted by President Nixon—the strengthening of efforts to halt the production and sale of illegal narcotics, the improving of rehabilitation programs for drug addicts, and the educating of all Americans to the dangers of drug abuse—can we begin to cope effectively with this most complex problem of drug addiction and its rise and spread.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today President Nixon has sent to Congress a most important message on a serious national problem, the problem of drug abuse.

The statistics presented in the President's message are appalling to say the least. Between 1960 and 1967, juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs has risen by nearly 800 percent. Half of those arrested for the illict use of narcotics are under 21 years of age. And we are told that in New York City alone there are some 40,000 heroin addicts, and that that number increases by 7,000 to 9,000 addicts a year. But even these figures are deceptive since they reflect only the number of addicts on record. Or, as the President puts it, they represent "only the tip of an iceberg whose dimensions we can only surmise." It is estimated that hundreds of thousands of Americans are narcotic addicts.

This problem poses a threat not only to the individual user, but to the community at large. The very moral fiber of our society is threatened by the increasing reliance on dangerous drugs. As the President has stated, the time has come to put an end to this growing national problem. Our present laws are obviously inadequate and outdated and in response to this the Attorney General is forwarding to the Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal to control these drugs. New laws are needed to tighten regulatory controls on the use and trafficking of drugs. Greater emphasis must also be placed on education, research and rehabilitation since enforcement alone will not solve this complex problem.

We in the Congress should lend our full support to the administration's efforts to launch a program which will effectively eradicate what the President has referred to as, "this rising sickness in our land."

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of narcotics is not only one for the Federal Government. It is a problem that reaches across all areas of responsibility: local, State, national, and international.

I am pleased to see that President Nixon, in his message on narcotics and dangerous drugs, has taken a broad approach that would bring to bear the forces of all these levels of authority.

He has called for a new, comprehensive program of Federal legislation to control these drugs; he is proposing a model State Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Act that will be made available to all 50 State governments; he has called for the exploration of new avenues of cooperation with foreign governments to stop the production of drugs. To use the President's words:

> Together these proposals will provide an interlocking trellis of laws which will enable government at all levels to more effectively control the problem.

This is what we need if the terrible and tragic problem of narcotics is to be met as it must be met. I applaud the President for the broad scope of his proposals and I trust that the Congress will see the issue with an equally wide-ranging lens.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has sent the Congress a most perceptive, comprehensive, and constructive package of proposals for curbing the growing national scandal of the abuse of drugs.

Drug abuse is a particular threat to the youth of America. Juvenile arrests have skyrocketed. Addiction has spiraled. The time is long past where we can treat this problem indulgently.

The President has drawn attention to the fallacy of thinking of drug abuse as simply a problem of law enforcement. Federal, State, and international cooperation are required, along with education, research, and rehabilitation. There is an urgent and obvious need to establish scientifically the long-term effects of such drugs as narcotic marihuana, LSD, and other so-called soft drugs. It is essential to acquire new knowledge in this field.

The President has proposed powerful new strictures on the traffickers and the pushers. At the same time, he has placed strong emphasis on the need for compassionate treatment of the victims of drugs.

This is the kind of balanced, total view that is so necessary to make the proper attack on this growing national scandal. I commend the President for his wise proposals and I urge the Congress to give priority consideration to these proposals.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the President's message on drug abuse.

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

There was no objection.

THE VOYAGE OF THE "BEN FRANKLIN"

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are becoming focused on the State of Florida as the countdown for the launching of Apollo 11 reaches zero at 9:32 a.m., eastern daylight time on Wednesday, July 16.

But, as we look toward space and the fantastic feats that three Americans will accomplish on that forthcoming voyage, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to another voyage which will begin later today off the coast of West Palm Beach, Fla.

The deep submersible vessel *Ben Franklin* will today begin a historic trek, that will carry it beneath the surface of the Atlantic down to depths of 2,000 feet for approximately 1 month without surfacing as it drifts with the Gulf Stream, to a position off the coast of Newfoundland.

The internationally renowned oceanographer Dr. Jacques Piccard and a crew of five will accumulate data on the movements of the Gulf Stream, the types, and extent of marine life within the Gulf Stream at various depths and geological characteristics of the Continental Shelf from Florida to Cape Hatteras.

Mr. Speaker, the Gulf Stream is litterally a "river in the ocean" and a phenomenon about which we know very little. I am convinced that at the conclusion of this historic voyage, our knowledge of the sea will be greatly enhanced, and I congratulate Dr. Piccard his associates and his crew for undertaking this daring and scientific voyage.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN).

LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY).

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of each bill the chairman of the subcommittee and I be permitted to extend our remarks in explanation of each bill.

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the right to object.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas when the committee reports on the legislation before the House became available in the document room of the House of Representatives?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan that I do not know.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, these reports were not available in the document room until this morning. Before I withdraw my reservation of objection I wish to express to the gentleman from South Carolina and to the gentleman from Texas my concern over the practice of

making reports on District of Columbia bills available at the last minute. The gentlemen did not originate it, but they have fallen into this practice.

Here we had originally scheduled 16 bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia with no reports available for perusal of the Members of the House. I must compliment the distinguished chairman on his action withdrawing a number of these bills in order that Members may have time to study them.

What concerns me, though, is the custom which gave rise to this 11-hour withdrawal. This is only the second day this year that we have transacted business on District day, the other being April 28. In view of this, I find it difficult to understand why reports from the Committee on the District of Columbia cannot be made in a more timely fashion. I do not mean to imply criticism of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, nor do I presume to suggest how that committee's business should be conducted. But I would be remiss if I did not point out to the gentleman from South Carolina that the custom of considering bills on District day within a few hours after the reports became available, however unintentional, is vexatious to members and is not conducive to the enactment of carefully considered legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I might mention with reference to the reports on these bills, I am advised that they were filed Thursday and Friday last week by the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY)?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITING PICKETING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WITHIN 500 FEET OF ANY CHURCH

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 257) to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 257

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever, during any religious service or ceremony which is conducted in a building in the District of Columbia used as a church or other place of worship or which is conducted on the surrounding grounds of such building, or during the two-hour period immediately preceding such service or ceremony or the two-hour period immediately following such service or ceremony—

(1) displays within 500 feet of such grounds any sign, placard, banner, or device designed or adapted to annoy, embarrass, intimidate, coerce, or bring into public odium or disrepute any person officiating at or attending such religious service or ceremony, and refuses to cease such display when so ordered by police authorities of the District of Columbia; or

(2) congregates with others within 500 feet of such grounds for the purpose of (A) displaying any such sign, placard, banner, or device, or (B) annoying, embarrassing, intimidating, coercing, or bringing into public odium or disrepute any such person, and refuses to disperse when so ordered by police authorities of the District of Columbia;

shall be fined not more than $300 or imprisoned for not more than 60 days, or both.

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 257 is to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church or other place of worship in the District of Columbia.

The bill provides that it shall be unlawful for any person, during a period beginning 2 hours before any religious service or ceremony or within the 2-hour period immediately following the end of such religious service or ceremony, and within 500 feet of the grounds of a church or other place of worship, to display any sign, placard, banner, or device which is designed for the purpose of annoying, embarrassing, intimidating, coercing, or of bringing into public odium or disrepute any person officiating at or attending such religious service or ceremony.

Any person who engages in the activities prohibited, and who refuses to discontinue such display when ordered by the police, shall be subject to a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment of not more than 60 days, or both.

The bill similarly applies to those who congregate within the distance and during the time period specified for such purposes and who refuse to disperse when so ordered by the police, and provides that they shall be subject to similar penalties.

In considering the proposed legislation, your committee carefully considered existing laws of the District of Columbia providing for the protection of the peace and quiet within the community and for freedom from insult coercion, or intimidation. Laws relating to unlawful assembly provide such protection to the community from verbal assaults and abusive language. Existing law provides protection to officials of foreign governments and the buildings occupied by such governments and from demonstrations and the use of posters, signs, banners, and other devices designed to ridicule and insult such nations or their representatives. Our committee found nothing, however, in existing law providing similar protection for those attending or participating in religious services or ceremonies during the time of their arrival or departure. Our committee feels that the freedom of citizens to participate in such occasions free from interferences and insults is needed, is reasonable, and proper in the exercise of basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

In the course of the study of the legislation, the committee consulted wtih law enforcement officials of the District of Columbia in the review of existing law, and the need for, and desirability of such legislation. Cases involving the enforcement of existing laws of the District of Columbia were reviewed. Our committee is not aware of any court decision at any level dealing with laws prescribing the acts mentioned in the bill which would indicate any limitation upon the propriety and the power of Congress to enact such legislation with full anticipation that its provisions would be sustained in the courts.

This bill is identical to H.R. 16340 of the 89th Congress, which was approved by the House on August 22, 1966—House Report No. 1786—by a rollcall vote of 249 to 44.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill which seems to be designed in response to an isolated incident, the picketing by antiwar demonstrators at the wedding of Luci Nugent, nee Johnson. While such picketing is in bad taste, a law abridging the first amendment should not be passed to deal with such an isolated incident.

There already exists in the District of Columbia laws which control disorderly conduct and rightly so. This bill goes even further and in my judgment, if enacted, would ultimately be found unconstitutional since it is intended not simply to affect disorderly conduct but to prevent the exercise of free speech guaranteed by the first amendment. The bill before us creates a new definition of what would constitute disorderly conduct when outside a church. No longer does disorderly conduct mean what one would ordinarily consider it to cover. Now in these situations, it is enlarged to include conduct which annoys and embarrasses. It also makes unlawful the simple carrying of placards and banners which annoy or embarrass. I repeat that I think such legislation must be struck down by the courts of this country if indeed it is passed by the other body.

The implication of what is intended here becomes more evident when one looks at these restrictions which apply 2 hours before any religious service or ceremony and 2 hours following such religious service or ceremony. If a group of priests or parishioners of a church wish to peacefully assemble and demonstrate in front of their own church in opposition to the policies of that church if that were their pleasure, they could be hauled off and jailed.

This kind of legislation for the District of Columbia points up once again that Congress should turn over to the people of the District the right to control legislation in their District. Instead, some Members of this Congress are using the District of Columbia as a laboratory in which to try out repressive legislation. For these reasons, I will vote against the bill.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF RETIRED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4183) to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married

such officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4183

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a)(3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–521(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'widow' means the surviving wife of a member or former member if—

"(A) she was married to such member or former member (i) while he was a member, or (ii) for at least two years immediately preceding his death, or

"(B) she is the mother of issue by such marriage."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall apply with respect to any surviving wife of a "member" (as that term is defined in subsection (a)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act) or former member irrespective of whether such wife became a "widow" (as that term is defined in such amendment) prior to, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that no annuity shall be paid by reason of the amendment made by this Act for any period prior to the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1967.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 14, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4183 is to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such an officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits under the Policemen's and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act.

REASONS FOR LEGISLATION

Under existing law, if a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia marries subsequent to his retirement, upon his death his widow is not entitled to any pension whatever. Your committee is of the opinion that this is an injustice and should be corrected.

Accordingly, H.R. 4183 provides that in the event that a retired such officer or member marries after his retirement, his widow will be entitled to the same full benefits as provided in subsection (a)(3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to which she would be entitled had she married the officer or member during his active service. It is specified, however, that in order to qualify for such pension the widow must have been married to such officer or member for at least 2 years prior to his death, or that she be the mother of issue by the marriage.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

This bill is identical to H.R. 2824 of the 90th Congress, which was approved by the House on April 24, 1967—House Report No. 200. It is identical also to a provision in title II of H.R. 15857 of the 89th Congress, a bill which amended the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen's Salary Act—Public Law 89–810—as approved by the House on June 27, 1966. However, that provision was subsequently deleted by House and Senate conferees.

The reason for this deletion was that it came to the attention of the conferees that a similar provision in law at that time pertaining to widows of retired veterans contained a 5-year minimum for the length of such marriage before the widow could qualify for a pension. This created some doubt as to the propriety of the 2-year minimum which this provision in H.R. 15857 would have imposed in the case of widows of retired District of Columbia policemen and firemen. However, since that time subsequent legislation has reduced the minimum period of marriage for widows of retired veterans, who married after the veterans' retirement, from 5 years to 1 year. Hence, the 2-year minimum period for marriages of District of Columbia policemen and firemen contracted subsequent to their retirement, as proposed in H.R. 4183, is now well within comparable limits of similar legislation.

Our committee feels that this proposed legislation will correct an inequity of long standing, and commends it to this body for favorable action.

EQUALIZE RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR TOTALLY DISABLED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4184) to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4184

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the United States Secret Service who has been retired during the period beginning before October 1, 1956, and continuing through July 1, 1967—

(1) under the provisions of the fourth paragraph of section 12 of the Act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as in effect prior to October 1, 1956, and

(2) on the basis of a disability which was rated at 100 per centum at the time of his retirement.

shall, on and after the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1967 have his retirement benefits computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–527(1)).

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to reduce the relief or retirement compensation any person receives or is entitled to receive, from the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

Page 2, line 7, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4184 is to provide that former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, the U.S. Secret Service, and the District of Columbia Fire Department who were retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability which was rated at 100 percent at the time of their retirement, shall have their annuities computed on the same basis as are those for members who retired for disability subsequent to that date.

BACKGROUND

From 1916, when the Policemen's and Firemen's Relief Fund was first established by act of Congress, until 1957, there was never any disparity in the pensions paid to retired members of the Fire Department and the several police forces in the District of Columbia, or to their widows and dependent orphaned children. All who retired at the same rank and with the same length of service received equal amounts, regardless of changes in contribution rates.

In 1957, however, this long-established policy was abandoned by the enactment of Public Law 85–157, which amended the Policemen's and Firemen's Disability Act to provide substantial increases in the annuities for those members retiring after October 1, 1956, and for their widows and orphaned children, but provided no increases whatever for annuitants who had retired prior to that date, nor for their surviving dependents.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

For these reasons, your committee urges favorable action on H.R. 4184, which provides simply that members of the various police forces and the District of Columbia Fire Department who retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability incurred in line of duty and which was rated at 100 percent under the Veterans Manual at the time of their retirement, shall have their annuities computed on the basis of the formula provided by the 1957 amendments to the Policemen's and Firemen's Disability Act which have been in effect since October 1, 1956. This provision is to be effective on and after the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1969.

This would increase the pension rate of such a retiree from the present figure of 50 percent of his last annual salary to a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent, depending on his length of service.

A survey of the personnel files 2 years ago revealed that at that time, there were some 200 former members of these police forces and the District of Columbia Fire Department who had retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability incurred in line of duty and which was rated at 100 percent under the Veterans Manual at the time of retirement. Today, however, only 177 such annuitants survive, and hence this is the number who will be affected by the enactment of this proposed legislation. It is estimated that the cost involved for the first full fiscal year will be approximately $248,000. This cost will of course diminish each year thereafter, and eventually will disappear entirely.

AMENDING THE ACT REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF PODIATRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 9549) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9549

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia", approved May 23, 1918 (40 Stat. 560), as amended (sec. 2–705, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by designating the first paragraph as subsection (a), by redesignating the second and third paragraphs as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and by adding at the end of the second paragraph, redesignated herein as subsection (b), the following: "The Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, waive both the written and oral tests or either such test and accept in lieu thereof the satisfactory completion by an applicant of an examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided,* That such applicant shall pass a practical examination given by the Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided further,* That in exercising its discretion to waive the written and oral tests or either such test the Board of Podiatry Examiners shall satisfy itself that the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners was as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, require an applicant to satisfactorily complete an examination which supplements the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 18, add the following:

"Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall not be considered as affecting the functions of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Council under such Act of May 23, 1918."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners with the discretionary authority to accept the written theoretical examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners to virtually all graduates of the recognized podiatry colleges, in lieu of the local board's own theoretical examinations for licensing of podiatrists in the District. However, a satisfactory performance on a practical demonstration test administered by the District of Columbia board will continue to be required of all applicants for such license.

The National Board of Podiatry Examiners consists of 12 members, representing such nationally recognized professional organizations as the Federation of Podiatry Boards, the American Podiatry Association, and the American Association of Colleges of Podiatry. In addition, 13 groups of prominent educational testing specialists assist the national board in the development of its testing program, which is presently recognized and accepted in 19 States and by the Army and the Navy.

Your committee is advised that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners favors the adoption of the national board theoretical examinations as the standard for licensing of podiatrists in the District because this examination, by reason of its national scope and character, offers a uniform and consistent measure of academic professional qualification. Also, the resources available to the national board make possible a rapid processing of these tests, and the early reporting of the results to the applicants. Further all expenses incident to the preparation and administration of these tests are sustained by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners.

We are advised that the examination given by the national board is at least as comprehensive and as difficult as that conducted by the District of Columbia Board. However, this bill charges the District of Columbia Board with the responsibility of satisfying itself that this continues to be the case; and the Board is empowered, in its discretion, to require any applicant to supplement his national board examination with whatever further theoretical test or tests the Board may deem advisable.

PRECEDENT

H.R. 6350, which was passed by the House on July 23, 1963, and which was approved on August 19, 1964—Public Law 88–460—extended an identical discretionary authority to the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners, enabling them to accept a national board examination in connection with the licensing of dental hygienists in the District of Columbia.

Your committee is of the opinion that this same authority should be granted with regard to the licensing of podiatrists in the District of Columbia, for the same reasons; namely, the elimination of a needed duplication of theoretical testing with a consequent saving of time and expense on the part of the District of Columbia Board, and also the alleviation of needless hardship on the part of applicants who may have been out of school for some years and yet can demonstrate professional competence by satisfactory performance on the practical demonstration test, which would still be required of all applicants.

Proposed legislation identical to H.R. 9549 has been approved by the House in each of the past three Congresses, only to fail of action in the Senate. These bills were H.R. 9962 of the 88th Congress, approved by the House on March 9, 1964—House Report No. 1223; H.R. 1699 of the 89th Congress passed by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report No. 22; and H.R. 3370 of the 90th Congress, approved by the House on April 24, 1967—House Report No. 98.

AMEND STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4181) to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4181

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) Chapter 3 of title 12 of the District of Columbia Code (relating to limitation of actions) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 12–310. Actions arising out of death or injury caused by defective or unsafe improvements to real property

"(a)(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), any action—

"(A) to recover damages for—

"(i) personal injury,

"(ii) injury to real or personal property, or

"(iii) wrongful death,

resulting from the defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property, and

"(B) for contribution or indemnity which is brought as a result of such injury or death,

shall be barred unless in the case where injury is the basis of such action, such injury occurs within the five-year period beginning on the date the improvement was substantially completed, or in the case where death is the basis of such action, either such death or the injury resulting in such death

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, an improvement to real property shall be considered substantially completed when—

"(A) it is first used, or

"(B) it is first available for use after having been completed in accordance with the contract or agreement covering the improvement, including any agreed changes to the contract or agreement,

whichever occurs first.

"(b) The limitation of actions prescribed in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any action based on a contract, express or implied, or

"(2) any action brought against the person who, at the time the defective or unsafe condition of the improvement to real prop-

erty caused injury or death, was the owner of or in actual possession or control of such real property."

(b) The table of sections for such chapter 3 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"§ 12–310. Actions arising out of death or injury caused by defective or unsafe improvements to real property."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by section 1 of this Act shall apply only with respect to actions brought after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4181 is to provide a limitation on the period of time during which an action may be brought to recover damages, contribution, or indemnity against architects, designers, engineers, or contractors on the ground of a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property. At the present time in the District of Columbia there is no limitation as to the period of liability of an architect, engineer, or contractor for a defective or unsafe condition in an improvement to real property. Thus, such parties may become defendants in a suit brought by a person who sustains a personal injury in a building which was built 25 or even 50 years ago. The only limitation applying in such case under District of Columbia law is that such an action must be brought within 3 years after the date of the cause of action accrues.

The bill, H.R. 4181 reported by your committee, would require that such an action would be barred unless it is brought within 5 years from the date the improvement to real property was substantially completed.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In recent years there has been a substantial increase in the number of actions for the recovery of damages, contribution, or indemnity, for injury to property or persons or wrongful death against architects, engineers, and contractors, based upon a defective or unsafe condition of an improvement to real property.

The District of Columbia, as was the case in the States, has no statute of limitations relating to such actions. Architects who design buildings or improvements to real property, engineers who design and install equipment, or contractors, who build the improvements under rigid inspection and conformity with building codes, may find themselves named as defendants in such damage suits many years after the improvement was completed and occupied.

Comparatively, modern architecture, engineering, and construction, with the new techniques, technology, and methods, may give the appearance of defective or unsafe conditions to older structures which conditions may be used as a basis for such damage suits. In such cases, the architectural plans used may have been discarded, copies of building codes in force at the time of design or construction may no longer be in existence, and the persons who were individually involved may have deceased or may not be located. The purpose of the law is to provide a reasonable time and opportunity for a person who has suffered injury or damages to bring an action. To permit the bringing of such actions without any limitation as to time places the defendant in an unreasonable position if not imposing the impossibility of asserting a reasonable defense.

Our committee believes that as a matter of good law, in fairness and equity to the architect, designer, engineer and builder, it is proper to enact legislation such as H.R. 4181 to establish a reasonable time limit within which suits for damages, alleging defective or unsafe conditions, attributable to their actions, can be brought.

STATE ENACTMENTS

The problem which this legislation is designed to remedy has been recognized throughout the United States. Since 1960, 30 States have enacted statutes of limitation similar to that proposed in this bill. In addition, the legislatures in 10 other States are considering such legislation. Our committee finds that the provisions of the bill are reasonable comparable to legislation enacted in the States.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4181 is a bill to amend the code to provide a limitation on actions arising out of death or injury caused by defective or unsafe improvements to real property. The bill would establish a statute of limitations of 5 years, after which suit could not be brought against the architects who designed the building, designers, engineers, or contractors, who did the work on the ground of defective or unsafe condition of the improvement to the real estate, even if they were negligent.

In short, if you should inherit real property in the District of Columbia that had been constructed or improved more than 5 years before, and if due to negligence in design or construction the ceiling should fall in on the inhabitants of that building or if a wall should fall out on someone, perhaps even before you knew you had inherited the property, as the owner of the property you would be liable and subject to suit, but under this bill, if such an accident should occur more than 5 years after the construction of the building or the improvement was completed, the architect who designed it, the engineers, and the construction people who built it even if negligent could escape liability. I oppose the bill for these reasons.

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

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.

EXEMPTIONS FROM ATTACHMENT AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCESS IN THE CASE OF PERSONS NOT RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 9548) to amend section 15–503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9548

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 15–503 of the District of Columbia Code is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages (as defined in section 16–571 of the District of Columbia Code) of any person not residing in the District of Columbia who does not earn the major portion of such wages in the District of Columbia shall, in any case arising out of a contract or transaction entered into outside of the District of Columbia, be exempt from attachment, levy, or seizure, by any process or proceeding of any court, judge, or officer of the District of Columbia in the same amount and to the same extent as is provided by law of the State in which such person resides for persons residing therein. Whenever any claim is made for an exemption from attachment pursuant to this subsection, the burden shall be upon the plaintiff to prove that the contract or transaction involved in the case was entered into within the District of Columbia."

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to stop a practice which has developed in relation to the use of garnishment laws in a way which enables a creditor to do indirectly what he is not permitted to do directly in his own jurisdiction.

This practice involves the filing in the District of Columbia of an action for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland, or Virginia, so as to secure payment by attachment of wages from an employee who is not a resident of the District. The object of such practice is to escape the limitations in States outside the District, regarding exemptions from garnishment in favor of employees. This bill is designed to assure that where an action in such a case is brought in the District of Columbia, the nonresident defendant involved will be entitled to the same exemptions as are provided by law in the State in which the said defendant may reside.

Maryland law, for example, provides for an exemption from attachment of wages and salaries in the amount of $100 for each pay period. In a month, or 4⅓ weeks, this exemption would aggregate $433. Your committee has been informed that some persons in the debt collection business have found that the District of Columbia garnishment law provides a lower exemption; namely, 90 percent of the first $200 per month of wages, 80 percent of the next $300 per month, and 50 percent of all above $500 per month. In the case of a worker earning a wage of $100 per week, or $433 per month, therefore, an employee's entire salary

would be exempt from attachment in Maryland, but in the District of Columbia only $366.40 per month would be exempt, leaving $66.60 per month subject to garnishment.

Accordingly, your committee was advised that Baltimore creditors, with claims against employees living and working in Baltimore, have in several instances determined that the employers also have places of business in the District of Columbia and hence are subject to service of garnishment or attachment process in the District, and accordingly have brought their claims to Washington and filed suits here, laying an attachment against the wages of the employee debtor in the hands of the employer, thus escaping the exemption from attachment provided by Maryland laws.

This same procedure could conceivably be adopted by collection agencies from any State if the employer maintains a place of business in the District, so that he would be subject to the service of garnishment process here.

This committee is of the opinion that it was never intended that District of Columbia law should serve as a collection medium against employees who live elsewhere, work elsewhere, and may even never have been in the District of Columbia. This bill is intended to so amend the District of Columbia law as to terminate this practice by granting to nonresidents of the District the exemptions from garnishment and attachment of wages afford by their local State laws.

Except for technical amendments, this bill is identical to H.R. 7882 of the 88th Congress, which passed the House on October 14, 1963—House Report No. 836; and also to H.R. 1007 of the 89th Congress, which was approved by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report No. 25. It is identical also to H.R. 836 of the 90th Congress, approved by the House on March 13, 1967—House Report No. 89.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to insert their remarks concerning any of the bills called by the District Committee today.

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

There was no objection.

LEASE OF DISTRICT PROPERTY TO THE JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF GREATER WASHINGTON

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 12677) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12677

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to enable the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington, a nonprofit corporation organized in the District of Columbia, to place on real property of the District of Columbia the structure which served as the synagogue of Adas Israel Congregation (located in the District of Columbia on the southeast corner of Sixth and G Streets, Northwest) and to improve and restore such structure for the purpose of establishing and maintaining it as a Jewish Historical Museum or for other appropriate purposes.

SEC. 2. To carry out the purpose of this Act, the Commissioner may—

(1) acquire the structure described in the first section and lease it to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington, and

(2) lease to such Society real property of the District of Columbia which he determines is not then required for the needs of the District of Columbia.

Any lease made under this Act shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act and in the discretion of the Commissioner, may be made with or without monetary consideration.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12677 is to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to acquire the city's oldest synagogue building, the synagogue of Adas Israel Congregation, and to lease it and real property of the District of Columbia to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia does not have authority under existing law to enter into agreements for the preservation of historic buildings such as Adas Israel Synagogue. The authority to be granted by H.R. 12677 is sought because of vital Government interest in the property: the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority owns the building; and the District of Columbia has highway property which is a suitable site for its location.

The Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington desires to obtain a lease of the building and property on which it may be relocated, to move the synagogue and to restore it for use as a museum and as headquarters for the society. It has pledged itself to raising the required funds to match Federal grants for this purpose.

Our committee recommends passage of this bill. It will provide for the preservation of this outstanding landmark in the District of Columbia, enabling the Adas Israel Synagogue to remain in its original environment, a witness to Jewish beginnings in the inner city.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I notice that this bill, H.R. 12677, is primarily to authorize the District of Columbia to acquire the city's oldest synagogue building and then lease it back to the Jewish Historical Society, and it apparently is necessary that we, by this act, declare it an item of historical interest, or at least such a declaration would give weight to and support to it.

I certainly have no objection to this procedure, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, who is sponsoring the bill and handling it on the floor, if there would be a cost to the U.S. taxpayer involved in so declaring this an item of historical interest, or any cost in any of the transfers between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia or the Jewish Historical Society, and particularly the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority which now owns the land and building?

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I will defer to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) for some enlightenment on this.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has explained the purpose of the bill almost completely correctly, with one exception, and that is that the building is already owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. It was acquired as a result of the acquisition of certain rights-of-way for the Transit Authority. As the result of this ownership, the purpose of this bill is to permit the removal of this building and its lease to the Jewish Historical Society. If this bill is not passed, this building will simply be destroyed.

So, there is no cost to either the District of Columbia, the Federal Government—not at all—nor the Transit Authority itself, since it already has acquired the property.

Mr. Speaker, I think in fairness to the gentleman I should point out the Jewish Historical Society is planning to apply to HUD for a grant, but this bill in no way requires acceptance of that grant or implies that HUD would make the grant.

The Jewish Historical Society is responsible for the complete restoration of the building, and they have indicated they will do so whether or not they are successful in obtaining the grant.

To answer the gentleman's question more briefly, there is no cost involved to the Federal Government in this transfer.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the response of the gentleman, and I appreciate the yielding by the gentleman who is handling the bill so I could have this response.

Mr. Speaker, I think my question has been answered. I presume the Jewish Historical Society could provide services in kind to match the $60,500 they expect to get from HUD if it is granted, but the gentleman has reassured us that does not imply or put a lien on HUD that such a grant will be made, and there is no way that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority in its dealing on this with the Jewish Historical Society or the District of Columbia or HUD could reap any unusual benefits above the fair market value for this piece of property. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. That is correct.

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

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12677 is a bill worthy of note as it pays tribute to our Jewish brethren who came to the District of Columbia mainly from Germany after the revolution of 1848. They settled here and established their house of worship. It is this historical building which the bill before us would lease to the Jewish Historical Society. It will be used as a historical museum.

When Congregation Adas Israel dedicated its building in 1876, President Ulysses S. Grant and his Cabinet attended the ceremonies. It is interesting to note that the brother of the first president of the congregation, B. J. Behrend, was the first Jewish graduate of my alma mater, Georgetown University, in 1867.

The District of Columbia has been enriched by the presence of this early colony of Jewish people and Adas Israel has made an important contribution, through its membership, to the culture, business, and professional life of this community. I urge that this bill be voted upon favorably.

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

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.

CONVEY DISTRICT PROPERTY TO THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL, INC.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 12720) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Inc.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12720

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Commissioner of the District of Columbia (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioner") shall convey to the Washington International School, Incorporated (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Corporation"), a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia, all the right, title, and interest of the District of Columbia in and to the real property in the District of Columbia described as lot 806 of square 1215 and known as the Phillips School, upon payment to the District of Columbia by or on behalf of the Corporation of the sum of $500,000.

(b) The conveyance under subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to the condition that the Corporation shall use such real property for educational purposes during the five-year period beginning on the date of such conveyance, and that in the event that at any time during such period it ceases to use such real property for such purposes, it shall notify the Commissioner in writing of such fact and all right, title, and interest in and to such real property shall, at the option of the Commissioner, revert to the District of Columbia, but only upon payment to the Corporation of $500,000 or, if greater, the fair market value of such real property (but not to exceed $600,000), determined as of the date the Corporation notifies the Commissioner that the Corporation has ceased to use such real property for such purposes. The Commissioner may exercise such option only during the one-year period beginning on the date such notice is received by the Commissioner.

(c) During the five-year period beginning on the date of the conveyance under subsection (a) of this section, or, if shorter, during such period as the Corporation holds title to the real property conveyed under such subsection, the District of Columbia may, under its power of eminent domain, acquire such real property from the Corporation only upon payment to the Corporation of $500,000 or, if greater, the fair market value of such real property (but not to exceed $600,000), determined as of the date of acquisition by the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12720 is to provide that the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall convey to the Washington International School, Inc., certain land and improvements owned by the District of Columbia and known as the Phillips School, which is located in Georgetown in Northwest Washington. The bill provides that the conveyance of the property shall be subject to certain conditions and that the International School pay to the District the sum of $500,000.

THE PHILLIPS SCHOOL PROPERTY

The Phillips School is an elementary school structure which has not been used for 15 years for instruction purposes and has been surplus to any use for public education purposes for some time. The District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations directed the District of Columbia government to secure an appraisal on the Phillips School and to dispose of it for its reasonable market value. An appraisal study at the direction of the District of Columbia government set the value of the Phillips School property at $475,000.

THE WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL

The Washington International School is a private, nonprofit corporation and has been given tax-exempt status by the Internal Revenue Service. The school was established in January 1966. In May of that year the school was incorporated in the District of Columbia as a nonprofit educational institution. The school has been in operation for 3 years and the enrollment in October 1968 was 130 children. The school in testimony before the committee advised that it expects to increase its enrollment in elementary-level schoolwork to something in excess of 200 students.

Bilingual instruction is provided for children from more than 40 countries. The school is open to children desiring the type of curriculum offered and who are able to pay the tuition of approximately $825 for the full day sessions for the school year.

At the present time the school is staffed with 27 teachers from 10 countries and the school has been able to maintain a ratio of about one teacher for each seven children. Eighty percent of the families whose children attend the school live within the District of Columbia.

HEARINGS

Committee hearings were held July 8, 1969, on H.R. 11971 and H.R. 12092, identical bills, which are similar in purpose to the clean bill, H.R. 12720, which is favorably reported by your committee.

Your committee received testimony from the sponsors of the legislation from the associate director and the counsel for the Washington International School, Inc., and from the Assistant Corporation Counsel representing the government of the District of Columbia. No opposition to the bill was expressed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I assume this bill requires no outlay on the part of the Federal Government—or does it?

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I will defer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who sponsored this bill, for a reply.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I can give the gentleman the assurance that not only does it not involve any outlay, but it involves the receipt by the District Government of $500,000.

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to my colleagues the bill H.R. 12720. I introduced a companion bill to this proposed legislation in its original form, and am pleased indeed to endorse the measure.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to convey the old Phillips School property, located at 2735 Olive Street in Georgetown, to the Washington International School, Inc., a private educational institution. The consideration for this sale is to be $500,000, which is some $25,000 higher than the appraised fair market value of the property. The bill provides also for a 5-year period during which the school, after acquiring the property, must use it for educational purposes. Should the International School terminate this use within the 5-year period, the District of Columbia will then be authorized to reacquire title to the property, for a consideration of at least $500,000 or, if greater, the fair market value of the property at that time, not to exceed $600,000.

The Washington International School was founded in the District of Columbia in 1966, as a nonprofit corporation. The school is organized in the same tradition as the International School which was established in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1924, and also the United Nations School which was founded in New York City in 1947. The school offers a unique system of bilingual education for all students, with its regular academic curriculum being taught half the day in English and half in either French or Spanish. The faculty includes instructors from many different countries, with a pupil-teacher ratio of less than 10 to 1.

In the past school year, only the third year of its existence, the Washington International School had a total enrollment of some 135 children from all social, economic, religious, and national backgrounds. Approximately one-half of the students are American, and the rest come from more than 30 different countries. Many, of course, are children of embassy officials and international civil servants. These students presently range from 3 to 12 years of age, but the school plans to expand its curriculum eventually to

include instruction from the preschool to the university entrance level.

In addition to offering the advantages of its unique curriculum to the children of diplomats and other citizens of foreign nations living in the District of Columbia, the Washington International School is seeking also to enrich the educational and cultural backgrounds of underprivileged youngsters who reside in the District. To this end, the school has established a program of scholarships for inner-city children. They were able to offer two such scholarships during the past school year, and plan to increase this number to 10 by next September. Ultimately, the school plans to offer as many as 60 scholarships per year to these District of Columbia children. As a matter of fact, a Ford Foundation grant to the school stipulates that a certain percentage of its students be children from the inner city, on a scholarship basis.

During its first 3 years of existence, this school has enjoyed a ready acceptance in the Nation's capital. At a public hearing on March 19 of this year, in connection with the school's application for a special zoning exception to enable them to use the Phillips School property for their purpose, residents of the neighborhood volunteered testimony in support of the school's program and plans. The Georgetown Citizens Association, for example, unanimously voted their approval of the application. Also, the school has succeeded in obtaining substantial sums of money in the form of grants from private foundations, in recognition of the school's outstanding educational program; and in fact this is the source from which they will obtain the necessary funds for the purchase of the Phillips School property.

The main problem presently facing this fine institution is a dire need for adequate space and facilities in which the school may expand and fulfill its proper role. At present, classes are being held in the basement Sunday school rooms in three different churches.

The Phillips Elementary School building was used by the city for classroom purposes until 1955. For some years thereafter, it was used by the school system for administrative offices. Since the D.C. school administration has now been consolidated in a single new office building, however, the Phillips School has not been used at all, and hence has become excess to the city's needs. The District of Columbia revenue proposals last year included a plan to sell this property, and to use the $500,000 sale price as a part of the city's revenues for the coming fiscal year.

This property, however, appears to be ideal as a location for the Washington International School. In addition to the classroom facilities, which the school plans to improve, the property includes about an acre of land which will afford sufficient space for playgrounds and parking facilities. The District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections has inspected the property and will approve its use by the school with no major repairs. And on June 5 of this year, the District Public Improvements Committee of the National Capital Planning Commission recommended the sale of the Phillips School property—noting in its recommendation that its use by the International School would be appropriate and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The authorization which this bill will provide for the conveyance of this property is vitally important, since without such legislative authority the District would be required to ask bids on the property, and hence would not be able to assure its future use as an educational institution by conveying it to the International School. The financial benefits which would accrue to the District through this sale, in addition to assuring the continued existence of a very fine and unique school which will be an asset to the city in many ways, are twofold. First, the $500,000 sale price, somewhat higher than the appraised fair market value of the property, will be a welcome addition to the city's revenue. Second, inasmuch as it costs the District of Columbia about $1,000 per year to educate each child in the public school system, each local pupil enrolled in the International School will represent a saving of $1,000 to the city for that school year. Hence, an annual saving of nearly $300,000 will result.

I feel strongly that the International School, offering its broad range of students a bilingual education of the finest quality, is filling a very important need in the Washington community. Certainly the Nation's Capital, by reason of its strong international flavor, offers outstanding opportunities for such bilingual education. Further, it is my opinion that with the advantages which the Phillips School property will afford, this school will provide an invaluable opportunity for the residents of the District of Columbia to participate in an enriching educational experience with the international community. The great public interest shown in this school, and its rapid growth during its brief period of existence, is eloquent testimony to the need for and acceptance of an educational institution of this character in the District of Columbia.

For these reasons, I feel that the bill H.R. 12720 represents an opportunity for the Congress to perform a very real service to the District of Columbia, and I urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the work of our committee for District day.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the business for District day.

HOOVER'S RUNDOWN ON REVOLUTIONISTS IMPRESSIVE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the following article from the Washington Evening Star, of July 11, 1969:

HOOVER'S RUNDOWN ON REVOLUTIONISTS IMPRESSIVE

(By Richard Wilson)

J. Edgar Hoover said so much in recent testimony before Congress, and so little of it was reported, that reviewing the scope of it in capsule form gives a bewildering picture of a nation in dangerous turmoil.

The average person sees, hears or reads of only that part of the turmoil currently in the news. Hoover is keeping track of a staggering array of revolutionists, of both the right and the left—incendiaries, spies, provocateurs, and other militants who increase in numbers by the thousands years by year.

How is one to judge these darkening shadows of violence and disruption? Not, surely, from the paranoic's view of an encircling conspiracy. Yet the totality and diversity of the appeal to violence can cause the skeptical reader of Hoover's report to Congress to wonder where the limits of tolerating insurrection lie.

Few of Hoover's critics would deny he is a pretty good investigator. Too good, some think. In any event, he is increasingly busy with the appeal to violence.

Here, in capsule form, are a few of his findings:

Students for a Democratic Society, and the New Left have openly turned to violent plans and tactics. These range from all manner of violent demonstrations to the use of bombs and incendiary devices with the aim of creating an era of chaos which will destroy the present form of government.

Funds to finance the New Left activities come from wealthy benefactors, several foundations, an organization of college professors, small donors in the $10-to-$50 range, those identified as either past or present members or sympathizers with the Communist party, student organizations, fund-raising drives. A "very prominent foundation" in New York City, Hoover reported, contributed more than $250,000. Other New Left donors included a Cleveland industrialist "who has long been a Soviet apologist," a wealthy New York lecturer and writer, the wife of a millionaire attorney in Chicago, a New England heiress.

Five black power organizations advocate or practice various forms of insurrection: the Black Panther party, the Republic of New Africa, the Nation of Islam, the Revolutionary Action Movement and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the latter having developed recently into "a full-blown all-Negro revolutionary movement." The past year, Hoover reported, has seen a proliferation of such organizations concerned with guerrilla warfare and terrorism.

Hoover expresses suspicion without offering very convincing evidence of foreign influences, some arising from Cuba. Contrary to the general supposition that Castro's Cuba has lost its revolutionary drive, Hoover reports the revolutionary movement there is going strong and is sparing no effort to expand the Communist takeover to the rest of Latin America. Castro, says Hoover, is supplying men, materiel and logistical support to help overthrow existing regimes in Latin American countries.

As for internal U.S. espionage and subversion, there is no letup on the part of Communist countries in their efforts to penetrate our national defense interests. Hoover reports that a defector has disclosed to him that 70 percent to 80 percent of all personnel assigned to Soviet diplomatic establishments work in the intelligence field.

The Chinese, Hoover claims, are becoming a problem. He suggests that some of the 300,000 Chinese residing here are susceptible to recruitment for espionage and propaganda work. He is bothered by 40,000 Hong Kong-based Chinese seamen, at least a few of whom

are believed to be serving as couriers. Thousands of them enter U.S. cities each year, and Hoover notes that over 700 jumped ship in U.S. ports in 1968 to vanish into the nation's Chinese communities.

By contrast, Hoover finds the rightist appeal to violence rather puny. The Minutemen are down to about 500. Fourteen Klan-type organizations have about 8,500 members, with thousands of sympathizers. The Nazi party is beset by internal strife. It is evident that the effort to break up these groups is having some effect. Hoover is continuing to infiltrate the Klan at all levels.

One wonders why, if the violent right can be so suppressed the violent left cannot be suppressed. The answer is not too hard to find. A vague, but real, social sanction protects the violent left. People who find the Klan vulgar and repugnant beyond words can find moral, social and intellectual justification for causes of the bloody left. Thus the contributing college professors, heiresses, foundations, and the enthralled youth.

But there should be no confusion on where the danger lies. It lies with the more numerous, better organized, more zealous, stronger-motivated violent left with its techniques of guerrilla warfare and terrorism, its neo-Marxist doctrines, and its heroes, Che and Mao. Even discounting Hoover's alarming prospectus the problem is real and not much is being done about it except by Hoover.

THE PRESIDENT URGED TO STATE HIS POSITION ON TAX LOOPHOLES

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday 82 Democratic Congressmen joined in a letter to President Nixon urging him to state his position on plugging such loopholes as the oil depletion allowance, tax-exempt State and local bonds, capital gains, special treatment for stock options, accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate, and payment of estate taxes by redemption of Government bonds at par. I include the text of the letter and the names of the signers in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your June 30 letter to Rep. Gerald Ford, read on the House floor during debate on the surtax bill, committed the Administration to "prompt and meaningful tax reform." In our view, "meaningful tax reform" means plugging such loopholes as the oil depletion allowance, tax-exempt state and local bonds, capital gains, special treatment for stock options, accelerated depreciation on speculative real estate, and the provision permitting payment of estate taxes by redempion of government bonds at par.

The tax reform package you submitted to Congress on April 21 does not attempt to plug these loopholes. Nor are they dealt with in the reform package tentatively approved on May 27 by the Ways and Means Committee.

Many Members voted against extending the surtax June 30 because they feared chances for meaningful, revenue-raising tax reform would fade rapidly with passage of the surtax extension. The extension bill, as a result, narrowly survived its first test in the House. Senate consideration is just beginning and there will, of course, be another vote in the House.

We urge you, therefore, to state your views and recommendations on the specific revenue-raising, loophole-plugging reforms listed above and all others that would correct abuses in our tax system. This kind of statement would make it clear to the international financial community that our country is serious about fighting inflation. Fully as important, it would let the average taxpayer know that the era of tax loopholes for the wealthy is drawing to a close and that the tax burden in the future will be shared fully by all.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. BARRETT, JAMES HANLEY, PATSY MINK, JULIA B. HANSEN, B. F. SISK, JOHN CONYERS, JOHN BLATNIK, RICHARD MCCARTHY, JOSEPH KARTH, EDWARD ROYBAL, FERNAND ST GERMAIN, RICHARD HANNA, CHARLES VANIK, THOMAS O'NEILL, CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, PETER KYROS, ABNER MIKVA, JEFFERY COHELAN, HUGH CAREY, ANDREW JACOBS. JR.

RICHARD FULTON, FLOYD HICKS, JOSEPH MINISH, CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, JOHN CULVER, TORBERT MACDONALD, JOSEPH GAYDOS, ROMAN PUCINSKI, FRANK THOMPSON, WILLIAM ST. ONGE, JOSEPH VIGORITO, GUS YATRON, DON EDWARDS, ROBERT LEGGETT, WILLIAM RYAN, HENRY HELSTOSKI, KEN HECHLER, EDWARD KOCH, RICHARD OTTINGER, ARNOLD OLSEN, HENRY S. REUSS.

RAY MADDEN, DAVID OBEY, BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, JAMES O'HARA, WILLIAM MOORHEAD, FRANK EVANS, DOMINICK DANIELS, CLARENCE LONG, JAMES SCHEUER, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, LESTER WOLFF, CHARLES WILSON, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, EDWARD BOLAND, SAMUEL FRIEDEL, WILLIAM FORD, THOMAS REES, LLOYD MEEDS, THADDEUS DULSKI, JOHN MCFALL.

LEE HAMILTON, JOHN MOSS, BERTRAM PODELL, JAMES HOWARD, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, PETER RODINO, JEROME WALDIE, JONATHAN BINGHAM, ALLARD LOWENSTEIN, MARIO BIAGGI, GEORGE E. BROWN, ROBERT TIERNAN, LUCIEN NEDZI, ROBERT NIX, BROCK ADAMS, WILLIAM HATHAWAY, DONALD M. FRASER, SAM GIBBONS, MORRIS UDALL, JOHN BRADEMAS, EMILIO DADDARIO.

RETAIL MEAT PRICES REFLECT SUPPLY AND DEMAND SITUATION

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens are very noticeably and understandably disturbed over the rapidly rising price of beef in our markets and grocery stores. Certainly I make no claim to any unique knowledge on this subject, but feeling that I might have some little factual information on this subject which is not generally available to all of our citizens, I felt that I should try to analyze this phenomenon.

Today's higher beef prices are the natural consequence of consumer demand. interacting with a fixed, limited supply of cattle available for slaughter.

The American public today is consuming record quantities of beef—both total and per capita consumption—at record prices. The primary reasons for this are general inflation and alltime record consumer buying power.

As the House Committee on Agriculture begins hearings on general farm and food stamp legislation tomorrow, the question of assuring abundant meat supplies for all Americans is of especial concern to those of us on the committee.

In the long run only if we have a farm program which moves unneeded cultivated acres from crop production into grass or forage, can we be very hopeful of any considerable increase in beef production.

It has been estimated that we need to expand our cow herd by about a million per year, so long as our present buying capacity continues to increase at the present rate. Whether this can be done depends in a very large part on whether or not we have a farm program which will move substantial acreage from field crops to grass and forage, regardless of whether this shift is achieved by a soil bank or by a crop adjustment program.

The beef industry is unique in that biological factors require producers to have nearly 3 years' leadtime in which to adjust their production. The gestation period for cattle is 9 months. After a calf is born it must be fed for nearly 2 years before it is mature enough for slaughter. In other words, the number of cattle which are available for consumption today was irrevocably fixed nearly 3 years ago.

While it is true that the number of cattle available for slaughter today was determined 3 years ago, the beef producer does have some leeway as to how large he will permit an individual animal to grow before it is sold for slaughter. The usual market weight for a steer is around 1,050 pounds, but this figure can run as high as 1,200 pounds or more. Years ago it was common to slaughter 4-year-old steers.

If the price of cattle is high and a producer feels confident it will remain high, he may elect to hold his livestock back from slaughter for a short while and market it later at higher weights. But since the producer's marginal cost of gain goes up tremendously as the animal grows heavier, his confidence in continued high prices is critical to his decision to increase beef production in this manner.

Barring a sudden decline in wages and employment, consumer demand for meat likely will continue to be very strong, but meat production can be only moderately larger than a year ago. This situation is likely since unemployment rates are expected to remain relatively low, consumer incomes are expected to rise further, and population will continue upward. Consumer demand for meat, however, may be tempered somewhat in the fall if the measures recently undertaken to dampen the general rise in prices are effective in reducing inflationary pressures. But even then, a sharp decline in consumers' willingness and ability to buy meat does not seem likely, unless housewives should get the idea that producers were charging them unfair prices. So long as producers are getting less than they were 18 years ago, which is the case, it seems that no such charge could be made unless the facts are misrepresented or suppressed.

Any such consumers' revolt would be most disastrous to both producers and consumers, because it would utterly destroy the confidence which cattle breeders must have in a profitable future mar-

ket if they are to make the investment and take the risks incident to enlarging our present inadequate breeding herds.

On the supply side, the recent reduction in meat production compared with a year ago likely will be reversed later on. There are more cattle on feed than last year. Thus, beef production in coming months likely will run moderately larger than in the same months of 1968. All of the increase in beef production is expected to be high quality fed beef, and production of lower quality cow beef and other nonfed beef likely will be smaller than last summer and fall. In the long run, increases in meat production probably will outpace increases in population, only if we increase the Nation's cow herd, and as explained, this cannot be very effective for at least 3 years.

Indeed, as we divert heifers from slaughter to breeding, we will tend, at least temporarily, to reduce the amount of beef coming on the market.

In general, retail prices of most goods and services have been rising for many years. Retail food prices rose during the early 1960's but lagged behind prices of nonfood items while the farm price of many farm products actually dropped. Meat prices, however, changed very little from 1958 to 1964. During this period, meat prices, both live and dressed, lagged far behind prices of other foods as well as prices of nonfoods. Since 1964, however, meat prices have also risen.

Increases in food prices, including meat prices, however, have not kept pace with rises in consumer incomes. For example, per capita disposable income in 1968 was about 59 percent higher than in 1957–59. Food prices during this period were up only about 19 percent; meat prices in 1968 averaged only about 16 percent higher. The price of dressed meat like most food costs is more a reflection of the cost of marketing than the cost of the food itself. The marketing cost of getting a choice steer from the ranch to the consumer is up 15 percent in the last 8 years. Labor costs alone in the food processing and distributing industries have increased more than 45 percent when compared to the 1957–59 averages.

Prices of food, at this time amounting to only 17 percent of the take-home wages, have run far below the increased cost of all items and services as measured by the consumer price index. The following table indicates that the increase in the cost of rents, homes, medical care, entertainment, transportation and other items has increased more than twice as fast as retail food prices:

RETAIL PRICES, APRIL 1969 WITH COMPARISONS

Item	Consumer Price Index (1957–59=100)[1]				April 1969 change from—		
	April 1969	April 1968	April 1966	1947–49 average	April 1968 percent	April 1966 percent	1947–49 average percent
Consumer prices: All items	126.4	119.9	112.5	81.5	+5	+12	+55
Food at home	119.3	115.1	112.7	86.1	+4	+6	+39
Cereals and bakery products	121.3	118.3	114.1	75.4	+3	+6	+61
Meats, poultry, and fish	118.4	112.7	115.6	90.7	+5	+2	+31
Dairy products	122.9	118.8	108.9	88.3	+3	+13	+39
Fruits and vegetables	127.9	128.3	119.8	80.9	(2)	+7	+58
Other foods	109.0	103.0	103.6	90.5	+6	+5	+20
Food away from home	142.2	134.4	121.6	(3)	+6	+17	----------
Housing	125.3	117.5	110.3	78.3	+7	+14	+60
Rent	117.8	114.4	110.1	72.8	+3	+7	+62
Home ownership	137.1	124.0	114.3	(3)	+11	+20	----------
Fuel, oil, and coal	117.4	114.0	108.5	73.4	+3	+8	+60
Gas and electricity	111.2	109.5	108.3	85.8	+2	+3	+30
Furnishings and operations	116.9	112.2	104.4	(3)	+4	+12	----------
Apparel and upkeep:							
Men's and boys'	127.3	119.2	109.6	92.0	+7	+16	+38
Women's and girls'	121.0	114.5	104.2	101.0	+6	+16	+20
Footwear	138.4	130.4	118.1	76.3	+6	+17	+81
Transportation:							
Private	121.9	116.8	110.5	76.7	+4	+10	+59
Public	148.0	137.2	122.1	53.7	+8	+21	+176
Health and recreation:							
Medical care	153.6	143.5	125.8	69.2	+7	+22	+122
Personal care	125.5	119.0	111.6	78.1	+5	+12	+61
Reading and recreation	129.6	124.9	116.8	86.4	+4	+11	+50
Other goods and services	126.6	122.5	114.3	78.5	+3	+11	+61
U.S. average retail meat prices, cents per pound:							
Round steak	123.7	111.8	114.6	83.8	+11	+8	+48
Rib roast	104.5	97.8	94.7	67.8	+7	+10	+54
Chuck roast	68.6	63.8	65.3	57.1	+8	+5	+20
Hamburger	59.7	55.4	55.4	50.4	+8	+8	+18
Veal cutlets	189.9	175.0	155.3	93.2	+9	+22	+104
Pork chops	105.6	101.4	104.4	74.6	+4	+1	+42
Ham, whole	67.3	68.3	74.6	66.3	−1	−10	+2
Bacon, sliced	82.9	80.7	93.6	73.7	+3	−11	+12
Frankfurters	73.0	71.2	73.3	(3)	+3	(2)	----------
Chicken, fryers	42.2	40.6	43.6	(3)	+4	−3	----------
Consumer incomes:							
Weekly wage rates	$126.86	$118.21	$111.24	$52.06	+7	+14	+144
Per capita disposable income	[4] $3,006	[4] $2,866	[4] $2,537	$1,244	+5	+18	+142

[1] Consumer Price Index.
[2] Small.
[3] Not available.
[4] 1st quarter.

A smaller portion of the family budget is spent for food in the United States than at any time in history or in any major country of the world. Just 10 years ago, 20.9 percent of the disposable personal income was spent for food. In 1968, food took only 17.2 percent of take-home pay. And in spite of rising prices, the percentage of disposable personal income spent for food has continued at this low level so far in 1969.

Retail meat prices have, it is true, risen sharply. Dressed beef prices are the highest on record. The price rise is, as has been pointed out, basically due to unusually strong consumer demand for meat and inflationary pressures on the general economy that have more than offset moderate increases in supplies of red meats. So far this year, meat production has increased enough to a little more than offset population increases, so per capita supplies of meat have been slightly larger than the record supplies last year. The average consumer, therefore, has been eating as much meat as last year even though prices are up.

The consumer is getting a much better beef product today than in years past. Over two-thirds of today's beef has spent time in a feedlot, compared to only 40 percent a few short years ago. This results in increased tenderness, flavor and desirability. Even the cutting and merchandising techniques give today's modern housewife more meat for the table. With new trimming and packaging changes, there is less waste and more actual edible meat per pound purchased than ever before. This, of course, adds to the cost. Of such cuts of beef, 6.50 percent of the carcass is used for porterhouse steak, 6.75 percent for sirloin steak, 6.40 percent for rib roast, 7.20 percent for chuck steak, 3.35 percent for top round, and 4.50 percent for ground meat, leaving just about two-thirds of relatively low value.

Livestock and meat prices have risen even though the quantity of meat available for consumption has been slightly larger than a year ago. Red meat output was up 3 percent during January to April, including 2 percent more beef, 4 percent more pork, but considerably less veal and lamb. In addition, poultry production was up 6 percent during the first 4 months of this year, and imports of red meat have been larger than a year ago. The meat supply situation changed somewhat during May, however, when both beef and pork production supplies were smaller than in May 1968. As supplies this spring began to run below year-earlier levels and demand continued unusually strong, livestock and meat prices rose sharply. The demand has been extremely strong in recent months because of unusually low unemployment rates and rapid increases in consumer incomes.

Recently the United Press International made a nationwide report on meat prices. Because of the comprehensive aspect of this survey, it is made a part of this statement for it indicates the diverse impact of conditions on local prices.

The article, published in the New York Times, June 15, 1969, follows:

MEAT PRICES RISE ACROSS COUNTRY—BUT SAMPLE SHOWS GAINS HAVE NOT BEEN UNIFORM

CHICAGO, June 14.—Meat prices are rising all across the country. But in some cities they are markedly higher than in others.

A United Press International spot check of supermarkets in 13 cities on June 5 showed that the price of sirloin steak (bone in) ranged from $1.08 a pound in Albuquerque, N.M., to $1.59 a pound in Detroit and Birmingham, Ala.

The survey came at a time when the Department of Agriculture said the meat bill for the first quarter of 1969 had risen by 3.7 per cent from a year earlier. And department

economists declined to say when, or whether, prices would start to come down.

A sampling of 16 stores checked coast to coast revealed that sirloin averaged roughly $1.45 a pound at meat counters, which chuck averages 87 cents a pound, leg of lamb $1.13, pork chops $1.24, lamb chops $1.82 and rib roast, $1.22.

LOW IN ALBUQUERQUE

The Albuquerque Safeway charged, per pound, 68 cents for ground chuck, 98 cents for oven-ready leg of lamb, $1.04 for pork chops, $1.49 for lamb shops and 98 cents for rib roast.

In Birmingham ground chuck was priced at 95 cents a pound, leg of lamb $1.29, pork chops, $1.19, lamb chops, $2.29 and rib roast, $1.29.

First National Stores in Portland, Me., charged $1.48 for sirloin, 89 cents for ground chuck, 99 cents for leg of lamb, $1.19 for pork chops, $1.89 for lamb chops and $1.29 for rib roast.

Supermarkets in Dallas came closest to the national average with their meat prices. Dallas stores were charging $1.44 for sirloin, 83 cents for ground chuck, $1.19 for leg of lamb, $1.22 for pork chops, $1.64 for lamb chops and $1.09 for rib roast.

On the average, shoppers in Los Angeles paid less for beef products than did those in San Francisco. San Francisco housewives got a break, however, on lamb prices.

* * * * *

A sampling of six Middle Western area stores showed that shoppers in Des Moines, Iowa, paid about the same for meat products as the shoppers in Detroit.

* * * * *

At First National Stores in Providence, R.I., rib roast was $1.46 while other prices were comparable to the national average.

* * * * *

Following is a comparison of retail prices in 13 major cities reported as of Thursday, June 5:

City	Sirloin steak	Ground chuck	Leg lamb	Pork chops	Lamb chops	Rib roast
San Francisco	$1.59	$0.91	$1.13	$1.34	$1.69	$1.31
Los Angeles	1.29	.79	1.49	1.29	1.89	1.39
Albuquerque	1.08	.68	.98	1.04	1.49	.98
Dallas	1.44	.83	1.19	1.22	1.64	1.09
Des Moines	1.55	.89	----------	1.29	----------	1.19
Detroit	1.59	1.29	1.25	1.60	2.10	1.25
Memphis	1.45	.89	----------	1.09	1.59	1.09
Miami	1.49	.89	1.19	1.29	2.19	1.29
Birmingham	1.59	.95	1.29	1.19	2.29	1.29
Providence	1.49	.98	.95	1.29	1.35	1.46
Portland, Maine	1.48	.89	.99	1.19	1.89	1.29
New York City	1.39	.85	.99	1.19	1.89	1.19

U.S. IMPORTS OF MEAT AND MEATS SUBJECT TO U.S. IMPORT QUOTA RESTRICTIONS

(Thousands of pounds)

Item	Average, 1965–67		1968		1969	
	January–April	Year	January–April	Year	January–April	Year
Meat (carcass weight equivalent):						
Beef and veal	313,138	1,157,896	433,604	1,518,030	476,314	----------
Pork	128,064	368,952	141,947	416,099	133,479	----------
Lamb	4,447	13,224	4,364	22,896	13,027	----------
Total red meat	474,530	1,636,643	630,671	2,081,034	651,852	----------
Imports under quota [1]	214,931	777,500	295,836	1,000,550	318,425	[2] 1,035,000

[1] Includes fresh and frozen beef, veal, mutton and goat on a product weight basis.
[2] USDA estimate.

CHOICE STEERS AT CHICAGO AND COMPOSITE RETAIL PRICE OF BEEF

Year	Choice steers (cents per pound) [1]	Beef, retail (cents per pound)
1951	35.96	88.2
1952	33.18	86.6
1953	24.14	69.1
1954	24.66	68.5
1955	23.16	67.5
1956	22.30	66.0
1957	23.83	70.6
1958	27.42	81.0
1959	27.83	82.8
1960	26.24	81.0
1961	24.65	79.2
1962	27.67	82.4
1963	23.96	81.0
1964	23.12	77.8
1965	26.19	81.4
1966	26.29	84.3
1967	26.04	84.1
1968	27.74	87.3
1969:		
January	29.23	90.1
February	29.11	90.0
March	30.19	89.9
April	30.98	92.7
May	33.85	----------

[1] Live weight. Average beef animal dresses out at approximately 62 percent of live weight. U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Cattle prices in early January were around $29 per 100 pounds—choice grade steers at Chicago. Since then, cattle prices have risen and in recent weeks have been averaging $34 to $35 per 100 pounds, about $7 higher than a year earlier. Hog prices are currently about $5 higher than they were at the turn of the year and a year earlier. In 1951 the price of choice live steers was 35.96 cents per pound—liveweight—in Chicago. This was 2.11 cents per pound higher than it was in May 1969. On the other hand the retail price of beef in the same market was 92.7 cents per pound, or 4½ cents higher this year than in 1951. That is in 18 years the price of live animals had gone down and the price of the commodity in the retail store had gone up. In this respect the price of beef but reflects a number of farm commodities.

Beef production reached an alltime high of 20.9 billion pounds in 1968, and pork production also increased. Imports of beef and veal totaled 1,518 million pounds and were equal to 7 percent of U.S. beef and veal production. Pork imports also were larger. These increases more than offset moderate reductions in U.S. lamb and veal production and provided in record large volume of meat for consumption, both in total and per capita.

Imports of red meat early this year were down sharply because of the dock strike in most eastern and gulf ports. However, in March and April imports were again considerably larger than a year earlier. On balance, red meat imports were 3 percent larger than a year earlier during the first 4 months of 1969—beef and veal imports were nearly 10 percent larger, but pork imports were down 6 percent. Imports of meat subject to quota have been up about 8 percent so far this year.

MINERAL DEPLETION ALLOWANCES

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about a reduction in mineral depletion allowances, particularly oil. I believe someone should say something about the reason for depletion allowances.

In recent months the petroleum industry in the United States has been in the political spotlight to an excessive degree. Emotion is running high and this important industry has become a "symbol" beyond sober reason or equitable balance.

For the RECORD the following facts should be carefully weighed by each Member of this Congress.

During the past decade the mandatory oil import control program has been administered so that imports of foreign oil, other than residual fuel oil to be used as fuel, has remained at, or below, 12.2 percent of the estimated average daily oil production from domestic reserves located in districts I to IV.

The effective restriction on the importation of foreign oil has helped accomplish the national security result intended by proclamation No. 3279, as amended.

The domestic petroleum industry and the petroleum self-sufficiency of the United States have benefited meaningfully from the oil import control program.

In spite of the national security benefit given by the program, however, the petroleum industry in the United States has experienced progressive deterioration in its ability to find and develop new domestic oil reserves to replace those being consumed at greater and greater rates.

The domestic reserves to production ratio for natural gas has declined to about 15 to 1 at the end of 1968. The first consumer evidence of the rapidly declining availability of natural gas will be felt this coming winter by industrial gas consumers on the east coast. The following winter, and the winters after, will experience progressively tighter natural gas supply conditions.

The number of years of supply of all oils in the United States from domestic reserves has decreased to 8.4 years at the start of 1969.

Petroleum now supplies almost three-fourths of the Nation's energy requirements. The demand for energy from all sources is insatiable and is increasing

dramatically. If this Nation is to remain independent, it must be self-sufficient in its energy supplies.

All energy sources—coal, uranium, shale oil, tar sands, as well as petroleum—should receive increased attention by Government and by industry. Unbiased concern should be evidenced for the present and future availability of energy reserves by producers, processors, transporters and consumers alike.

Competent authority reveals that the U.S. reserves of uranium ore available at today's price and technology are about one-fourth of the requirements for facilities in use, under construction, or planned to be installed by 1980.

U.S. reserves of shale oil in the Western States have been said to total 2 trillion barrels or more, however, under existing economic and operating conditions not one barrel of shale oil is available to any consumer in the United States.

Mineable reserves of coal in the United States have been stated as being over 800 billion tons, or sufficient for several hundred years at today's rates of consumption. Actually, the "commercial" quantities of coal available under existing economic and operating conditions are only 2 to 3 percent of the total quantity available if economics is ignored.

It is, therefore, apparent that our available domestic energy supplies from all sources has reached a dangerously low level. Of all of our sources, petroleum, shale oil, uranium, and coal, petroleum is the most abundant due, I feel, to the tax laws under which this industry has operated for so many years.

Much has been said and written about tax reform that would include reducing the depletion allowance and modifying other tax laws that now apply to petroleum.

In my judgment, this country cannot afford the luxury of embarking upon a program of "tax reform for the sake of reform," particularly one that will result in our early dependence upon the Middle East and North Africa for our petroleum supplies.

Fortunately, petroleum is only one of several sources of energy for the people of this Nation. I, therefore, urge that the investigation of the oil import control program being conducted by the Cabinet task force under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, George P. Shultz, be enlarged to include all other sources of energy such as coal, shale oil, uranium, and tar sands.

The President of the United States, and Presidents before President Nixon, have consistently and stanchly defended the fundamental assumption and central theme that a worldwide American presence is necessary for global stability, and peace flows not from weakness but from strength—this theme has been basic to the U.S. foreign and military policy for decades.

Energy is strength. This Nation can, this Nation must, remain completely self-sufficient in its energy supplies.

I, therefore, urge the governments of the States and the Federal Government to conduct a critical assessment of the Nation's present and future energy needs, and availability from all sources and to effect laws and regulations that will stimulate the exploration for and the development of energy supplies adequate to insure the continued energy self-sufficiency of the United States.

PAYMENT LIMIT POSES QUESTION OF LEGALITY

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, until the appropriation bill disagreement between the House and Senate over the $20,000 limit on individual payments to farmer is resolved, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot legally spend funds to formulate 1970 crop programs unless they provide a $20,000 limit.

This has special importance because the 1970 wheat program already is about a month behind schedule.

So far, conferees on the appropriation bill have not been named.

Last Friday I sent the following telegram to Agriculture Secretary Hardin, explaining the problem:

The provisions of H.J. Res. 790. passed by the House of Representatives on June 30 and subsequently by the Senate and signed by the President, provides authority for departments and agencies of government to continue operations pending final approval of appropriation bills. Careful reading of Section 101 raises serious questions to the legality of any expenditures being made at this time by the Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation for the formulation of programs for the 1970 crop year which fail to establish a $20,000 ceiling on aggregate payments under wheat, cotton and feed grains programs to any individual farmer. I call this to your attention with special urgency, because your staff may well be in the process of formulating the 1970 wheat program, and perhaps the 1970 programs for cotton and feed grains as well.

The section clearly requires that the House version of the agriculture appropriation act for fiscal 1970 be followed. It further directs that, as between House and Senate versions the more restrictive authority be followed.

The language of Section 101–a–4 would not set aside this requirement, because the $20,000 limitation derives from a single appropriation, a single fund and a single authority.

Until disagreements between the House and Senate versions of the money bill are resolved, it would therefore seem illegal to spend funds during fiscal 1970 to formulate these programs unless subject to the $20,000 limit.

THE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA THREE FORGOTTEN STATES

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

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, there are only three States in the Union which have not a single standard metropolitan statistical area within their boundaries. My own State of Wyoming is one—the others are Alaska and Vermont.

I today introduce a resolution which would declare it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that the Bureau of the Budget establish at least one SMSA in any State which at present has none.

This matter was also submitted in the last Congress.

One of the major purposes of the SMSA concept is to promote commerce among the several States, to facilitate the movement of people, goods, and industries from one part of the Nation to another.

In the words of the Bureau of the Budget:

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas definitions are used in presenting data from the censuses of business, manufacturers, and mineral industries; the census of population and housing; and the census of governments; in presenting current economic and social data; and in analysis of local area problems. And, the data are used in many market analyses.

The utility of the SMSA figures is readily apparent. Industries which are relocating look first to reliable standardized statistics in their quest for the right spot. At a time when the urban centers of the country have become so crowded with people and their arteries of traffic that to live there is neither pleasant nor easy, it behooves us to encourage the development of outlying portions of this vast country. While the industries concentrated in the great metropolitan complexes overload the air and water of those areas with pollutants, it makes little sense to continue policies which have the practical effect of channeling yet more factories into the same places.

The Bureau of the Budget feels that to make exceptions to the criteria which they have arbitrarily established for the purpose of defining SMSA's would jeopardize the entire system. The Bureau states that the uniformity and consistency of the data would be lost were Wyoming, Vermont, and Alaska to be included. This resolution does not ask for the reduction of standards across the board; it only requests equal treatment for all of the States.

Although the minimum requirement for SMSA is a population of 50,000, there appears to be no upper limit. Thus a State which has only a few SMSA's can easily have data available for the vast majority of the State's population. Where there is no SMSA, the entire State is bypassed. Small communities near a vast metropolis can be included, but an entire State whose cities fall below the 50,000 mark by however small a margin must be excluded. Among the regions in this plight is the largest State in the Union.

Each of the three States ignored by the Bureau of the Budget contains a city of which the population was at least 40,000 in 1960 and is certainly substantially greater some 9 years later. We are not dealing with areas consisting solely of villages and farms, but having substantial commerce and, what is more, the potential for vast increases in that commerce—increases which are in part constrained by the lack of information made available to the Nation's industries.

In Wyoming alone there are two strong candidates for centers of SMSA's. Casper

is centrally located and is known as the "oil capital of the Rockies." Cheyenne is the capital city and, although it does not have Casper's central location, is a vital area for commerce, business, industry, and, of course, the government of the Equality State. Casper had an estimated population of 42,500 in 1965 and Cheyenne had reached 50,000. It seems that the Bureau need have little concern for the effect on their guidelines and since some of the SMSA's have populations of more than double the 50,000 figure, it appears that uniformity was not too serious a consideration in any event.

I am hopeful that Congress will act quickly and affirmatively on this resolution in order that the advantages of having a standard metropolitan statistical area within State boundaries might no longer be denied to Wyoming, Vermont, and Alaska.

FOOD PROGRAM REORGANIZATION

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hardin, on announcing today the formation of the Food and Nutrition Service in USDA. This new agency is being established in accordance with a directive from President Nixon. The Food and Nutrition Service will be charged with the responsibility of administering Federal food programs. In his May 6 message to Congress on Hunger, President Nixon said:

> Presently the food programs are operated in conjunction with numerous other unrelated programs. The creation of a new agency will permit greater specialization and concentration on the effective administration of the food programs.

Mr. Speaker, there is considerable evidence that our present food programs are woefully inadequate. We are currently reaching about 7 million Americans either through the commodity distribution program or the food stamp program. The meager statistical information which we do have indicates that there are about 15 million Americans in need of food assistance. We also know that those who are being reached are not being properly served. Many have testified before various congressional investigative committees that the needy often have to travel for miles to purchase food stamps, that they have to wait in line for hours to be certified, and that the eligibility requirements are unrealistic in terms of their needs. We have learned to our dismay that in this land of plenty there is still plenty of hunger and malnutrition.

All of these facts prompted the administration to take a hard look at this problem with a view to completely overhauling our Federal food assistance programs. This is precisely what President Nixon called for in his May 6 message to Congress. In the President's words:

> That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable.

He went on to say that more is at stake than the welfare of millions of Americans who need food assistance; in his words:

> Something very like the honor of American democracy is at issue.

In discussing the administration's new food program, the July issue of the Atlantic Monthly editorialized as follows:

> Nixon officials are quite justified in their claims that the proposals—$270 million more for food stamps in the fiscal year ending next June 30, growing to a full $1 billion more in the following year—represent the most comprehensive program for providing food assistance that has ever been put forward by a President.

The President deserves our praise and support in his commitment to the problem of hunger in America. I am hopeful that this Congress will speedily implement the administration's proposals for expanding and improving our Federal food assistance efforts.

Secretary Hardin's announcement today of the creation of the Food and Nutrition Service under Executive reorganization authority is an important first step in putting these programs on the right track and in eradicating the awful blemish of hunger and malnutrition from the face of America.

OUR FOREFATHERS WERE DEEPLY RELIGIOUS

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in our Fourth of July celebration we should have thanked God that our forefathers were so deeply religious. Some of them could have made a name for themselves in the pulpit as well as in affairs of state.

For example, Washington wrote:

> I am sure that there was never a people who had more reason to acknowledge a divine interposition in their affairs than those of the United States.

John Adams wrote:

> I have been a churchgoing animal for 76 years, from the cradle.

Franklin wrote:

> I believe in one God, Creator of the universe.

And it was he who moved "that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven be held in this Assembly every morning."

Congress continues the practice to this day. Jefferson, during his trying days as President, began a writing, "The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth." It was later translated into three languages. Alexander Hamilton, just before his duel with Aaron Burr, wrote his wife:

> The consolation of religion, my beloved, can alone support you; and these you have a right to enjoy. Fly to the bosom of God and be comforted.

This sort of man founded our Nation with faith. They differed in their religious beliefs but they all agreed the religion of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man. This is our heritage. Let us give thanks for the "Faith of Our Fathers, Living Still."

Since our forefathers, who founded this Nation believed so strongly in God, and since this Congress starts every session with prayer, it seems entirely fitting that prayers should be offered in the schools of our country. A step in this direction has been made by those of us who have introduced a resolution for a constitutional amendment which would permit nondenominational prayers in our schools.

I know the majority of this House supports such a resolution. I am confident the people of the United States support such a resolution and a constitutional amendment. At last we are on the right track, and if we persist, stanchly and steadfastly, prayers will again be heard in our schools throughout the land.

UNEMPLOYMENT INCREASE

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we are presently witnessing a gradual but, nonetheless, disturbing increase in the rate of unemployment. I would be less than candid were I to fail to point out that the medicine I prescribe today for our economy may serve to give a degree of stimulus to this trend. It seems fair to say that both the administration for their inaction and the Congress—should it follow the course of action which I posit—would be purchasing disinflation at the price of increased unemployment in the private sector. Note that I add the caveat, "the private" sector. I do this because I wish to draw attention to the fact that where employment declines in the private sector as a consequence of steps to ameliorate inflation there must be a proportionate response in the public sector to compensate for the reduction in private employment. By this I mean to suggest that the Federal Government must be prepared to assume an increasing responsibility as a residual employer in our economy. In the weeks to come I shall introduce legislation which would initiate a program of Federal conservation to be implemented through the employment of presently unemployed youths in addition to this program, it is my intention to continue to encourage Federal efforts in the field of manpower development and training to the end that each individual shall be given an opportunity to play a full productive role in the American economic life.

HERBLOCK DENIED RUSSIAN VISA

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the morning paper today the Russians have seen fit to deny a travel visa to political cartoonist Herblock who is a cartoonist for the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that this action has been taken because the Russians like to posture themselves as a society that has a degree of open-

ness and a degree of freedom, when, in fact, the people who represent our press establishment in this country are being denied visas to travel in that country.

I think this is disturbing and distressing.

I would hope that those Russians who are stationed in this country and who read our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will know that I, for one, am concerned about this and distressed by it and that I hope they will rethink this policy of preventing American citizens from traveling freely in that country.

If relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. are to improve, a useful step would be to allow the unrestricted exchange of members of press establishments of both countries.

One can only conclude that the denial of Mr. Herblock's visa is a form of political punishment—and if such punishment is meted out to foreign journalists, one must worry about the enormous pressure thoughtful members of Soviet press must endure.

Mr. Block has written a letter to Mr. Brezhnev which I believe ought to be included in the RECORD. The text follows:

A LETTER FROM HERBLOCK TO BREZHNEV

DEAR MR. BREZHNEV: Earlier this year I signed up for a guided group tour which included travel to Russia, and filled out applications for the necessary visas. Some time later the tour agent said that everything was in order for everyone, except for my Russian visa, and that this was under consideration in Moscow.

Well, I hadn't realized that I was regarded as such a hot item over there. It was a little flattering to think of your government sitting around for five weeks or so debating whether it could take the risk of admitting me. But as the time narrowed down to little over a week before departure, I got to thinking about packing and all.

I have some trouble figuring what to toss into a bag just for an overnight trip to New York, where nobody tells you that you ought to take along things like soap and toilet paper and a sink stopper.

So I was interested and even somewhat relieved to learn before take-off time that your government had finally reached a decision on the matter of my impending trip, and had cabled that my application for a visa was denied.

I couldn't help wondering, though, why the Soviet Government should have such qualms about the prospect of a visit by me. True, your government has complained about some of my cartoons on your regime, and this was cited by an embassy official when a friend in Congress had called to inquire about the status of my visa application.

But I really hadn't been planning to draw, print and distribute cartoons in Russia. You wouldn't believe it but it takes me a day to do a cartoon right here at home. And on an Intourist schedule designed to keep the visitor fully occupied, there would hardly have been time for anything but an occasional rest period and a spoonful of paregoric.

One cartoon that your government had particularly objected to had to do with the pains you took in keeping Russian writers and artists under control—a kind of domestic trouble spot, as I saw it. So perhaps your officials feared that I was going to foregather with some of your most talented and outspoken creative people. But if your aides had only looked at the agency's travel schedule, they would have found that Siberia wasn't included in my tour at all.

I thought I'd just stick with the group plan, which included some museums, the tomb of Lenin and some approved recent Russian art, which seems to be equally safe and well-preserved. Little did I realize that your government would regard my scheduled week and a half in Russia as Ten Days That Shook the Kremlin.

I'm kind of sorry to have been the cause of so much concern. At a time when the news from Russia tells of border conflicts with China, which has nuclear weapons, I didn't feel right about the Russian government having to do all that worrying about one American cartoonist armed with nothing but a pencil, a notebook and a tour schedule.

You fellows already have problems enough with other people—like Russians.

Well, your decision against my taking part in that museum tour ought to ease your burdens a little. I noticed that as soon as the Soviet Government resolved its problem about me, Mr. Gromyko got right to work with a speech on improving American relations, which I've long hoped you'd get around to. He even suggested considering the exchange of official delegations of The Supreme Soviet and the United States Congress. He didn't mention anything about Soviet writers and artists, who I used to enjoy meeting when they came here, but never mind. Travel is educational. I think you should get around more, and without being preceded by tanks.

Without even going to your country I found my brief experience with your government pretty educational in itself. And I'm sure there's a lot for you to learn about us.

I hope you'll think about coming here. I'm not worried about our government surviving a visit by you, and I really think your government might have survived me. If you see President Nixon, he can explain to you that I don't exactly have total control over events, even here in the U.S.

Anytime you're in the neighborhood, don't hesitate to get in touch with me; and you can let me know exactly how you feel about those cartoons. After all, it's a free country.

Sincerely,

HERB BLOCK.

TELEVISION VIOLENCE

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, much attention has recently been focused on the impact of violence on television. This was the subject of a recent research study conducted by the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania.

In yesterday's edition of the New York Times, Jack Gould commented on this recent report and tried to put the entire problem into perspective.

I feel Mr. Gould's incisive article would be of interest to my colleagues. It follows:

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1969]

OF SCAPEGOATS AND HEADLINES

(By Jack Gould)

In connection with the issue of violence on television the most pressing problem is research into violence on television. The latest example of the dilemma came last week in a "preliminary" study by a research team of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania, headed by Dr. George Gerbner, dean and chief investigator for the study.

Once again the study took the familiar form of monitoring two sample weeks—in early October of 1967 and 1968—and counting up the number of dead or injured in television dramas, motion pictures and cartoons. It concluded that there were five casualties for every program containing violence. (The announcement of the preliminary study said that the monitoring hours ran from 4 to 10 p.m. This left out the final prime evening hour of 10 to 11 in which mayhem, according to the Annenberg criteria, is sufficiently prevalent to make the study's figures slightly suspect, unless the University of Pennsylvania conducted its research in the central time zone.)

In the headlining tradition introduced years ago by the National Association for Better Broadcasting, the Annenberg preliminary study in the course of its two sample weeks found that 791 persons had been killed or injured on the picture tube.

Without benefit of supporting statistics in its publicity handouts, the Pennsylvania group found that in 1968 the Columbia Broadcasting System generally featured less simulated bloodshed than in 1967. The American Broadcasting Company was deemed "the most violent in many respects" in the two-year comparison, but, according to the study, did reduce the proportion of violence's significance to the plots and the frequency of such violence. Violence on the National Broadcasting Company was reported to have "receded slightly" in 1968.

The Annenberg study was prepared for the National Commission on the Causes and the Prevention of Violence, which emphasized that the University of Pennsylvania's handout was only a working paper for part of a report on violence in the mass media. The commission hopes to release the report late next month. Louis Harris, the public opinion analyst, is making his own survey on violence and the mass media which will be taken into account by the commission.

The weakness of the Annenberg study, at least to the extent it was issued in fragmentary form, was that it did not list which specific shows were monitored or by whom, or whether it was talking about the same shows in 1968. Nor did it spell out in anything like coherent terms how it defined "violence."

The Annenberg School is not alone in a distressing trend in TV analysis. If data are to be released at all, then the complete working papers should be simultaneously and voluntarily unfolded for independent perusal. A study that reaches conclusions without a wealth of supporting statistic is not really research at all.

In addition to the efforts of the national commission, the subject of violence is scheduled to be explored for at least a year by the office of the United States Surgeon General. This move was made at the prodding of the Senate Commerce Committee.

That there has been a plethora of violence on the home screen in past years goes without saying. At least some of it has come in the Saturday programing for children, which the Annenberg School inexplicably failed to take into account. Violence is an easy way to avoid the more exacting development of characterization, and any number of supposedly responsible citizens—including the Federal Bureau of Investigation—exploit shooting on the air for its box-office appeal. A writer and director may yearn for quality; the producer, network or sponsor are the ones demanding "action."

But the Annenberg School's approach in many ways typifies the superficiality of the standard concern over violence, a concern that does not get to real issues and treats all aspects of violence in the same way. On the latter score, for instance, a wholesale purge of all Westerns—which is practically in the offing for the coming season—seems rather silly. The Western is staple fare going back to the earliest movie days, its setting is clearly not contemporary and it is a form of accepted visual fiction that will not succumb to any self-appointed Senate clean-up

squads. Where sadistic cruelty is injected into a Western, then in simple common-sense the networks and Hollywood producers should exercise restraint; the task is not that hard.

But the overwhelming need of research into violence and television is to turn up at least a scintilla of persuasive evidence that there is a direct causal relationship between what is shown on the home screen and the subsequent behavior of those who watch TV. Staggering volumes of literature are completely inconclusive on the social question that really counts, and contrary arguments abound. Definitive research in this area would take years and millions of dollars.

To isolate entertainment TV, just because it is so simple to monitor and is such an inviting scapegoat rich in productive headlines, does not reflect other factors. TV may be ridden with sins but it certainly cannot be blamed for the Vietnam war. The spread of narcotics addiction which, police will readily attest, so often lies at the root of robberies and muggings, is not electronic in origin. And Congress itself collapsed under the pressure of the gun lobby.

Because television does enjoy such awesome popularity with the young it would be foolhardy not to support any effort to bring the proportion of violent themes into sensible perspective. The broadcaster who dishes out an evening's diet of violence as an end in itself and not as an integral part of legitimate theatrical characterization is guilty of failing to make his contribution to softening the accent on violence that plagues the nation.

But picking on TV alone is a national copout for the failure of adults to do what they can to set an example. Children of today are years ahead of their parents in an awareness of the deep and perplexing international and domestic crises which so often find expression in violent forms, and about which their elders vacillate in irresolute and self-serving expediency. A TV screen that presented nothing but "The Sound of Music" and "Mickey Mouse" would be a sociological escape hatch for those who bring a profundity to effects and display a comforting disinterest in causes.

LEGISLATION TO CURB UNSOLICITED OBSCENE ADVERTISEMENTS DELIVERED THROUGH THE U.S. MAIL

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an amendment to title 39 of the United States Code that would define in specific terms certain types of illustrations that would not be permitted to appear in unsolicited advertisements flowing through the mails.

In recent months, the Nation has been subjected to an increasing flow of degenerate advertisements for obscene literature through the Post Office. On July 8, the Government Activities Subcommittee, which I serve as chairman, held a hearing on this problem with the Postmaster General as our principal witness. At that time, it was recommended to him that the Post Office Department promulgate a regulation pursuant to the authority of the statutes Congress has previously enacted relating to the mailing of obscene matter to prohibit certain types of illustrations in unsolicited advertisements. This proposed regulation was specific and dealt directly with what presently constitutes the heart of the problem to most people—that is, illustrations in unsolicited advertisements that are being sent into the homes and into the offices of millions of Americans to be opened by children, by wives, and by secretaries. In recent months, the depravity and degeneracy of the illustrations appearing in some of these unsolicited advertisements have become so extreme as to defy description.

Unfortunately, the Postmaster General refused to consider the implementation of this proposed regulation. Although constitutional and administrative grounds were cited, the bases of these objections would not stand up under examination. This regulation, in fact, is of a very limited nature. It would not extend, for example, to any written material or to matter that is solicited by the person receiving it. In addition, the regulation would, for the first time, clearly define in prospective terms certain areas of obscenity that would constitute a general guide to those who would exploit the public through the sale of this material. This proposed regulation does not contain any subjective tests which in the past have been such a difficult stumbling block to our courts in upholding convictions under our obscenity laws.

Also, the regulation contains no criminal sanctions. The idea behind this concept is that we wish to stop the flow of obscene material coming within the specific limitations enunciated in the regulation. As the Post Office would have the power not to deliver material coming within this definition, the success of the effort would not necessarily require criminal prosecutions of individual mailers.

Unfortunately, the defeatist attitude of top Post Office officials has jeopardized efforts to halt the flow of obscene advertisements through the mail at this time. Under present statutes, the Postmaster General has the power—in fact, he has the responsibility—to issue appropriate regulations implementing the directives Congress has enacted. If such terms as "obscene" in themselves are too broad and too subjective to constitute an effective standard to deny access of the mailers to objectionable material, then the Postmaster General should, through regulation, clearly define under the authority of present statutes the nature of material he believes comes within this category and is, therefore, not subject to delivery through the Post Office.

The overwhelming majority of American people object to this sordid and filthy material flowing unsolicited into their homes. We want effective action taken. We want the Post Office Department to exploit every reasonable approach permitted under present statutory authority that is consistent with the first amendment to the Constitution. Unfortunately, instead of vigor, enthusiasm, and eagerness to try new approaches, we find the Department deeply imbedded in old concepts, overwhelmed by past defeats, and too timid to try anything new.

It was disappointing to learn that key officials in the Department were more concerned in determining what was wrong with this proposed regulation than suggesting modifications that might have made it acceptable from their point of view. Interestingly enough, some of the Department's objections to this proposed regulation would seem to apply with even greater force to the proposals for new legislation they have recommended to the Congress.

As a result, the Post Office Department's testimony before the subcommittee constitutes a veritable primer of why we cannot do anything ever so slight and reasonable to curb the flow of this objectionable material into the homes of the American people. With this defeatist attitude prevailing in the Department, I have redrafted the regulation and have introduced it as an amendment to title 39 of the United States Code. I have taken this action because I believe the basic approach reflected in this proposal constitutes an effective solution to a major segment of the obscene literature problem. At the same time, I believe that its concise and limited nature offers no meaningful compromise to the rights of free speech and the broader concept of freedom of expression which we all agree must remain inviolate.

In the ultimate sense, if the Postmaster General refuses to implement specific regulations stating in prospective terms the nature of material that cannot be delivered through the mails, then Congress must perform this task for him.

If there is no meaningful basis to limit the use of the mails to those who would exploit the public through the sale of obscene literature and other material, then the time has come for this fact to be established. On the other hand, if some effective action can be taken consistent with the Constitution, then it is high time that we get on with it.

Thank you.

The bill follows:

H.R. 12788

A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain obscene matter

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Matter otherwise legally acceptable in the mails which—

"(1) is unsolicited,

"(2) offers for sale, rent, or loan any photograph, drawing, picture of any kind, or any material containing any illustration which depicts in whole or in part the genitals of the human body, or any act of sodomy, masturbation, homosexuality, sexual intercourse, sadism, or masochism, and

"(3) illustrates in any way the nature or the contents of the items offered for sale, rent, or loan is nonmailable matter, shall not be carried or delivered by mail, and shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs."

REFORM OF THE BAIL REFORM ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor the Nixon administration's legislation to reform the Bail Re-

form Act of 1966. This bill is a perfection and refinement of the approach outlined in two other bills on this subject, the first of which I introduced on January 3, 1969.

The most succinct explanation of the perfected bill is found in the words of a memorandum prepared by Attorney General John N. Mitchell:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The proposed amendments, like the Bail Reform Act itself, will be applicable in the District of Columbia and in Federal courts throughout the country. The principal features of the bill are:

1. Authority for the courts to consider danger to the community in setting nonfinancial conditions of release on bail.

2. Pretrial detention for up to 60 days for defendants who are within certain crime categories and who are found to be dangerous after full hearing.

3. Sanctions for violations of conditions of release either by revocation of release and detention or by contempt proceedings.

4. Added penalties for bail jumping and committing offenses while on bail.

Background Information: The Bail Reform Act of 1966 was directed toward the serious abuses of the money bail system throughout the United States. Its sole purpose was to "revise the practice relating to bail to assure that all persons, regardless of their financial status, shall not be needlessly detained pending their appearance to answer charges . . ."

The Bail Reform Act did not deal with the question of defendants who are released on bail and who endanger the community by committing additional crime. It did not resolve issues of preventive detention. Congress specifically put these matters to one side.

Since 1966, the problems of crime committed by persons released on bail have become acute. Newspapers have contained daily reports of crime committed by persons on bail; statistical studies have been made and the problem is acknowledged as a serious one. The available data includes the Judicial Council Bail Committee study which concluded that about 10% of the persons indicted in the United States District Court had allegedly committed these crimes while released on bail, in another felony case and a study by the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia who found a rearrest rate of 60–70% among persons charged with robbery and released on bail.

Several prestigious groups have undertaken further study of bail problems. The District of Columbia Crime Commission studied the situation and a majority recommended legislative authority to permit preventive detention of certain dangerous persons. The American Bar Association Committee on Minimum Standards has prepared recommendations on bail and believes that a judge should have authority to consider dangerousness in setting nonfinancial conditions. The District of Columbia Judicial Conference has approved consideration of dangerousness in setting release conditions and a majority of its Committee headed by Judge George L. Hart of the United States District Court favors preventive detention.

At the present time, Congress has before it literally dozens of bills which provide various methods of controlling crime committed by persons released on bail. Few, however, contain the same criteria and procedures as the Administration bill.

Consideration of Dangerousness: Section 1 of the Administration bill authorizes judges to consider dangerousness in setting conditions of release on bail. It specifically says that the judge may consider "the safety of any other person or the community" in setting bail. A judge may not, however, impose money bond or financial conditions to assure safety.

This provision is endorsed by virtually all informed persons.

Pretrial Detention: Pretrial detention is already authorized for persons charged in capital cases. Section 2 of this bill would authorize pretrial detention of certain persons charged in a limited number of non-capital violence related cases.

The *categories of persons* who may be detained after certain findings and procedures are:

1. Persons charged with a "dangerous crime".[1]

2. Persons who are repeat offenders and who have been charged with at least two crimes of violence,[2] i.e. persons charged with a crime of violence while on bail and persons convicted of a crime of violence in the preceding 10 years.

3. Narcotics addicts who are charged with crimes of violence.

4. Persons who are charged with any offense and who threaten witnesses or jurors.

These categories were selected after analysis of the available data showing recidivism and after careful consideration of judicial experience in these matters. A preliminary survey indicates that about 10% of the persons arrested in the District of Columbia will fall within these categories:

The judicial findings which must be made in writing before pretrial detention are these:

1. Clear and convincing evidence that the person is a person described in one of the categories;

2. A determination that no condition of release will reasonably assure the safety of the community and

3. Substantial probability that the person committed the offense with which he is charged.

Under these standards, it is plain that only those few defendants who meet all the tests will be temporarily detained pretrial.

In addition to safeguard individual liberties special procedures must be followed before detention may be ordered. Specifically,

1. There must be a hearing;

2. The defendant is entitled to present information, testify and present and cross-examine witnesses;

3. The judicial officer must enter a written order with finding and reasons; and

4. There are rights of appeal,

Persons who are believed to be addicts also spend three days under medical supervision for a determination of addiction.

Finally there are limits on detention and added protections for detained persons. These include:

1. An expedited trial which must take place within 60 days unless delay is caused by the defendant;

2. Confinement where possible in facilities separate from convicted persons; and

3. Opportunity to prepare defenses including release in custody of appropriate persons to aid the preparation.

Sanctions for Violating Conditions: The Bail Reform Act did not provide specific sanctions for violating conditions of release. Section 6 of this bill provides two types of sanctions.

First, release may be revoked and the defendant detained if upon hearing the United States Attorney establishes "clear and convincing evidence" of violations and the Court finds that no additional conditions of release will protect the community or prevent flight. This sanction is endorsed by the ABA Committee on Minimum Standards and the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia.

Alternatively the defendant may be tried for criminal contempt and sentenced up to 6 months. While the contempt procedure is probably available under present law, it seemed desirable to clarify the law. See 18 U.S.C. 3151.

Added Penalties: The proposed bill creates added penalties for persons who jump bail and persons who commit crimes while on bail.

Bail jumpers will be subject to sentences of not less than one year and not more than 5 years if charged with a felony and not less than 90 days and not more than 1 year if charged with a misdemeanor. These sentences are to be consecutive to any other sentence. In addition failure to appear after notice will be prima facie evidence of willful bail jumping.

Persons convicted of offenses committed on bail are also subject to mandatory added penalties of not less than 1 year nor more than 5 years if convicted of committing a felony while released and not less than 90 days nor more than 1 year if convicted of a misdemeanor. These sentences are to be consecutive.

[1] "Dangerous crime" is defined to cover only offenses with high risk of additional repeated public danger, e.g., robbery and sale of narcotics. (Sec. 7.)

[2] "Crime of violence" is defined more broadly and covers the whole range of violent crimes. (Sec. 7.)

Mr. Speaker, this proposal represents the best thinking of the best minds in the field of criminal justice. It is addressed to the problem which is approaching crisis dimensions. The safety and security of the people and property of the American community are at stake. Congress should give the matter priority attention.

VIETNAM: EVENTUALLY; WHY NOT NOW?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in just 2 days, this Nation and the world will be caught up by a spectacular journey into space. We marvel at the technology that has made the Apollo missions possible, at the courage of the men who man our space craft, at the boldness of vision and the sure execution of a program that have led us to a moon landing in the decade. Our Naiton will be proud.

Standing in sharp contrast to our feats in space will be our disastrous entanglement in Vietnam. Here, we have pitted our advanced technology against the will of stubborn adversaries and have wrought only vast destruction. Here, we have asked brave men to fight and die while we helped a regime repugnant to many cling to power, and while the wisdom and justice of our cause were increasingly doubted at home and abroad. Our vision has been faulty, our decision to change course tragically long in coming.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon took office in January committed to bring the Vietnam war to an end. He brought with him a new team for the task. He had the opportunity which comes at the beginning of a new administration to make some bold new departures.

Like others, Mr. Speaker, I have restrained my impatience and withheld my comments so that the President might have as much leeway as possible for devising a peace strategy, and for whatever secret exchanges might be underway. But

the war continues, the casualties mount daily, and the talks in Paris remain on dead center. Last year we had the seige of Khe-Sanh. This year we have had Hamburger Hill and Benhet. And next year?

The President himself has now tipped his hand and his hopes for troop withdrawal to the world and Hanoi. I think those of us who have grave reservations about our present policy need not hesitate to make them known.

The President has announced withdrawal of 25,000 U.S. troops, which is now in progress. He has said that he hopes to better the withdrawal schedule proposed by former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, which is 100,000 combat troops by the end of this year and the remaining combat troops—some 150,000—by the end of 1970. Moreover, there is a new rumor every day that announcements of further withdrawals will soon be forthcoming.

My message, Mr. Speaker, is this: "If eventually, why not now, and why not a definite expression of intent to that effect?" Mr. Clifford and others have pointed the way. We should start removing our troops in important numbers now.

And why not, at the same time, an announcement of a decision to scale down our military activities in South Vietnam? The policy of maintaining unceasing pressure on the enemy appears to be the last redoubt of those who believe that superior arms, when allied to the cause we have espoused, must somehow prevail. The bombing of North Vietnam was defended in much the same terms as the policy of maximum military pressure in South Vietnam. But the dogma that our troops would be greatly endangered by a cessation of the bombing has now fallen. Surely, we can take the risk of substantially halting offensive military operations for a trial period, while we seek an agreement for a standstill cease-fire from all parties.

And why not also, at the same time, step up pressure on the Thieu-Ky government to broaden its membership, to release some of its critics from prisons, to bring back some exiles from abroad? When neutrality for South Vietnam can be labeled acceptable by the President of the United States, it is scandalous that advocates of this posture in Saigon still risk reprisal.

Given the present array of forces in South Vietnam, it seems improbable that the Thieu-Ky regime would survive in its present form if elections were held in which all major groups, including the NLF, were permitted to compete on equal terms. Our policy should reflect that improbability. A broadened Saigon regime under present leadership may be no more acceptable to the NLF as a negotiating partner than the present regime. But it is a vital step toward the transitional arrangements that must be part of any political settlement. If Thieu and Ky cannot take this step, then there is all the more reason to question the present policy which assigns to them the major responsibility for working out a political settlement with the NLF.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the genuineness of President Nixon's search for peace in Vietnam. But I believe his approach needs to be broadened. If we continue to follow a low-risk, hedge-every-bet, carrot-and-stick, one-step-at-a-time, strategy in Vietnam, I think we are headed straight for the shoals on which the policies of previous years have foundered. The conflict will continue simply because we ourselves have arranged it so that we can find no acceptable way out.

If we continue to pace our troop withdrawals as President Nixon has said we should, to hypothetical improvements in Saigon's military performance, or to progress in Paris, or to reductions in military activity on the part of the enemy—while we continue on the offensive—we will lose the opportunity to find out what the response would be to a bolder initiative. A piecemeal and conditional troop withdrawal strategy seems unlikely either to keep the impatience of the American public long within bounds or to truly test Hanoi. And where is Saigon's incentive to improve its military performance, if they know that foot-dragging can lead us to stay around in force?

Similarly, if we continue to dismiss every lull in enemy military efforts as merely a prelude to a new offensive; if while we withdraw troops, we never let up our military pressure, we are in effect seeking peace with one hand tied behind our back.

The main point of a scaled-down military effort and a probe for a cease-fire is to put a stop to the fighting and killing. The fact that Hanoi and the NLF have insisted on an end to our offensive military operations should be no bar to our initiative.

The longer the administration follows its present strategy, the harder it will be to change it. As the weeks go by and the rhetroic of policy justification accumulates—"we must negotiate from strength"; "the enemy is in trouble"; "we must not renege on our solemn pledges"; "we must preserve our diplomatic credibility"—the President will find his options reduced by his own record and by the interests that have gathered about his policy.

Indeed, the words of the Vice President on July 1 had the ominous ring of an administration settling into the last administration's war with all the attendant policy assumptions. He warned:

> Our progress and success depend on the staying power of the American people. The Vietcong remains intransigent because of the slender hope that the voices of dissent at home will force us to alter—perhaps even abdicate—our policy of proving that confrontation with the United States is costly.

Mr. Speaker, after 8 years and over 36,000 American men killed, the American people have more than proved their staying power. They have, moreover, at great sacrifice, prepared the way for South Vietnam to prove its staying power.

Above all, it is the voices of dissent at home that have given to President Nixon the opportunity to bring the ghastly Vietnam war to an end.

That opportunity will slip by unless he acts on his mandate with boldness, confidence and imagination—and soon. Our achievements in space will be as naught if the havoc continues in Vietnam and if at home our society continues to be torn apart.

WE ALL LIVE DOWNSTREAM FROM SOMEWHERE AND SOMEONE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point where pollution of the Nation's waters is reaching an intolerable point. We have arrived at a juncture where from sea to shining sea the waters of America, finite in supply, are being choked with effluent, raw sewage, chemical wastes, pulp plant residues, packing plant garbage, animal entrails, and a complete range of all the filth that mankind, in his ignorance, chooses to pollute the water he must draw life and sustenance from.

I find that this situation strains credulity. Only a short while ago, the Cuyahoga River running through the city of Cleveland, actually caught fire because of chemical and oil wastes in it. Before that conflagration was extinguished, extensive property damage was done.

Industrial sewers are all that remain of most of the rivers flowing through almost all American cities with significant amounts of industry. Because pollution of any substance as basic as water knows no boundaries, pollution of one body of water inevitably leads to that of another, and another, until a complete water chain serving an entire area of our Nation is choked with filth and waste. Garbage, effluent, and residues dumped in one area end up in some form in your water downstream. And we all live downstream from somewhere. To me, relative inactivity on the part of Government and society in general in the face of such a menace is nothing short of political insanity. Are we waiting for national epidemics? In most major cities, the water we drink has already passed through several people and is literally loaded with chlorine.

Daily this situation grows worse. Yet one of the greatest tools America has for combating water pollution lies idle as far as such work is concerned. Further, it is now being utilized to further an old task which is cumulatively harming America as much as it once aided it. The Army Corps of Engineers has served the Nation long and honorably. Its primary work consists of dam building. Yet we have almost totally run out of major dam sites in the United States. So the corps, in order to continue fufilling its mission, continues to propose smaller dam projects, such as the series of dams along the Potomac. If I may be so bold as to say so, our rivers, particularly the Potomac, require cleansing far more than they need damming.

This Nation requires a major, ongoing antipollution program, with a major government arm utilizing all skills, complete with 100-percent Federal financing to bring into being sewage and waste-dis-

posal systems to clean up the filth presently polluting our environment. No better agency with a wider variety of skills and experience exists in our Nation for this task than the Army Corps of Engineers.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. REUSS of Wisconsin, has pioneered in introducing a measure which would accomplish this eminently laudable task. I take pleasure in joining him in advocating this approach, which would terminate a once beneficial policy which has turned stale, stagnant and nationally self-defeating. The bill would then turn this excellent agency into a modern, up-to-date operation in the very forefront of a battle against what may perhaps be our worst environmental problem.

It does little good to scoop up filth clogging our industrial sewers, only to dump it into another body of water. This is being done now. It does less than good to disturb ecology in the name of public works, which is also transpiring as a result of present corps activity.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect for the corps. I simply feel that their mission must alter direction to adapt to the times. The measure I am introducing now would accomplish that in the name of clean water and a balanced environment.

It provides for the corps to include in its civil works program projects for research, development and construction to take care of pollution caused by storm sewer dumping, sanitary sewage, industrial and other liquid wastes. Priority of programs would be determined by amount of benefit toward environmental cleanup as compared to costs.

THE AVERAGE TAXPAYER PAYS MORE—THE AVERAGE OIL COMPANY PAYS LESS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the proof of oil industry evasion of legitimate Federal taxes grows steadily more damning and conclusive. Their own tax figures, submitted to and verified by the SEC, damn them out of their own account books.

While the tax rates of almost every average, lower- or middle-income taxpayer in America went steadily up, oil industry rates, as a whole, went down significantly. How does America like them apples? As almost all Americans, the few privileged ones excepted, counted their pennies and dollars, the oil industry not only piled up unprecedented profits, but paid lower taxes as an industry.

Last week I inserted in the RECORD a chart showing the 1967 and 1968 Federal taxes paid by a selected group of the Nation's largest oil and refining companies. In 1967, these companies paid $491,235,000 tax on net income before tax on net income of $6,653,617,000, which comes to a tax rate of 7.4 percent. In 1968, these same companies paid $500,090,000 in Federal tax on net income of $7,354,346,000. This is a tax rate of 6.8 percent. Compare this with what the average lower- and middle-income taxpayer has to disgorge as his share of our unfair tax burden.

Is this sense? Is this fairness? Is this justice? If so, then Khrushchev is really a secret director of General Motors. No outrage upon solvency and tax justice is more inexcusable than the facts revealed here. As John Randolph of Roanoke once said:

> Like a mackerel by moonlight, it shines and stinks.

I am including the 1968 and 1967 comparison of figures again, so this House and the American people may take a close look at how their solvency is being cured.

A glance at the figures for Gulf, Sinclair, and Atlantic-Richfield is designed to raise national blood pressure. These people are almost carting their loot away in dumptrucks. Gee whiz, fellows.

The oil industry regards its privileges as a birthright. Their tears move me not. Lady tax reform waits in the wings, for the Congress, her director, to cue her so she may perform for the delight of her audience, the taxpayers.

The figures referred to follow:

TAXES PAID BY A SELECTED GROUP OF THE NATION'S LARGEST REFINING COMPANIES, 1967 AND 1968

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Net income before tax	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some States' tax	Percent	Profit after tax
Standard Oil (New Jersey):						
1967	$2,098,283	$166,000	7.9	$700,000	33.0	$1,232,283
1968	2,303,587	223,999	9.7	802,907	34.8	1,276,681
Gulf:						
1967	955,968	74,142	7.8	303,539	31.8	578,287
1968	977,321	8,005	.81	342,997	35.1	626,319
Texaco:						
1967	892,986	17,500	1.9	121,100	13.5	754,386
1968	1,019,930	23,800	2.4	160,600	15.8	835,530
Mobil:						
1967	594,593	26,900	4.5	182,300	30.7	385,393
1968	673,739	22,000	3.3	223,500	33.2	428,239
Standard Oil (California):						
1967	513,067	6,000	1.2	85,400	16.6	421,667
1968	569,431	16,700	2.9	100,900	17.0	451,831
Standard Oil (Indiana):						
1967	366,847	74,021	20.2	10,576		282,250
1968	395,064	74,678	18.8	10,892	2.7	309,494
Shell:						
1967	342,022	44,940	13.1	12,233	3.6	284,849
1968	387,767	63,378	16.3	12,298	3.2	312,091
Cities Service:						
1967	165,289	32,347	19.6	5,105	3.1	127,837
1968	138,613	12,683	9.2	4,594	3.3	121,336
Union:						
1967	163,820	10,400	6.3	8,457	5.2	144,963
1968	164,232	5,955	3.6	7,045	4.3	151,232
Sun:						
1967	146,946	24,700	16.8	13,670	9.3	108,576
1968	227,790	44,290	19.4	19,070	8.4	164,430
Atlantic-Richfield:						
1967	145,259		0	15,254	10.5	130,005
1968	240,272	2,999	1.2	37,713	15.7	199,560
Marathon:						
1967	138,520	3,700	2.7	60,962	44.0	73,858
1968	155,335	4,350	2.8	67,659	43.6	83,326
Sinclair:						
1967	130,017	10,585	8.1	24,060	18.5	95,372
1968	101,265	−2,747	0	27,429	27.0	76,583

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY ESTABLISHES CENTER FOR VIETNAMESE STUDIES

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my House colleagues the establishment of the Center for Vietnamese Studies and Programs at Southern Illinois University.

Located at the Carbondale Campus of the university the center will provide students and faculty with opportunities to study Vietnam and to participate in programs of assistance for the Nation's economic and social development and postwar recovery. Of particular interest is the fact that special attention will be given to returning veterans who will have the opportunity to contribute as technicians and professionals—to the postwar reconstruction in that area.

U.S. interest and involvement in Southeast Asia has expanded dramatically over the past 20 years. The center reflects another dimension of our interest and concern with that area of the world that has been referred to as the "arc of crisis."

Southern Illinois University is to be commended for developing a facility dedicated to advancing our knowledge and understanding through an institutionalized program of Vietnamese studies. I congratulate the university for its foresight in recognizing the need for this type of program. I also commend the Agency for International Development for assisting the university in the development of the center.

LITTLE LEAGUE WEEK

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week our Nation celebrated Little League Week, honoring those thousands of men, women, and children who have done so much to make sportsmanship a living reality on the American scene. Throughout the summer months from one end of the country to the other, hundreds of Little League teams meet on the dia-

mond, organizing and participating in what has come to be known as the national pastime.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we commemorate the establishment of the Little League system and for a number of reasons. We hear a great deal about the generation gap in our country, but there is no generation gap between a team of youngsters and their coach. Nor is there a generation gap between an enthusiastic parent and a son who pitches a no-hitter or belts a home run. Athletic participation is one of the great cohesive forces at work in our society. It binds not only the young and the old; it brings together in fair competition all the divergent elements of our society. A young man, properly guided, who learns to play by the rules on the ballfield is readily capable of carrying that discipline into the rest of his activities, and this in itself is important, for, aside from the potential of developing athletic prowess, that young man is provided an opportunity to develop a sense of responsibility to others around him.

Like most of my colleagues, I have a number of Little League teams in my congressional district. I am proud of them all and I am proud also of the tremendous parents who make this program work. They deserve our heartfelt appreciation and gratitude.

DEDICATED PERSONNEL IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the national attention currently being focused on postal reform, and the fact that in the not too distant future Congress will be called upon to make a determination which will have great impact on our Nation's postal system, some weeks ago here in the House I delivered a speech reflecting upon the great asset inherent in our system, and that is its dedicated personnel.

I believe it important that all of us take advantage of whatever available material related to the postal system and its procedures, and so, hopefully, when the time comes be in a position to make educated judgment with respect to the matter on which we vote.

Several days ago I received some interesting material related to the role of the post office clerk, authored by the executive vice president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, Mr. Don E. Dunn. I would like to share it with my colleagues, as follows:

POST OFFICE CLERK IMAGE BEING CHALLENGED

(By Don E. Dunn)

(Because of the many changes which have taken place in recent years in Post Office Department personnel policies, practices and working conditions, and in the postal employes' working environment, mostly in response to the mail "explosion" and all creating new pressures and problems, it appears that the always-proud image of the postal clerk may have become somewhat obscured. The clerk in his responsible and conscientious performance of duties is again being taken for granted. The true reflection of the postal clerk, working in the face of adversity represented by salary restraint, impaired working conditions, and onerous personnel policies, must be restored and elevated to its proper level. The article below may provide some encouragement to locals as we continue our efforts to restore the traditional image of the loyal conscientious, dedicated, sacrificing, career-minded post office clerk.)

We, of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, are proud of our organization and its reputation down through all its 62 years.

We are proud that in the very beginning our Federation was the first group of Federal employes ever to receive a charter from the American Federation of Labor. And, it was the Federation which many years ago recognized that the best interest of fellow postal employes would be best protected and promoted by an organization of their own. In 1917 the organization surrendered jurisdiction over letter carriers and the postal transport employes so these groups could obtain separate charters from the American Federation of Labor.

There are 24,974 first-, second-, and third-class post offices in which there are career postal clerks, and in over 19,000 of these post offices the United Federation of Postal Clerks is represented by 175,000 clerks who are members of the United Federation of Postal Clerks.

We believe there is no other organization in the United States that covers as extensively each of the 50 states as does the United Federation of Postal Clerks.

No other organization reaches so deeply into the far-flung grass roots of our country as does the Federation. Even the two great political parties, Democrat and Republican, do not have near the continuous contact with every American citizen. This fact alone gives us the very basic foundation of our prestige.

Close and continuous contact with the public places postal clerks in a unique position in which they are in effect working directly for every American citizen. This gives them a sense of responsibility in performing their duties and a sense of pride in doing a good job. We think this concept of a two-way street has been satisfying to both parties.

THE ROLE OF THE CLERK

There is another reason for all of us being proud of being post office clerks; that is, the responsible part that all post office clerks play, not only in making a good Postal Service, but also in the growth and advancement of the economy of our great country. Post office clerks have been justly characterized as the unsung heroes in the Postal Service.

We would like to use an example, and in so doing, we want it fully understood that we mean no reflection upon any other group of employees in the Postal Service and the important part they play. We only want to use this example as a means of pointing up the importance of the responsibilities and skills of a post office clerk.

Have you ever paused to consider that we could do away temporarily with the Post Office Department officials—we could do away with the Regional Officers—we could do away with postmasters—supervisors—mail-handlers—custodial employes—letter carriers. Yes, we could do away with them for a short period of time only and still maintain some degree of postal service.

However, one could not dare to attempt to eliminate even for a very short period of time the post office clerks, the real technicians. Take them away from the letter cases, in the originating offices, in the mail cars, the highway post offices, and the delivery offices—these post office technicians, who on their own time have spent many hours, and will continue to do so for as long as they are in the Postal Service, to become and stay qualified on intricate and complicated schemes of distribution—not only on mail going to the little town a few miles down the road, but going to the small town or the big metropolitan city across the country—perhaps by train, perhaps by other surface means, or by air, and to be able at a flicker—at an instant—to distribute a piece of mail addressed to a particular house, business or apartment to some abstract number on a distribution case. And, each of those little pigeon holes may cover an area of one square block to perhaps a good many square blocks. If post office clerks with their knowledge and developed skills were eliminated, the entire mail service would come to a complete halt.

Several years ago, the Bureau of Standards stated that a post office clerk was required to have more than 11,000 items of knowledge at his finger tips. This vast span of knowledge, plus knowing how to properly apply it, qualifies the clerk as a highly-skilled technician.

One can bring someone in from the outside to maintain a modified type of mail service temporarily, but there is no substitute for having skilled and trained technicians for the distribution of all classes of mail, whether by manual, machine or other new methods.

So far, we have emphasized only one area of the skills and responsibilities of these post office technicians—the complicated distribution of mail. The post office clerk must also be the actual policeman and guardian of every penny and dollar of revenue received by the Post Office Department. These post office technicians must know the classifications, rates, and regulations, domestic and foreign, that affect mail costs to assure that the Post Office Department receives full revenue as required by the Congress.

Window clerks must work under the uncomfortable threat of a fixed credit policy which holds them liable for any shortages, counterfeits or forgeries which may arise in their fixed credit. It is reasonable to assume, supported by statistical probability theory, that shortages will sometimes exceed overages, and that an initial shortage (perhaps a large one) will sometimes occur before a counterbalancing overage exists. To even use his overage to counterbalance, nevertheless, requires that the clerk specifically document the instant case in which the shortage, forgery or receipt of counterfeit occurred. Seasonal and random pressures of working at a window, along with window consolidation of various and diverse kinds of financial transactions, make it more likely that errors will occur, and at the same time compound the fear psychology which is felt by different clerks in varying degrees.

All these duties are performed under constant eight-hour-a-day supervision. In addition, these tedious duties are continuously performed under measurements and quotas previously established for each respective area of work. This means tremendous pressure on the clerk every minute of the day.

If this skilled post office technician were taken away, the entire mail service would crumble immediately. Yes, the post office clerk is like the heart in the human body. The human body may lose a leg, arm or an eye, be handicapped through deafness or crippled, and yet, that body can keep going just as long as the heart functions. But if the heart is stopped, the body is lost completely.

Such is the role of the post office clerk. He is not only the very heart, the very nerve center and the very backbone, not only of good postal service, but of operation of the entire national economy.

It is hard to realize what would happen if the movement of mail through those complicated distribution cases were ever stopped the window clerks were not available, the smooth and expeditious flow of letters of agreement, transmission of funds, the writ-

ten word, and the lines of written communications were ever interrupted.

We feel that by these few minutes of reflection, all will realize the value and importance of the skilled post office technician. It is not merely a matter of his obtaining the skill once; he must continuously study (on his own time) to maintain that skill during his entire career in the Postal Service. This is vitally necessary due to the constant changing of policies, modes of transportation, expansion and growth in the local communities, and changes in postal rates by the Congress. This training and skill cannot be applied in any job except that of a post office clerk.

This was the sound and basic reasoning which motivated the Federation's National Officers when appearing before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to testify and support position reclassification—to recognize these additional skills and responsibilities not required of any other group of employes, and to propose an amendment to place these post office technicians, upon the basis of their difficult and unusual skills, in a higher Postal Field Service salary level.

The United Federation of Postal Clerks believes that it is imperative that the Post Office Department take immediate action to assure that the work jurisdiction of Post Office clerks shall not be segmented and that such additional new positions as may be needed and which do not include managerial or supervisory responsibilities are promptly established and designated in the clerk craft to be filled by the "senior qualified bidder," and we firmly believe we should vigorously assert our rights as post office clerks and technicians and request the Congress of the United States to assure that our jobs are compensated commensurate with our required skills and responsibilities.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE REQUIRE IMMEDIATE BIPARTISAN CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's criminal justice proposal which I have introduced today along with a number of my colleagues.

All of us, on both sides of the aisle, know that our constituents are almost as concerned about law and order as they are about the Vietnam conflict. My mail reflects this concern; and on my weekly visitations to my home district I am constantly faced with the query about why the Congress has not done something about reversing this ever-increasing utter disregard for law and order, by certain elements of our society, both young and old.

One of the principal reasons for my support of President Nixon was my firm conviction that he would really do something constructive and effective to stop the hardened criminal, and to deter others that outwardly and unashamedly flout the laws of our communities and of our country.

Well, President Nixon has done something. On January 31—11 days after he assumed office—he told the American people he was preparing to make "a meaningful assault on crime on many fronts."

Since then, his judicial appointments have been men of experience in the law who will interpret the law as written by Congress; and will not in effect write laws. Our Federal courts, district court of appeals, and U.S. Supreme Court in the past few years have seemed to be in almost fanatical competition to see which can be most concerned about the rights of criminals and less concerned about the rights of society.

I am confident that President Nixon's judicial appointments will reverse this trend; and that their decisions will show some clear evidence of concern about rights of all of our citizens to feel safe in their homes, and on our streets.

Now the President, through his distinguished Attorney General, has sent Congress proposed legislation which is the epitome of careful, thoughtful consideration of the rights of all of our citizens—good and bad—and, if enacted, will assure prompt, efficient justice; but, at the same time, assure those charged with crime of a fair trial, with effective representation of competent counsel at every step of the accused's conflict with the law—from the time of apprehension to final appellate court action.

As a former FBI agent and prosecuting attorney, and after more than 10 years in Congress, I think the proposed legislation just might be giving the criminal more justice than he really deserves, but because of the fully apparent deliberation, painstaking process, which the people who prepared this legislation must have gone through, I am prepared to accept these recommendations, so that the people of my district and throughout the country will know Congress is discharging its heavy responsibility for doing something about law and order. Congress must not shirk from this responsibility. We must meet it head on. And the President and the Attorney General have presented us with the vehicle with which to act responsibly and quickly.

I intend to urge all of my friends on both sides of the aisle, to peruse the memorandum from the Department of Justice which has been sent to each of us, describing the proposed legislation; and, in turn, to urge our colleagues on the Judiciary and District of Columbia committees to act expeditiously and favorably on this most worthwhile and needed legislation. As the Attorney General has stated, this legislation, if enacted, should serve as a model for other major metropolitan areas struggling to solve their own crucial crime and administration of criminal justice problems.

ABM: OUR ACE IN DEALING WITH RUSSIA

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as Secretary of State in the Truman administration, Dean Acheson learned that the United States should enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union only from the strongest possible position. The Russians, he says, do not actually negotiate. They do not make concessions. They enter into an agreement only when they believe it is to their advantage to do so. For the Russians, Acheson says, negotiations are a form of war. The Congress would do well to draw upon Acheson's great fund of experience as we debate and vote on the ABM deployment issue and prepare ourselves for arms control talks with the Soviet Union. Because of his knowledge of Soviet negotiating tactics, Acheson declares that deployment of the Safeguard ABM system is absolutely vital from the standpoint of strengthening our bargaining position in arms control talks.

Dean Acheson has set forth his viewpoints on the ABM and negotiations with the Russians in clear and convincing form in an article which appeared July 6 in the Detroit News. Because I believe all of my colleagues would benefit from reading the article by Dean Acheson, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

ABM: OUR ACE IN DEALING WITH THE RUSSIANS

(By Hon. Dean Acheson)

The Congress and the people of the United States are periodically distracted by red herrings, witch hunts, and waves of cliches. Over the more than 70 years during which I have been dimly conscious of the world around me, I have seen us preoccupied with a succession of witches.

In my early years in Middletown, Conn., I was thrilled to observe the crusade against the demon rum, which culminated in Prohibition, one of the least gifted experiments in statesmanship we have ever engaged in. (I would still maintain that the song of those days, "The Brewer's Big Horses Won't Run Over Me," is just as good as "We Shall Overcome.") Then in foreign affairs we had a witch hunt in fear of the yellow peril, and wasted a good deal of effort worrying about that.

When we got to the '20s and '30s we changed our worries. Our two witches then were the bankers and the munitions makers. The bankers were placed under control when someone managed to put a midget in J. P. Morgan's lap at a congressional hearing, and Senator Nye took care of the munitions makers so well that it was almost impossible to help our allies in the early part of World War II.

After this war we had the contribution of the first Senator McCarthy, who made me very prominent in the press as the well-known Communist who was at the head of a group of Communists at the State Department.

In 1969, the witch has changed. We hear today about the menace of the military-industrial complex, and this is surely the strangest witch-hunt of all. In 1940 President Roosevelt referred proudly to our munitions industry as the "arsenal of democracy." I simply cannot imagine how anybody could take seriously the thought that the great soldiers who have so bravely and skillfully defended our country would be engaged in a conspiracy to waste the resources of the United States. I should hope that responsible citizens will think about this seriously, and that this particular foolish cliche will be dropped for good.

What I decry is the effort to portray marginal problems as centrally important. It was probably a good idea to regulate the munitions industry in the '30s. It was folly to try to put American strategy into a straitjacket in the Neutrality Acts. Tighter security regulations were in order in the '50s. What was reprehensible was the attempt to exploit the situation as a lever for overthrowing due process and subverting our pattern of constitutional authority.

Intensified rigor in congressional review of defense appropriations may well be appropriate now. What I wish to warn against—and I do so with all the emphasis at my command—is any effort to use the attendant issues as an excuse for tampering with defense and foreign policies which rise from external existence.

A most pernicious effect of such cliches is that they lead us to disregard the lessons about the outside world which we have paid a heavy price in the past to learn.

A pertinent case in 1969 is the problem of negotiating with the Russians. We hear a lot of arguments that going ahead with military programs such as the ABM will minimize the chance of a successful negotiation with the Soviet Union. The fact is that all of our experience indicates that this is just not so. The Russians have a different conception of what negotiations mean.

I might remark that on this matter I speak from personal experience—far too much personal experience. I shall be the last to object to new negotiations between us and the Russians, but only if I personally may be excused.

As a Connecticut Yankee my conception of negotiation is a David Harum type of negotiation and deal. You have a horse and I want to buy it. We are both trying to accomplish a common result. You wish to get as much out of me as you can. I wish to pay as little as possible. Somewhere between those two desires we have a negotiation and make a deal and perhaps I get the horse. This is what I think most Americans think of when the word negotiation arises.

That is not the Russian conception of negotiation at all. The Russians look upon negotiation as a variety of war. It is the converse of Clausewitz who talked of war as diplomacy carried out by other means—the Russians see negotiation as war carried out with words.

So the Russians don't engage in give and take at the bargaining table. They are completely unresponsive to argument or to persuasion. A Russian diplomat, like a soldier already committed to battle, is only interested in the calculation of opposing forces. They will make a deal only when their calculations lead them to believe that it is more advantageous to make a deal than not.

Sir William Hayter has said that negotiating with the Russians is like putting a penny in an old-fashioned slot machine. Sometimes you got what you wanted, but usually not. Sometimes you got nothing at all. It helped from time to time to shake the machine and sometimes to kick it, but it never helped to argue with it.

Now, of course, the Russian calculation of forces is based upon their own set of priorities. The Soviet Union is always going to do what they believe is best for them, and so when I was at the State Department we used to devote a great deal of effort to working out what the Soviet intentions were. We concluded that the Russians have a number of intentions with different priorities, and that these priorities are pretty consistent.

The central overriding intention—the heart of all Russian policy—is to protect the regime in every way. That never changes, and they will never compromise on that.

It affects many things that they do—for example, I think that they have seen the grave inroads which any contact with the free world, free speech, free diplomacy, or a free economy has upon their satellites and their own people, and they are determined to prevent this from happening. If they have to invade all the satellites to protect their regimes, they will do so. If they have to take more serious action, they will do that.

Beyond this central purpose, there is a second one which has been in existence since the very beginning of the Communist organization, and that is probing weaknesses on the outside.

Wherever they believe they see a weakness, they probe. They try never to get in so deep that they might be trapped in some irremediable trouble, and so they stop when they meet sufficient resistance. But if the probing encounters a weak spot, they keep pushing until the weakness ends. We found examples of this in Cuba and in Indonesia.

This is a trend which has been presented in the Muscov'te state since the 12th century and I cannot see any possibility of popular pressure or revolt in the Soviet Union changing it.

This means that we will never make any progress in negotiating with the Russians by trying to persuade them of our intentions or by trying to alter theirs. What we can do to get results is to change the balance of forces as they would calculate it.

A very good example of this is the way the Russians began and ended the Berlin blockade. Their intentions were the same for both steps—they were trying to frustrate our attempts to reconstruct Europe and create a government which could govern Germany effectively without menacing its neighbors.

The Russians decided that they would rather keep Germany divided, and started a series of actions in opposition to our German policy culminating in the blockade of Berlin. At this point we still had a monopoly of nuclear weapons and so some people suggested that we should threaten to use them and frighten the Russians into giving up.

What we did instead was to create a counterblockade which isolated East Germany from the West, and which turned out to hurt the Russians a great deal more than their blockade hurt us. This was all the more true after our airlift turned out to be such a success. So the Russians realized that their calculation of forces had been mistaken, and eventually they took the initiative to propose that they would call off the blockade if we would call off the counterblockade.

The Russians conducted these negotiations with us in great secrecy—for a period of time only four Americans knew they were going on—but there was nothing subtle or complicated about the negotiations themselves. They offered to call off the blockade if we would call off the creation of a West German state, and we refused. So because of their calculation of forces, they agreed to call off the blockade anyway.

All of this has a bearing on the prospects for successful negotiations with the Russians this summer. I myself am convinced that these negotiations won't get very far.

The point is that if we go ahead with the ABM program (Safeguard antiballistic missile system) it won't make these negotiations any more difficult. They are just as difficult as they can be to start with. The Russians already have an ABM and MIRV program (multiple, independently targetable reentry vehicle system) of their own, and if they want to reach a reasonable agreement we will get an agreement. If they don't, which I think likely, they will probe to see if they can find an American weakness, but we need not worry about that as long as we take care that there are no American weaknesses for them to exploit.

The Russians are not children, and they are not easily frightened. They will come to the negotiating table, and they will calculate the forces as they see them, and they will do what seems most advantageous for them.

I would suggest that this is one case where we should do the same. A responsible Congress ought to obtain the best information it can from the men who are responsible for knowing the facts, and it should make a decision about ABM on the basis of a prudent defense of the United States in what continues to be a very dangerous world.

We are in a situation today, as we have often been in the past, in which the experts disagree about whether a particular policy is necessary for our security. I consider that a responsible legislator does not pretend that he is himself a technical expert, but instead obtains the best advice he can.

On the issue of the ABM, it is necessary to choose between opposing experts, and we must face up to the fact that the experts we choose just might be wrong. This means that to some extent the United States must take a chance, and the question is what would be the most prudent gamble.

Now the public debate on this question has been obscured by our national bad habits of hunting witches and of supposing that the Russians are really just like Americans in their diplomacy.

I hope that I have made it clear that the current cliche about a "military-industrial complex" is irrelevant nonsense, and that in fact the Russians have a very distinctive negotiating style which we should have learned to expect by now.

Once these red herrings are removed, I find the answer to the ABM debate very clear. We are being asked to gamble with a program involving some billions spread over five years, which is not such a very large sum when the defense of the entire country is at stake.

If the experts of our government are correct, then the protection the ABM will provide for this sum of money is a bargain. But if we disregard their advice and abandon the Safeguard program, and it turns out in five years that the administration was right, the consequences will be extremely serious, perhaps catastrophic.

On the other hand, it may be that the opposition is right and the ABM is unnecessary. If we build it anyway, would we have lost $9 billion?

Not at all, for we would in the process have built up a very considerable fund of technical knowledge. Knowledge which we know the Russians will have since they are going ahead with their own program. So even in the worst case the American effort will not have been wasted.

We live in a far more dangerous world than did our fathers and grandfathers. When we were unprepared in 1917 and in 1941, we had very strong allies and the width of the Atlantic Ocean, to shield us from the consequences of our folly. This is no longer true.

To build an ABM system is a course with a possibility of great gains and only small losses. To refrain could bring a relatively small saving at best, and catastrophe at worst. I find that what wisdom I have indicates that once the red herrings and cliches are abandoned, a prudent Congress will follow the advice of the President and his advisors.

THE 10TH ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this week we mark the 10th anniversary of a testament to freedom first proclaimed by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This is the 10th annual observance of Captive Nations Week, authorized by congressional resolution in 1959. That resolution empowered American Presidents to proclaim Captive Nations Week each year until "such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world."

This 10th anniversary of the observance of Captive Nations Week takes on special significance. It comes while the

Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia is fresh in our minds. It is a most fitting time to look at the original captive nations resolution and to ask ourselves some searching questions about the meaning and purpose of Captive Nations Week.

The original resolution told it like it is. It said:

> The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukrainia, Czechoslovakia, Latvia.

And so forth. In all, 22 nations were listed as having lost their independence because of Communist aggression. Then last on the list was North Vietnam.

Today we are fighting Communist aggression in South Vietnam and maneuvering against Soviet domination of the Mideast while probing the possibility of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam and a general arms control agreement with the Soviet Union.

But whatever is involved in the intricacies of current diplomacy, we still must tell it like it is.

We still weep for the Polish workers of Poznan so brutally suppressed when they rose in revolt 13 years ago against their Communist puppet rulers. We still are outraged over the bloodbath 13 years ago in Hungary when security forces fired upon the people and the Communist puppet rulers there called in Soviet troops to put down the uprising. Our hearts go out to the people of Czechoslovakia, invaded by the Soviet Union and four other Warsaw Pact nations last August 20 in a move to stamp out the freedoms being enjoyed by the Czechs and Slovaks.

What tremendous courage has been shown by the Poles of Poznan, the freedom fighters of Hungary, and the Czechoslovakians resisting the Soviet occupation and the reimposition of tyranny and censorship in their country.

It is this that points up the significance of Captive Nations Week and the dedication of Americans to the nurturing of freedom throughout the world.

There is a truth that no arms and no occupation can kill. The truth is that within the hearts of the enslaved peoples there burns a love of liberty which is a constant threat to their rulers—a yearning for freedom which will ultimately prevail. And this truth gives meaning to our Captive Nations Week observance.

Communism as an ideology has proven itself a myth. The form of government we see in the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Red satellite nations is simply statism—tyrannical rule by an oligarchy and a single political party. Statism is dictatorship, whatever the name given to it—communism, nazism, or fascism.

Only the government which governs with the consent of the governed is worthy of allegiance from its people.

This, too, is a truth that must be trumpeted during Captive Nations Week. And it is a truth which evokes fear and anger within Communist ruling circles when Americans speak of it during Captive Nations Week or any other time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the United States should seek enforceable agreements with the Soviet Union aimed at avoiding a third world war.

But it would be the greatest hypocrisy to close our eyes to the wrongs that the Soviet Union has done to millions of human beings deprived of individual freedoms and national independence.

There are some Americans who think that Captive Nations Week should be soft-pedaled or forgotten. I strongly disagree.

Americans must continue to make known their deep concern about the people of the captive nations and convey this message to the captive world.

Americans should continue to make known their refusal to accept the regimes imposed upon these unfortunate victims of tyranny.

Americans should continue to promote the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms which are the God-given rights of all people—and not talk of them only when it may be expedient to do so.

Americans must never accept the view that freedom is foreclosed for the now-enslaved peoples of the world. Consistent with our own national interests, America should constantly explore all avenues that might lead to a lessening of their plight.

Let us continue to inform the captive peoples of our full and uncompromising support for their unquenchable goal of national and individual freedom. Let them ever know that Americans are dedicated to the furtherance of freedom throughout the world.

Let us keep faith with the people of the captive nations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. GILBERT), for today through Thursday, July 17, 1969, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARSHA (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and the balance of the week, 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. PICKLE, for 30 minutes, on June 16, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. POFF, for 20 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Moss), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REUSS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SIKES, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. NELSEN to extend his remarks following those of Mr. MORSE today on the International School.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUKENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in five instances.

Mr. McDADE.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Moss) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in four instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. OBEY in six instances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington in two instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1686. An act relating to age limits in connection with the appointments to the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2173. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes," approved April 11, 1968; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11400. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his ap-

proval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 10, 1969:

H.R. 3689. An act to cede to the State of Montana concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over the real property comprising the Veterans' Administration Center, Fort Harrison, Mont.

On July 11, 1969:

H.R. 4153. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishment for the Coast Guard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 15, 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:

948. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 87th quarterly report on export control, covering the first quarter of 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

949. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act to increase the effectiveness of the Bail Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

950. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to expand and improve public defender services in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

951. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

952. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program administered by the Gila River Indian community under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

953. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Department of Labor's Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Carroll, Chariton, Lafayette, Ray, and Saline Counties, Mo., under title I–B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

954. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on schoolbus safety, pursuant to the provisions of title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

955. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on an evaluation of two proposed methods for enhancing competition in weapons systems procurement, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

956. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report concerning the effectiveness of cigarette labeling, current practices and methods of cigarette advertising and promotion, and recommendations for legislation which are deemed appropriate, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(d)(2) of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

957. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

958. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to authorize consideration of danger to the community in setting conditions of release, to provide for pretrial detention of dangerous persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of July 10, 1969, the following bills were reported on July 11, 1969:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5967. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to provide for the issuance of an additional congressional tag to Senators and Representatives (Rept. No. 91–372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8868. A bill to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the interstate compact on juveniles (Rept. No. 91–373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12677. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to lease to the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington the former synagogue of the Adas Israel Congregation and real property of the District of Columbia for the purposes of establishing a Jewish Historical Museum (Rept. No. 91–374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 255. A bill to authorize banks, savings and loan associations, and other regulated lenders in the District of Columbia to charge or deduct interest in advance on loans to be repaid in installments; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–375). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12671. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1928, to facilitate and encourage the employment of minors in the District of Columbia between the ages of 14 and 16 during the summer and other school vacation periods, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12720. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the District of Columbia to the Washington International School, Inc. (Rept. No. 91–377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: H.R. 12549. 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted July 14, 1969*]

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. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 11651. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free or reduced-price meals to needy children not now being reached (Rept. No. 91–379). 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. ASPINALL:

H.R. 12785. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Southern Ute Tribe approximately 213.37 acres of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 12786. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide a dependents' allowance for certain persons in the Reserves and National Guard ordered to active duty for training for a period of more than 30 days; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12787. A bill to amend section 5723(b) of title 5, United States Code, relating to length of service required by teachers in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools when travel and transportation expenses are paid to first post of duty; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 12788. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain obscene matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 12789. A bill to provide for computation of disability retirement pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12790. A bill to amend the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 12791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. SISK, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. UTT):

H.R. 12792. 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. DIGGS:

H.R. 12793. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 12794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income, for purposes of the individual income tax, certain monetary awards made by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. CRAMER) (by request):

H.R. 12795. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amount au-

thorized to be expended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12796. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12797. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker (in such individual's home) as part of a home health services plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12798. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12799. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work, and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 12800. A bill to authorize the construction of a low diversion structure or dam on the Potomac River, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 12801: A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12802. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12803. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 12804. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 12805. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the program of health insurance for the aged for services furnished an individual by a home maintenance worker (in such individual's home) as part of a home health services plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. POFF, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. FISH, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. KING, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. ROTH):

H.R. 12806. A bill to amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to authorize consideration of danger to the community in setting conditions of release, to provide for pretrial detention of dangerous persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 12807. A bill to amend the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 12808. A bill to bring into immediate operation the National Commission for the Review of Federal and State Laws Relating to Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 12809. A bill to extend to every person classified or processed under the Selective Service Act the right to legal counsel to the end that the rights and privileges afforded under law may be known and secured; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12810. A bill to encourage the flow of credit to urban and rural poverty areas in order to stimulate the rate of economic growth and employment in those areas, and to provide the residents thereof with greater access to consumer, business, and mortgage credit at reasonable rates; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12811. A bill to authorize and direct the Corps of Engineers to engage in public works for waste water purification and reuse; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 12812. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12813. A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements with Communist countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI (for himself and Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. DENT, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. POWELL):

H.R. 12814. A bill to provide for educational assistance for gifted and talented children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 12815. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and chief judges of district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 66; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12816. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to assault or kill any member of the armed services engaged in the performance of his official duties while on duty under orders of the President under chapter 15 of title 10 of the United States Code or paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3500 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12817. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow employers to deduct an additional amount as compensation for the duties required of them in connection with the withholding of taxes and the performance of other administrative and clerical duties under such code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12819. A bill to amend section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964 to eliminate the provision which presently limits eligibility for residential rehabilitation loans thereunder to persons whose income is within the limits prescribed for below-market-interest-rate mortgages insured under section 221 (d) (3) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 12820. A bill to require that persons displaced from their dwellings by real property condemnations in Federal or federally assisted programs be provided equivalent replacement housing; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12821. A bill to require certain vessels operating on the navigable waters of the United States to conform to standards of waste disposal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12822. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1905, relating to the dumping of certain materials into the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 12823. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12824. A bill to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, for earmarking funds for noise abatement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. MESKILL):

H.R. 12825. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests of the Bureau of the Census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. MESKILL):

H.R. 12826. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population in the year 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 814. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Res. 479. Resolution urging all Americans to display the flag of the United States in honor of the Apollo 11 mission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. Res. 480. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 481. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLD:

H. Res. 482. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of at least one standard metropolitan statistical area in each State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

239. By the SPEAKER: a Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to withdrawing its petition to the Congress of the United States to call a Constitutional Convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

240. Also, a memorial of the Governor of the State of Ohio, relative to the Ohio-West Virginia interstate air pollution control compacts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

241. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By. Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 12827. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe, Giuseppa, and Mario Iacona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 12828. A bill for the relief of Catherine Reinhart; 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:

175. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vincente Gatica Startti, Huntsville, Tex., relative to impeachment proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

176. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to procedures of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

177. Also, petition of the City Council, Belvedere, Calif., relative to taxation of State and local government securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—*Monday, July 14, 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:

Almighty God, before whose presence the generations rise and pass away, our fathers in their pilgrimage trusted in Thee and found that of Thy faithfulness there is no end. Still to us their children be the "cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night" to guide us lest we lose our way. Put Thy royal law of love within us that our affections may be set upon things above, so that amid our solemn duties and awesome responsibilities we may have Thy guiding light and know Thy peace and joy. Grant to all who serve Thee in this place the assurance of Thy pervading presence, and to the people of this Nation the faith that Thy divine providence overrules our human weakness. So fit us for Thy service and use us for Thy kingdom's sake. Not of our worthiness but of Thy mercy, hear our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 11, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

THE DRUG PROBLEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-138)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

Within the last decade, the abuse of drugs has grown from essentially a local police problem into a serious national threat to the personal health and safety of millions of Americans.

A national awareness of the gravity of the situation is needed; a new urgency and concerted national policy are needed at the Federal level to begin to cope with this growing menace to the general welfare of the United States.

Between the years of 1960 and 1967, juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs rose by almost 800 percent; half of those now being arrested for the illicit use of narcotics are under 21 years of age. New York City alone has records of some 40,000 heroin addicts, and the number rises between 7,000 and 9,000 a year. These official statistics are only the tip of an iceberg whose dimensions we can only surmise.

The number of narcotics addicts across the United States is now estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands. Another estimate is that several million American college students have at least experimented with marihuana, hashish, LSD, amphetamines, or barbiturates. It is doubtful that an American parent can send a son or daughter to college today without exposing the young man or woman to drug abuse. Parents must also be concerned about the availability and use of such drugs in our high schools and junior high schools.

The habit of the narcotics addict is not only a danger to himself, but a threat to the community where he lives. Narcotics have been cited as a primary cause of the enormous increase in street crimes over the last decade.

As the addict's tolerance for drugs increases, his demand for drugs rises, and the cost of his habit grows. It can easily reach hundreds of dollars a day. Since an underworld "fence" will give him only a fraction of the value of goods he steals, an addict can be forced to commit two or three burglaries a day to maintain his habit. Street robberies, prostitution, even the enticing of others into addiction to drugs—an addict will reduce himself to any offense, any degradation in order to acquire the drugs he craves.

However far the addict himself may fall, his offenses against himself and society do not compare with the inhumanity of those who make a living exploiting the weakness and desperation of their fellow men. Society has few judgments too severe, few penalties too harsh for the men who make their livelihood in the narcotics traffic.

It has been a common oversimplification to consider narcotics addiction, or drug abuse, to be a law enforcement problem alone. Effective control of illicit drugs requires the cooperation of many agencies of the Federal and local and State governments; it is beyond the province of any one of them alone. At the Federal level, the burden of the national effort must be carried by the Departments of Justice, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Treasury. I am proposing ten specific steps as this Administration's initial counter-moves against this growing national problem.

I. FEDERAL LEGISLATION

To more effectively meet the narcotic and dangerous drug problems at the Federal level, the Attorney General is forwarding to the Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal to control these drugs. This measure will place in a single statute, a revised and modern plan for control. Current laws in this field are inadequate and outdated.

I consider the legislative proposal a fair, rational and necessary approach to the total drug problem. It will tighten the regulatory controls and protect the public against illicit diversion of many of these drugs from legitimate channels. It will insure greater accountability and better recordkeeping. It will give law enforcement stronger and better tools that are sorely needed so that those charged with enforcing these laws can do so more effectively. Further, this proposal creates a more flexible mechanism which will allow quicker control of new dangerous drugs before their misuse and abuse reach epidemic proportions. I urge the Congress to take favorable action on this bill.

In mid-May the Supreme Court struck down segments of the marihuana laws and called into question some of the basic foundations for the other existing drug statutes. I have also asked the Attorney General to submit an interim measure to correct the constitutional deficiencies of the Marihuana Tax Act as