

The settlement came three weeks after an end to a larger, companion strike at the South Carolina Medical University Hospital.

The walkout by low-paid Negro nonprofessional workers, most of whom are women, brought organized labor and the civil rights movement together for the first time in the South.

Sitting beside Miss Rosetta Simmons, chairman of a five-member negotiating team for the strikers, Mitchell Graham, chairman of the Charleston County Council, told a news conference, "I am happy that strike and turmoil in the streets of Charleston have ended."

Miss Simmons said, "We are returning to work with a relation of mutual respect and dignity."

Forty-two of the 65 workers will return to work Tuesday and the council agreed "to make every effort" to employ the others within three months without any overstaffing.

An announcement of the settlement scheduled for 10 a.m. was delayed six hours by a disagreement over details of a grievance procedure.

Finally, the County Council agreed to a proposal by the workers to end the strike, but to continue to work on the grievance procedure.

After a two-hour morning session ended without agreement, the Charleston project director for the Southern Christian Leader-

ship Conference, Carl Farris, was arrested outside the council offices on a disorderly conduct charge and a charge of blocking a driveway while leading a demonstration of about 30 teenagers.

About an hour earlier pickets had been ordered to return to the hospital, and there was a possibility that the settlement talks would collapse.

The workers' committee and the County Council met most of Wednesday and yesterday working out settlement terms.

Mr. Graham termed the settlement a victory "only for the people of Charleston county and those who are ill at the hospital."

"We gained recognition as human beings in this community," Miss Simmons said of the striking workers. "It has accomplished a lot for the poor people of the city," she said. Mr. Graham promised a minimum hourly wage of at least \$1.70 next year and to attempt to make it \$1.75.

The hospital had increased its minimum wage from \$1.30 an hour to \$1.60 on July 1 to conform with the new minimum at the Medical University Hospital.

A week ago the County Council had refused to set a time table on the rehiring of all the workers, a key demand by the strikers.

Miss Simmons expressed confidence that all would return to work before 90 days.

In addition to accepting the timetable for re-employment the County Council also

dropped a ban on union activities by the workers from its offer of last week. Also dropped was a provision that would have made a worker with pending criminal charges ineligible for re-employment.

Several workers had been jailed during street demonstrations earlier in the strike.

The strike brought the leadership conference and Local 1199 of the Hospital and Nursing Home Workers together in Charleston. Miss Simmons praised leaders of both groups for their roles. Isalah Bennett, state director of Local 1199B in Charleston, said the next emphasis would be on voter registration and an attempt to organize poor workers throughout the state.

The grievance procedure was slowed by an insistence by the workers' committee for a written provision to allow a worker with a grievance to have another worker accompany him at any stage of the grievance procedure.

This was provided in the settlement of the Medical University strike.

Mr. Graham said the grievance procedure would be reviewed with all county employees and changes adopted if found necessary. But a union official, Henry Nicholas, told newsmen later that the council had agreed privately to continue negotiations with Miss Simmons and her committee on this point. Mr. Nicholas is assistant national organizing director of Local 1199 in New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 24, 1969

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

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear?—Psalm 27: 1.

O God, our Father, in a world filled with the noise of those who put their faith in violence and whose loud clamor would drown out the efforts of those who seek the rights of men in the right way, we come praying to be kept steady in a world of change and to be made strong in a swiftly moving age.

Grant unto us a vision of Thy greatness and an experience of Thy presence that we may lead our Nation in the good paths of righteousness and peace.

Help us to meet this hard day with high courage, to do our demanding duties with undying devotion and to practice what we profess lest our professions be proven impractical.

Give to these leaders of our people the insight and the inspiration to lead our beloved Republic in making the American dream a reality in our day.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight, July 24, 1969, to file a report on the bill H.R. 13079, to extend the interest equalization tax until August 31, 1969.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 13080

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 13080) to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withholding.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 121]

Abbutt	Diggs	Lujan
Arends	Dingell	May
Blackburn	Dorn	O'Konski
Broyhill, Va.	Halpern	Ottinger
Cahill	Hawkins	Pike
Carey	Howard	Poage
Celler	Ichord	Powell
Clark	Kirwan	Rostenkowski
Conyers	Kleppe	Scheuer
Davis, Ga.	Landgrebe	Stokes
Dawson	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
de la Garza	Lowenstein	Wiggins

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the minority?

Mr. ASHLEY. It is my understanding that this has been cleared; yes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4813 UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Friday, July 25, to file a report on the bill H.R. 4813.

Mr. Speaker, this has been cleared by the minority side.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the nature of this legislation?

Mr. GRAY. The bill, H.R. 4813, extends the provisions of the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) and myself.

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

APOLLO 11 SPLASHDOWN

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I announce to the House the very wonderful news that Apollo 11's droge chutes are now out, it is on the way down, and is 5 minutes from splashdown. The astronauts are back.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman if he thinks that 2 hours will be enough time to properly discuss that part of the hearings dealing with Mr. Bator and others from the Educational and Cultural Center.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is referring to Edmund Bator?

Mr. GROSS. I believe that is the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think we will spend too much time with that gentleman. I do not think he has any brains in his head.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12964, with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

As I have previously mentioned, this is the bill making appropriations for the

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

On page 2 of the committee report there will be found a table which indicates the action of the committee as compared with the amounts of the budget requests and as compared with last year's appropriations. As indicated in this table, the total amount recommended in the funding bill in new obligatory authority is \$2,534,134,200, which is an increase of \$479,461,300 over the total provided for fiscal year 1969. This large increase is due primarily to the additional \$244,466,000 provided to the Department of Justice to combat crime and narcotics violations, the increase of \$120,850,000 provided for the taking of the 19th Decennial Census and the increase of \$89,739,000 for the Maritime Administration, principally for new ship construction. The amount requested in the budget estimate for the Maritime Administration for the item of ship construction subsidies was \$15,918,000, which is a completely unrealistic figure.

The table I have referred to reads as follows:

Agency and item (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 (3)	Bill compared with—		
			New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date) (4)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1969 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 (6)
Department of State.....	\$398,091,600	\$408,381,000	\$404,122,600	+\$6,031,000	-\$4,258,400
Department of Justice.....	545,582,000	845,976,000	790,048,000	+244,466,000	-55,928,000
Department of Commerce.....	767,563,000	812,486,000	956,450,000	+188,887,000	+143,964,000
The Judiciary.....	109,944,900	125,024,600	121,026,200	+11,081,300	-3,998,400
Related Agencies.....	233,491,400	283,837,000	262,487,400	+28,996,000	-21,349,600
Total.....	2,054,672,900	2,475,704,600	2,534,134,200	+479,461,300	+58,429,600

For many years past, we have been appropriating \$120, \$130, \$140 million and more for American ship construction subsidies. It would appear that with the ridiculously low requested amount, to wit: \$15,918,000, together with the unobligated balance in the hands of the Maritime Administration, provisions would be made for the building of eight to 10 new ships during this fiscal year. The committee, fully realizing this completely unrealistic approach to solution of our merchant marine problems has appropriated \$200 million carried in this bill for ship construction subsidies. This would provide not even a sufficient number of ships necessary to catch up with the Soviet Union and other foreign powers in their ship construction programs. It would provide approximately 30 to 33 new ships this year.

Continuing with regard to the contents of the pending bill, and beginning with the first of the departments provided for therein, we find that the Department of State revised budget estimates for fiscal year 1970, as presented to the committee, totaled \$408,381,000. The committee has included in this bill \$404,122,600, which is a reduction of \$4,258,400 in the total budget estimates and is an increase of \$6,031,000 over the total appropriations for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr.

Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an announcement?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to announce that the three astronauts have now splashed down 9 miles off the carrier *Hornet*. The horizon is 10 miles. So they are now proceeding in the *Hornet* to pick up the astronauts.

Everybody hoped they would land safely. They have now returned safely to earth, and we hope they will be picked up safely.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is not a person in this Chamber and in this Committee of the Whole who does not welcome the news just delivered by our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

To return to the requested appropriations for the Department of State, we say in this report that much has been said and written about the number of positions in the Department of State, both here and abroad. Insofar as the appropriations therefor, which are contained in title I of the accompanying bill, the total number of positions pro-

vided amounts to 15,073, which is actually less than the number provided 8 year ago. This record has been accomplished through the efforts of the Department of State, headed by Secretary Rusk in the previous administration and by Secretary Rogers in the current administration, as well as some little assistance on the part of the Committees on Appropriations and the Congress. Two career foreign service officers, Deputy Under Secretaries of State for Administration William J. Crockett and Idar Rimestad, are also entitled to commendations for their leadership.

The first of the items for the Department of State is entitled "Salaries and Expenses." The committee has included \$207,095,600 for these salaries and expenses. I should point out, as indicated at page 3 of the report, that no funds were requested for the opening of any additional passport offices and no funds whatever have been provided for that purpose in this bill.

The next item is the so-called representation allowances, which I believe the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has commented on on previous occasions. The committee is including for these allowances \$993,000, as authorized by section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. This amount is the same as provided in the 5 preceding years.

It is the full amount requested in the budget estimate. It should provide, I shall say to my distinguished friend, ample entertainment for our Embassies and posts abroad.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I should think a million dollars would be ample for liquor and food.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, but that is not all, I must say to my distinguished friend. We also have some money in this bill in connection with the American mission to the United Nations. They must have some entertainment money. And the U.S. Information Agency has to do some entertaining, too.

Mr. GROSS. That would have been the next question. How much do you have for all the rest of these international organizations of one kind or another?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We have not increased any one of them.

Mr. GROSS. Could there not have been a cut with respect to this?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Theoretically there could have been a cut. However, we must make sure that they have enough money to dispense martinis, gibsons, whiskies and sodas, and such things when they are required. This is a world-wide operation, I say to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GROSS. I understand. It seems the more money we spend the more trouble we get into around the world. If it is trouble we want, we ought to spend more money.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, we considered a number of items in this bill which we thought might contribute to trouble between ourselves and other

countries, and we have not allowed any funds at all for them. But we certainly cannot deny our diplomats the entertainment which becomes necessary. These are—what did we call them some years ago?

Mr. GROSS. Tools of the trade.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Tools of the trade.

Continuing through the Department of State, I should like to pause here and point out, with regard to the item for international fisheries commissions, that the committee has allowed the sum of \$2,335,000 to cover the U.S. share of expenses of eight international fisheries commissions in which it participates, and also for the expenses of the U.S. commissioners. The amount allowed is \$260,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and is \$180,000 over the amount of the budget estimate.

The committee has approved \$1,263,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, which is an increase of \$200,000 over the amount of the budget estimate, for the control of sea lamprey eels.

The final item to which I should like to direct attention under the Department of State is entitled "Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Activities." Here the amount allowed is the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal year 1969 and is a decrease of \$3,975,000 from the amount of the budget estimate.

This has been the result of the committee's discovery that the Department of State has been sending some viciously obscene and filthy plays abroad to be exhibited, of all places, in countries behind the Iron Curtain. We all know that when the Soviet Union and Iron Curtain countries send their examples of their culture to this country they are meticulous insofar as their being above reproach as to obscenity or pornography.

First they proposed to send a certain play which was observed by a representative of the Department of State, who is no longer with them. He is back in the Information Agency, which he should never have left. This was Mr. Bator, referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. Bator went out to the University of Kansas and attended a pre-presentation of these plays. He saw the exact presentation which was to be given behind the Iron Curtain in such countries as Yugoslavia, Poland, et cetera. He thought one of these plays "America Hurrah" was so raw that it should be deleted from the program. By the time the committee was holding hearings we had obtained the script of a play called "Chicago," which Mr. Bator approved. This play was so vicious that we thought they would abandon the whole project, but, no, lo and behold, they decided to also take that one out, and then sent the screwball professor who directed the presentation and eight or nine students from the University of Kansas abroad behind the Iron Curtain. I recited lines from the script of one of the plays sent abroad in the full Committee on Appropriations last Monday. However, I do not believe I shall do that at this time. If there is any Member present who wishes

to read the lines of these plays, we have them here at the committee table and would be glad to let Members read them. For instance, in one of these plays, the one entitled "Chicago," there is an obscene word of five letters used in the form of the present participle and it appears seven times in this one paragraph [indicating]. This is here for any Member who cares to read it, as well as the scripts of the other two plays. One of those plays which was sent abroad I read to the full committee on Monday. I would rather not do that today, however, but anyone who wishes to read about "you know what" from the American dream can do so.

Now, the next item in this bill is title II for the Department of Justice.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves that subject?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman see the article in the Topeka, Kans., State Journal of July 10?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I hope the gentleman is not going to remind me that the professor came from Brooklyn.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the item says. He is one, Frederick Litto, professor of drama at the University of Kansas.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. GROSS. And he describes the play "Chicago," in this fashion: "it is very simply a man sitting in a bathtub commenting on a fictitious society."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. He is nuts. You can read the script right here which shows that they use the obscene word seven times in that one paragraph, and, if I recall correctly, they used it three times in this next paragraph. They struck out an obscene four-letter word in the form of the present participle and added the five-letter obscene word in the form of the present participle. The gentleman, Mr. Bator, told us that he thought the five-letter obscene word with "ing" attached to it is not as bad as the obscene four-letter word with "ing" attached to it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I have just seen a copy of the script of this play "Chicago," and I do not know when, if ever, I have read a filthier, more poorly written play. It is almost beyond description.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The script of "Chicago" in the printed hearings is not in pure, unadulterated form, because we had to use dashes for the many vicious words, but if the gentleman wants to read it in the raw, here it is.

Mr. GROSS. It is bad enough in the copy that the members of the committee supplied me with on this side of the aisle a few moments ago. This is a play that is being exported to the Communist countries or, at least, was intended to be exported to them. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. With money from the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. And what is the appropriation for this mutual educational and cultural business? Has the gentleman's committee cut them down?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We not only cut them down. We cut out every dollar for the so-called special educational and cultural projects.

Mr. GROSS. Cut them out altogether?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Altogether. And, incidentally, this action will allow \$685,000 over the amount provided last year for the student exchange program which has some merit.

Mr. GROSS. I commend and compliment both the gentleman from New York and the other committee members for this action. The gentleman is aware that he is going to be accused of being uncultural?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have been accused of that since I was a young fellow in Brooklyn, although I happen to have been a charter member of local 802 of the musicians' union.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to revert to the Department of Justice, the revised budget estimates for fiscal year 1970 total \$845,976,000. The committee recommends in the pending bill \$790,048,000, which is a reduction of \$55,928,000 in the total requested and is an increase of \$244,466,000 over the appropriation for the preceding fiscal year.

This large increase allowed for the Department of Justice is primarily related to the crime control program. It would in that regard include funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Narcotic and Dangerous Drugs, the Bureau of Narcotics now being a part of the Department of Justice. It was formerly in the Treasury Department.

Then we have funds for U.S. attorneys and marshals and the funding of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

In connection with the Community Relations Service which is referred to at page 9 of the report, the committee has included the sum of \$3,077,000 which would provide an increase of 43 positions. This is one of a number of items where the present speaker proposed the full amount requested but could not obtain sufficient votes in the subcommittee therefor, or, for that matter, in the full committee.

The gentleman from New York also proposed the full amount requested for the Federal Judicial Center, the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, Office of Education, Civil Rights, Education, and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, salaries and expenses.

Now we shall proceed, if we may, to "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration." The committee recommends a total of \$250 million for grants, contracts, loans, and other law enforcement assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, including departmental salaries and other expenses in connection therewith.

In addition, the sum of \$3.4 million included in the appropriation for the Fed-

eral Bureau of Investigation is authorized within the same act.

The distribution of the \$250 million will be found at page 12 of the committee report.

We next proceed to the Department of Commerce, which is title III of the bill.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. I understand that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have not as yet gotten to the details of that.

Mr. NIX. Well, then, I shall be glad to wait until we come to that item to discuss it with the chairman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee recommends an increase of \$188,887,000 over the 1969 appropriation for the Department of Commerce. This increase is due primarily to the funding of \$137,850,000 for the Nineteenth Decennial Census which is \$120,850,000 over the 1969 appropriation, and the \$200 million which I previously mentioned for Maritime Administration ship construction subsidy.

If there are any questions with regard to the Department of Commerce, I shall be glad to endeavor to answer them. If not, with the permission of the Chairman, I shall turn to page 16—

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman goes to that subject, I believe—and if I remember correctly, in the hearings, the gentleman said he could not find where the expenditure for the Department of Commerce Tourist Bureau had produced one single tourist.

What did you do? Did you give them some more money to perpetuate that kind of an operation, or did you cut them off?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that, no, we did not give them any extra money at all. We gave them the same amount as they had in the fiscal year just ended.

Mr. GROSS. How much was that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It was \$4.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. And on the record of past performance that they could not say last year's expenditure had produced a single tourist?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not believe there is any question about that. In the countries where we do not have a travel service office the increase in visitors, as I recall, was about 183 percent as compared with only 132 percent increase from the countries where we do have a so-called travel service office. But we run a democratic committee, I say to my friend from Iowa—and that is a small "d." I get outvoted ever so often.

Mr. GROSS. What did the gentleman say about Iowa? I could not hear the gentleman?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I said "I say to my distinguished friend from Iowa."

Mr. GROSS. But the fact is that you appropriated as much money as you did

last year for an outfit that, on the record of the hearings, could not show that they had produced a single tourist.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is so. One would have to admit that. We have been pointing out the same thing for a number of years, as a matter of fact, since the U.S. Travel Service was born, and back when they illegally spent the money for cuff links and ladies' bracelets and gave them away free of charge.

Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The gentleman showed me a set of jewelry, if you can call it that. But I would hope that next year the committee, unless they show results, would clip their wings, but good.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I can assure the gentleman that I will be guided by the record of next year's hearings, with the Lord's help.

Now, there is one other item in the Department of Commerce that I should like to call to the attention of the committee, and that is the so-called minority business enterprise, salaries and expenses.

This is an amount of \$1.2 million for the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, which was established in March of 1969 by Executive Order 11458. This Office is responsible for developing and coordinating programs aimed at increasing and strengthening the role of minority groups in the business life of America.

Proceeding to page 19, we find title IV of this bill, "The judiciary."

The total amount of the estimates for fiscal year 1970, as prepared and presented by the judicial branch, is \$125,024,600. The committee has allowed a total of \$121,026,200, which is a reduction of \$3,998,400 in the total amount requested, and is an increase of \$11,081,300 over the appropriations for fiscal year 1969.

The various courts and the provisions made therefor are included on the pages following page 19.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, I yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my understanding that two Justices of the Supreme Court requested 10 more policemen, because they claimed the present 32 policemen at the Supreme Court are inadequate—I am quoting—"are inadequate under today's conditions to maintain the standard of security needed for the Supreme Court Building."

It seems to me it is ironical for Justices of the Supreme Court to come in walling about the lack of police to protect them in view of the Court's decisions that have contributed to the lack of law and order.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The amount which is provided for 10 additional policemen, approved by the committee as requested by the Supreme Court, is merely \$78,000. The committee feels that the building itself, the physical building across Capitol Plaza here is of such value and means so much to the American public that we want it adequately protected at all times.

So, for that reason, we augmented their police force by \$78,000.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with that, but—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I knew the gentleman would.

Mr. GROSS. But I would hope the gentleman would impress upon the Justices that they have contributed to the situation that exists in this country.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman from Iowa must realize that the present speaker is only a lowly Congressman from New York who would not presume to dictate to the Chief Justice and the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I do not underestimate the effectiveness of the gentleman when he wants to be.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee had a request for nine additional law clerks for the eminent Justices but did not approve all of that request. The committee did allow three law clerks this year. Perhaps the committee will give them three more next year. At the end of the third year, they might have their requested nine additional law clerks.

This seems to be the orderly and sensible way to go about this. If they had taken the committee's suggestion 3 years ago, they would have their nine additional law clerks by now.

Mr. Chairman, under title V—related agencies, a total of \$262,487,400 is included in the accompanying bill for the 13 different agencies funded under this title. This amount is a reduction of \$21,349,600 in the total amount of the budget estimates and is an increase of \$28,996,000 over the total amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1969.

Included in the 13 agencies, the total amount requested for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is allowed. The full amount for the Civil Rights Commission has again been allowed, to wit: \$2,650,000, the full amount in the budget estimate and the amount authorized by law.

Also included in these 13 related agencies, is the item to which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX) made reference a while ago. This is to be found on page 23 of the committee report. It is an allowance of \$10,000,000 for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which is an increase of \$880,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. NIX. If the gentleman will yield, I understand the request by the Commission was for \$15.9 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. NIX. In view of the fact that the past chairman, Mr. Alexander, complained bitterly about the lack of cooperation and the lack of money and in view of the fact that the present chairman, Mr. Brown, echoes that criticism, I wonder what the thinking of the committee was? What was the discussion in the committee on this question?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I rise to say that at the appropriate time I expect to offer an amendment which will increase substantially the amount, and I would like to say, since the chairman is himself too modest to say it perhaps, that he has been very helpful and has been trying to obtain funding. I hope I am not telling a secret out of school when I say he has been trying to obtain full funding.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I proposed that the committee approve the full amount in the course of the markup, but I just did not have the votes. This Commission ought to be realistic. Whether Mr. Alexander or Mr. Brown is the head of it, I must point out that they have been furnished a substantial number of additional people every year. With the number of additional people we have given them we find the situation becomes no better than it was the year before.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. I understand that upwards of 11,000 cases were presented to the Commission in the year 1968. I am hopeful that I am being given some assurance at the present time that some effort will be made to increase the amount.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I can only assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I will offer an amendment. I cannot assure him of what the result will be.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The great trouble with this outfit in Government is that they are not too realistic.

Here is the situation: In 1967 they had 314 positions. In 1968 they had 389 positions. In 1969, the year that ended just this past June 30, they had 579 positions.

How far and how fast are they going to go? They come along now and they want 241 additional positions for a total of 820, and yet with all of these increases the backlog of complaints or whatever it was the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to has not been reduced.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is important, however, to give some idea of the number of investigations that were made. I have some figures on that from the Commission. Back in 1966 they had some 8,000 cases—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think the gentleman from Ohio will find all of those figures in the printed hearings of the subcommittee.

Mr. TAFT. I agree, Mr. Chairman, but in view of the fact that there will be an amendment offered later, I think it would be well to point out now that there were only 8,000 investigations in 1966. The figure went up to 12,000 in 1969, and to some 15,000 which are expected next year. The increased number of personnel and the increase to be asked for by the amendment would be in view of those figures.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad the gentleman feels as he does about

this matter. I would like to have had him with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) and myself when we were marking up this bill. Of course, I would not want the gentleman's help on a number of other items in this bill—and I say that facetiously.

If there are no further questions, Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG).

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

Mr. Chairman, as usual, the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of our subcommittee, has covered this bill so well that it is difficult really to find any area on which he has not already touched. My intention is to take very little time on this subject because I am sure we are ready to get into the amending procedure.

I do, however, want to mention just a few things. First, the gentleman commented regarding the State Department and the fact that the State Department has less employees today than it had 6 or 8 years ago. I think probably the State Department is used more as a whipping boy than almost any agency, and yet when we realize the number of new posts that have been added, with new nations coming into existence around the world, the Department has been able to hold the line on new employees. As far as the total budget is concerned, I think State's is one of the tightest we have in this bill, and probably one of the tightest we have in Government.

Not only do I believe credit is due to the efforts of former Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the present Secretary of State William Rogers, but I believe also over the years the Secretaries have had very fine Deputy Under Secretaries for Administration. Bill Crockett, who is now retired, was an excellent administrator, and he has been followed by Idar Rimestad, who is the present man in the post. He has done an equally good job.

I want just briefly to touch on the question of mutual educational and cultural exchanges. I think we can all agree it is important that we exchange people, and it is important that our people go abroad and that others come here. I have never heard anyone opposed to this. However, when we get a program that expands rapidly, we do run the risk of incurring abuses. The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has pointed out one of them. I also believe the Department was negligent in not paying attention to the record developed in our hearings and in not stopping this "play" from going overseas. As a result of their failure to do so, we felt we had to take action ourselves.

But, just so no one will get the idea we are not going to have plenty of people to exchange, I call attention to page 839 of part 2 of our hearings, and there under the heading of "American Lecturers, Research Scholars and Professors, 1968-1969 Academic Year," in order to have all of them listed, we have to go from

page 839 to page 977. There are literally hundreds of these professors and scholars going overseas.

I do not object to a reasonable number going over, but sometimes there are fiscal conditions that would indicate some of them might very well stay home. I have said this before and I will say it again. I wonder sometimes how we have enough professors to take care of the growing student load in the United States when we have so many going overseas, and some of them for, perhaps, studies that I am not sure will have a great deal of impact on the long-term best interest of the United States.

I also want to call attention to one item here, and I call it to the attention of Members, because it has a particular impact in the area which I represent, and that is the Great Lakes area. I want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee and to the full committee for recognizing the need for eradication of the lamprey eel. We did add \$200,000 over the budget for lamprey eel eradication. I am sure most of the Members who have been here over the years recognize this has been a very difficult problem in the Great Lakes area.

We have appropriated money for this commission for many years and we have had great success, especially in Lake Superior and in Lake Michigan with the eradication of the eel. The problem now is in Lake Huron, where they report 50 percent scarring on the Cohoes which have been caught in that lake. This is a wise expenditure. It will also generate some funds from the Canadian part of the commission to help bring this problem under effective control.

If we can continue to have a well-funded program, it will prevent a crash program later on.

Over the years because of the lamprey eel we had an absolute stop in trout and whitefish commercial fishing in Lake Superior and Lake Michigan. That fishing had been a substantial part of the area's economy many years ago. Now that the lamprey eel is being eradicated, fishing is coming back, and I am grateful we are going to be able to have a program that will extend to other areas affected by the lamprey eel.

With respect to the Department of Justice, the gentleman has alluded to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for which we put in \$250 million. The budget request was approximately \$297 million. Last year it was funded at about \$60 million.

I do not want this reduction of approximately \$47 million to indicate in any way that our subcommittee is not concerned about adequately funding this program. However, we do want to fund it as orderly and as sensibly as we can. I particularly believe when we go from \$60 million in one year to \$250 million in the next year, this is a rather substantial amount to try to digest.

The fact is that one-quarter of this fiscal year will have gone by before the bill becomes law. I believe we have done well by this program.

In the narcotics area we funded 100 percent. We are not unmindful that the President sent up a message on narcotics,

and more funds may be required. We are ready to do everything we possibly can to be sure that this program is carried out as intended, but we are not going to give them so much money that they can just spread it around and not use it effectively.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee is to be commended for its generous yet prudent recommendations with respect to the Justice Department appropriation for fiscal year 1970. The committee has reduced this budget request of \$845.9 million by \$55.9 million, or a modest 6.6 percent. This is clear evidence of the committee's commitment to improved criminal justice and strengthened law enforcement in America.

I am particularly pleased to see that the committee has recommended full funding for the FBI and the Bureau of Narcotics. Another vitally important program within the Department of Justice is the Law Enforcement Assistance program authorized in title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Title I embraces the all-important block grant funding concept which insures full partnership in law-enforcement functions by State and local governmental officials.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended \$250 million for these title I programs which is down \$46 million from the request submitted by both this and the previous administration. The action grant portion of the Law Enforcement Assistance program was reduced from \$229.6 million to \$200 million—a drop of 13 percent. While I can fully appreciate the tremendous demands being made on our limited general revenue funds, I would hope that in the future we could provide full funding for these title I programs as well as for the FBI and the Bureau of Narcotics.

The States have done an outstanding job of developing their comprehensive plans for the utilization of Federal funds. I am convinced that an appropriation of \$200 million for these action grants during the current fiscal year represents one of the wisest investments we can make in strengthening and improving the quality of law enforcement and of the administration of justice throughout America.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. I am well aware of the contribution which he has made in the formulation of this legislation as a member of the Judiciary Committee and his keen interest in it. I have to agree with him that the action grant program to the States of \$200 million, we feel, will be most important in trying to do something in this particular area.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. As I said earlier, we did allow everything for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and also for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These are a rather substantial increase, but as we pass these new pieces

of legislation we always add more work for the FBI and more investigative people are required year after year, so we felt that we could do nothing less than this.

As to the Department of Commerce, I can say I believe none of us fully agrees with everything in an appropriation bill. It is a result of a meeting of minds in the subcommittee.

The Secretary of Commerce was interested in having his administrative arm strengthened. I should have liked to have strengthened it even more. We only allowed him eight new positions in this area. I believe it might have been wise to have done somewhat better here.

I also have some reservations regarding the Economic Development Administration. I believe we cut them too much. This is another difference of opinion existing within the subcommittee, and if there are any changes we will iron them out in conference.

As everyone knows, we will be taking a decennial census next year, and funds are provided for that. It may be of some interest to the members of the committee to read some of the testimony given by the Director of the Bureau of the Census.

We have had a great deal of discussion about this decennial census, the asking of questions, and whether or not this ought to be mandatory and so forth. It might be helpful to answer some of your mail if you will read the hearings on the Bureau of the Census, because I believe they are enlightening.

The chairman of the subcommittee did mention that we provided \$200 million for ship construction in this bill. I believe this is an indication of the concern of our subcommittee for the merchant marine and the deterioration of the merchant marine fleet, and our recognition that something is going to have to be done in that regard.

As I understand the situation, there is a proposal which has been presented by the Department of Commerce to the White House. It is under active study and consideration now. I believe that probably late this year or perhaps early next year the administration will present some kind of orderly ship replacement program which is going to be essential if we are to keep an active merchant marine.

No one has said much about the U.S. Information Agency here today. This is another area where we may have cut a little too deeply.

I do not know. We had this agreement in the subcommittee and we are trying to live up to it.

The U.S. Information Agency, I believe, under the direction of Mr. Shakespeare, a former CBS executive is going to try to do the kind of a job which is essential in order to permit us to put our best foot forward on the international scene.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Has the gentleman taken notice of anything that

Mr. Shakespeare has done worthwhile up to now, outside of going on a trip abroad.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You really do not get much knowledge of anything within the span of only 5 months. However, let me say this: I have been impressed with most of the former Directors of the U.S. Information Agency, whether they were under the Democrat administration or under the Republican administration. I remember when Mr. Edward R. Murrow came before the committee; he did a very, very acceptable job. I also remember Carl Rowan who was once Director of that Agency. Mr. Shakespeare, is a former executive of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, is he not a television man? He is not a book man or a playwright.

Mr. CEDERBERG. He may be a television man, but that is one facet of the Nation's news media, and television is becoming more and more important in the communications business than it ever has been before. I appreciate the colloquy I had with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The distinguished gentleman appreciates my help, does he?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I appreciate the help of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman from Michigan knows, coming from the State of Michigan, that the States of Michigan and Ohio especially northwestern Ohio is subjected to very severe storms throughout the year. In northern Ohio we have just experienced on July 4 a very, very severe storm. We have heard over the last year or two about the inadequacy of the Toledo Weather Bureau's record and so forth.

I am just wondering whether or not there is anything in this bill which will provide some additional equipment. I am sure that in the case of Toledo additional equipment is needed and that more manpower is needed for these weather bureau stations so that they can adequately forewarn the people of these oncoming storms.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I cannot answer specifically the gentleman's question regarding the station at Toledo, but I do not believe there is anything in this legislation which would not permit them to do whatever they feel is necessary in that particular area of interest.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me call the gentleman's attention to page 8 of the hearings, part 3, to the colloquy between the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) and Secretary Stans wherein he stated as follows:

We have worked on eliminating 14 Weather Bureau stations because of our manpower limitations, and after a lot of analysis of their importance to the communities we decided to keep 4 of those and close 9 or 10, and this has caused a great amount of pressure on us from various people.

Then the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) stated:

You had better stay with the 14.

Then, the discussion went off the record. I am interested in what might have happened in this discussion off the record as pertains to the Toledo Weather Bureau station. Is the gentleman from Michigan familiar with it?

Mr. CEDERBERG. No, I am not, but I do not think it was discussed off the record at all. Was Toledo one of the stations that was closed?

Mr. LATTA. I do not know whether it is or is not. But it should not be closed. We should have additional manpower at that station and we should have some additional equipment. I say this in view of the fact that we lost 34 lives in the State of Ohio as a result of that July 4 storm and we lost millions and millions of dollars in property. The Federal Government and the President declared this area a disaster area and the sum of \$1 million has already been allocated for it and additional millions are going to have to be allocated for it.

It seems to me, in view of the fact that we have these storms in that area year after year, we are being penny wise and pound foolish in not putting in the additional few dollars that would be necessary to forewarn these people of these oncoming storms.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not disagree with the gentleman at all. I can only assume that the gentleman and members of his delegation have been in touch with the Weather Bureau people. I can only speak for myself in saying that as one member of the subcommittee I would certainly support whatever is necessary to provide the manpower and the equipment to adequately forewarn citizens of the area. I see nothing wrong with that at all.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would merely like to point out that this last week the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works was out in this area. Certainly its members, sitting in Toledo, Sandusky, and Cleveland, will attest to the fact that they need additional storm warning in that area. I would hope there is no cutback in this field and that in fact additional spending will be forthcoming.

I might say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that on this coming Saturday the director of the Weather Bureau will be in Toledo to investigate the inadequacies of that station. I hope when they come to your subcommittee for additional financing, that there will be money forthcoming for this purpose.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You can be mighty sure when they come before us we will certainly give the matter a hard look. We are reaching a point where this science is advancing so fast and the state of the art has advanced so much that consolidations can take place. With new equipment we can cover wider areas and do a much better job. Nevertheless, the point you bring up is certainly worthy of consideration, and I can assure you that we will do this.

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Along the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, we have much the same situation in our home State, and as the gentleman in the well knows, I was in the subcommittee with him when the director of the Weather Bureau was present and talked about the state of the art relating to weather forecasting. The problem is not so much a matter of installation and maintenance of the individual weather stations but of being able to devise methods by which more accurate forecasts can be made.

Just a few short moments ago we saw in the splash-down of our moon craft the problem which is facing us with relation to accurate weather predictions. Here we have the best scientific brains in America involved in an enterprise which can bring us a telecast from the moon, but even though they moved the splash-down site 100 miles this morning to get into clear weather, they did not reach it, and in fact clouds came over. This was against all of the predictions.

We can see that we need to have much more done in the field of research so that we can do a better job in predicting what will come along with on-site stations which will tell what is happening in a given location at a given time with respect to particular problems. With the combination of the two and with the Director of the Weather Bureau moving in this direction, we do know we can have the type of forewarning of weather problems which we badly need in this country.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman.

It is increasingly true, as the gentleman knows, that everyone talks about the weather, but it is difficult to do anything about it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), as chairman of our subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) have done their usual excellent job of explaining this bill.

Although there is little that can be added to their explanations of the bill item by item, I do want to make a few observations about the bill and emphasize and comment on some of the points which they have covered in their discussions.

As reported, the bill provides new obligational authority of \$2,534,134,200 which is \$58,429,600 above the budget estimate of \$2,475,704,600. The increase allowed by the committee over and above the budget request is occasioned by the fact that the committee has recommended \$184,082,000 above the \$15,918,000 amount proposed for the Maritime Administration's ship construction program in fiscal 1970.

I have pointed out on many occasions in the past that our merchant marine fleet is rapidly deteriorating and falling well behind our needs in this area. The addition of the \$184,000,000 above the budget request by the committee together with carryover balances should provide for a construction program level of about \$300,000,000 in 1970. Such a pro-

gram level will provide subsidies and allowances for the construction of something more than 30 new ships.

Our merchant fleet is one of the first arms of our national defense program, and it is imperative, it seems to me, that we must undertake an aggressive ship construction program if we are to avoid having to rely on other nations for assistance in time of national emergency.

The committee allowed the total request for the Federal Bureau of Investigation of \$232,855,000. That amount will permit the employment of an additional 525 agents and 336 clerks to assist the Bureau in carrying out its responsibilities under the administration's intensified investigative activities in the field of organized crime and in the continued expansion of police training. Director Hoover of the FBI made an outstanding presentation as he has done through all the years of my service on the committee. He and his associates certainly are to be commended for the outstanding job which the Bureau has performed as the general investigative arm of the Federal Government. His testimony indicated that the Bureau had posted a new record of \$302,938,789 in fines, savings, and recoveries this year. This indicates that for every dollar which Congress appropriated for the FBI last year, the returns in fines, savings, and recoveries were \$1.55.

With respect to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration the committee allowed \$250,000,000 out of a request for \$296,570,000. This is a new agency which was created under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and the majority of the committee felt that an appropriation of \$250,000,000 would be adequate in this second year of the agency's operation. \$200,000,000 of the total appropriated is for action grants to State and local law enforcement agencies, and that to my mind is where assistance is needed.

The Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce requested an appropriation of \$278,600,000, and the committee has allowed \$266,000,000, or a cut of \$12,600,000. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I think the \$170,000,000 which the committee allowed for grants and loans for development facilities under EDA is \$10,000,000 below the amount provided by Congress in 1969. I do feel that this \$170,000,000 may not be adequate to do the job. However, I should say that a majority of the committee felt the amount to be sufficient.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which is one of the related agencies covered by this bill was provided with only \$450,000 out of a request for \$781,000. The \$781,000 requested was to be used for settling claims as follows: China, \$214,000; Cuba, \$389,000; Yugoslavia, \$13,000; Italy, Bulgaria, and Rumania, \$111,000; and \$54,000 for a review of the claims program. The committee disallowed in total the \$214,000 requested for the Chinese claims, and the \$117,000 balance of the reduction from \$781,000 to \$450,000 is to be spread among the various claim settlement items which I have mentioned heretofore. We do anticipate, however, that settlement of

Cuban claims will be timely within the limit of the funds made available to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. Chairman, as always the provision of funds is a give and take proposition, and while there are items in the bill which I would have funded differently, the proposals are the result of majority action by the committee. On the whole, I think it is a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my concern over one item in the bill; namely, the U.S. Information Agency. The committee report, on page 24, indicates that \$173,300,000 is provided for the USIA.

This is not a large amount of money relative to overall Government spending or even to other items in this bill. However, I want to suggest that this \$173 million represents in my mind a double-edged sword.

On one hand this \$173 million is the most sensitive \$173 million that appears anywhere in all U.S. Government appropriations. And by "sensitive" I mean in the influence it commands for the course of our country in the maelstrom of world affairs.

On the other hand I believe it is very possible that we know less about just how that \$173 million is going to be spent than any other \$173 million in the same overall appropriation picture.

To read the very few lines in the committee report, on pages 24 and 25, and to read the hearings on the USIA presentation, gives us very little idea as to just what USIA is doing in its total program, or why it is doing it.

In my view we should know a great deal more. These are the people that are telling the world the story of our country. I do not know, frankly, whether or not they are doing as good a job as they should be. I do not know whether their \$173 million is too much, too little, or is about right.

My point is that I doubt that very many of us know these things, and this is a condition that should not be tolerated at a time such as this when the world's image of our country has become an extremely vital element in the overall psychological-military context of world events.

I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we cannot determine with satisfaction the operating methods and objectives of the various USIA programs, and this same thing has been going on for 10 to 15 years now, if we cannot now be satisfied that our Government foreign information programs are operating as effectively as we can reasonably expect, then we had better do something about it. If our present machinery for getting this job done is not working then we had better build some new machinery.

Each year the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) conducts subcommittee hearings which shed some valuable light on USIA activities. He should be commended for some of the nuggets of information and observations that he is able to turn up. But I contend

that we are barely scratching the surface.

For example, permit me to refer to page 678 of the hearings record where, at the bottom the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is quoted as suggesting to Mr. Frank Shakespeare, director of the USIA:

You have been captured.

He evidently refers to being captured "by the people in this Agency" which he had mentioned a moment earlier.

I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Shakespeare, and he does not appear to me as a person likely to be captured by the bureaucracy. But I am sufficiently disturbed by the observation of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) following his many years of attention to the USIA, so as to make me believe we need to know more about this. Maybe the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) is correct. In any case, the question is of sufficient importance that calls for investigation. If it is true that the incoming leadership at USIA has been unable to overcome the controlling influence of the continuing bureaucracy at USIA then Congress and the administration both should know about it and should do something about it.

What I am saying here is that, like so many other things about this Agency, we simply do not know. And if we do not know, how can we give the people of this country the satisfaction that the story of America is being conveyed to the world effectively and accurately?

I raise this question because a reading of the hearings shows clearly that the major thrust of the USIA presentation was provided not by the new Director, or the new Deputy Director, but by another gentleman who has occupied a top staff spot at USIA for many years. And the presentation offered by the Agency in this year's hearings does not appear to differ in any significant way from USIA hearings going back 10 to 15 years.

Near the beginning of the hearings, for example, on pages 457 and 458, the Director states that a new man is being hired for the task of assessing what the Agency is doing. But the gentleman from New York elicits from Mr. Posner, the old hand, the information that this sort of thing has happened at least 10 times previously at USIA.

The hearings do bring out that USIA intends to put a new emphasis on television activities, and this is instructive. But otherwise the hearings tell us very little. They follow generally the same pattern of the past many years.

I have the impression that the Agency and the subcommittee alike are playing a kind of numbers game with regard to the appropriations figure finally to be approved.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not good enough here because we are dealing with the opinions of people the world over about our Nation, or Government, and the kind of leadership we are providing.

I believe the important thing about USIA is not how much it spends in a year, not how many people they have, but rather the important thing is what they are doing and how they are doing

it; what they are saying and how they are saying it. We need to think in terms of quality, not quantity; in terms of the direction of Agency programs, not in terms of dollars.

The hearings show that USIA now has 409 people on the payroll in Vietnam. Of these, 92 are Americans. They show that the Agency plans to cut back these positions by seven Americans and 28 local employees. I think we should know more about what these 85 or 92 Americans are doing in Vietnam.

Maybe they are all doing work that must be done. But maybe they are not. I have heard that these USIA Americans in Vietnam are the first to acknowledge that their numbers are far too large—that they are bumping into each other without enough work to do, and that this has been going on now for quite a long while. My point again is that these are things we should know, and unfortunately we do not know.

I am also seriously concerned, Mr. Chairman, with a reference to the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information on page 25 of the committee report. It states:

When applying the reduction recommended by the Committee the overstuffed U.S. Advisory Commission on Information (4 employees and \$75,662 appropriation) should not be overlooked.

What about the Advisory Commission? If it is doing a job, perhaps it ought to have a good deal more than four employees. Or if it is not doing a job then perhaps it ought to be abolished. Here again, I offer the suggestion that perhaps we need to know more about it.

My impression is that the Commission was set up as a kind of continuing watchdog over what the USIA is doing. In any case I have seen its reports in recent years. And their findings seem to be consistent in many respects with the views of many of us. For example, the Commission's 23d report in 1968 offered this observation regarding the management of USIA:

The Commission is concerned about the swollen staff in headquarters. There is danger, as a previous Commission said, that USIA Washington is becoming a bureaucracy with so many unexamined routines, controls, restrictions, and clearances, and with so much paper production, that administrative arteries have begun to clog and ossification to set in. A deliberate effort should be made to break down the compartmentalization that has characterized headquarters operation. As a relatively small agency, USIA still has an opportunity to prevent the entrenchment of excessive bureaucracy.

That 1968 report, as well as the new 1969 report of the Commission, recommends that machinery be set up for conducting a basic and complete review of USIA operations. This seems to me like an eminently reasonable suggestion, and I have introduced legislation to carry it through. The bill is H.R. 12726 and I invite attention to it and I urge its adoption.

Aside from what the Commission recommends, I also wonder if it is really wise to include the Commission's appropriation as part of the USIA appropriation. Would it not make better sense that it be part of the Bureau of the Budget

or the Executive Office of the President? It seems to me that it needs to be set apart in terms of its support, from the agency over which it is supposed to be looking. And to achieve this the Commission's appropriation ought to be entirely independent of the USIA appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding of the situation at USIA is that over the years right up to today, the same old attitudes and the same old operating procedures have prevailed. My impression is that today, in spite of the incoming Nixon administration, the same people hold the controlling influence as was the case last year and the year before.

I have the strong impression that this agency needs a real review, that old assumptions need to be challenged, and that we need to find satisfaction that innovation and fresh thinking is a part of our effort to convey America's story to the world.

The U.S. Advisory Commission says these same things, and so does the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to know much more about what the USIA is doing. A good place to start is by supporting H.R. 12726.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as a first question, can the gentleman tell us what has happened to Tom Two Arrows?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As I recall, the State Department originally sent him abroad under the name of Tom Two Arrows, and then later he became Tom Dorsey. That is the last I heard of him. He must still be in the woodwork.

Mr. GROSS. It intrigued me, because he has certainly disappeared.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have not heard of him for years.

Mr. GROSS. He used to be prominent in the hearings of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. He was sent all over the world by the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. It appears that there is perhaps a worthy successor in the person of a \$21,438 man who went over to Jordan apparently to direct and administer the programs of the King Hussein Sports City, whatever that is.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is an athletic enterprise, I take it?

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not so sure that Tom Two Arrows was not engaged in certain facets of that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, he was not in any athletic business. I believe he was engaged in Indian folklore.

Mr. GROSS. But can the gentleman describe the King Hussein Sports City?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have not been in Amman, Jordan, in many years. I generally confine myself to the holy places in Jerusalem, so I am not familiar with the King's sports center.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I found the hearings of his committee most revealing, and when he

gets through page 3, I will ask him—I could not read them all—about the American specialists, the lecturers, and heaven only knows what else—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They sure have got some dillies in there.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, there are some dillies in there.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am afraid they are not going to be any better in this administration on finding dillies than they were in previous administrations.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not sure of that, either but let us hope.

Now, the Supreme Court wants more law clerks. How many more did the Court get?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The Supreme Court did not get any more law clerks except three.

Mr. GROSS. They got three? Well, I would hope the Justices would go to work and obviate the necessity of providing them with an increasing number of clerks.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say this: I happen to know quite well the new and distinguished Chief Justice. It might seem strange that a Democrat from Brooklyn would be on intimate terms with such a distinguished gentleman as Warren Burger, who came to Washington from the State of Minnesota. We became quite friendly 15 years ago when he came with the first troops of the Eisenhower Administration, and was appointed Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice. I think the country is in good hands when we are in the hands of Chief Justice Warren Burger. I am not going to predict what he does. Whatever he does, he will do because he thinks it is the God-directed thing to do—he is that kind of a man—and I am a great admirer of his.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New York has control of the time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The distinguished gentleman is from Minnesota, and I believe he wants to get in here to put in a plug for Chief Justice Burger.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman is absolutely right, and I might even say a nice thing or two about the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) while I do this.

The gentleman's comments—although belonging to Brooklyn—about the gentleman from Minnesota, who is now the Chief Justice of the United States, are very well taken indeed, and I do not think it odd that the gentleman from Brooklyn should be a close friend of the Chief Justice of the United States. It just shows that the gentleman from Brooklyn has good judgment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. I might say that I was very proud of the fact that, being just a lowly Democrat from Brooklyn, I was seated practically alongside the President of the United States on the morning that Chief Justice Warren Burger took the oath of office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gen-

tleman will yield further, I am pleased to hear what the gentleman has said about the new Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and I fervently hope that the gentleman is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, all of this would have nothing to do with the pros or cons of any request for appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand.

Now, the gentleman heading the office of Water for Peace—did he get the \$360,700 that he asked for in view of the fact that we have water desalination appropriations all over this place and in the millions of dollars?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman reminds me that after the hearings, when the answers of the Water for Peace people were so bad, the Department of State itself withdrew the entire request.

So there is nothing in this bill for water for peace.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to hear it. On page 4 of the report the committee castigates the State Department over the contribution to the international organizations but then goes ahead, I believe, and provides \$11,700,000 more than last year for a total of \$130 million plus.

I do not have the report with me today, but I am sure the committee has the report of the General Accounting Office saying that they cannot get the accounting of these funds from international organizations; that is, United Nations, UNICEF, the World Health Organization, and certain inter-American organizations.

I am a little surprised that the committee would go ahead with an added appropriation of \$11 million plus in the light of their refusal to give the Congress an accounting of how this money is being expended.

Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should be glad to. The gentleman from Iowa is a member of the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am sure he realizes that it is a result of the legislative authorizations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Committee on Appropriations is required to sign the check. That is what we are always confronted with. We deplore these increases in these world organization budgets, but our State Department, our people, never seem to be able to cope with them. The result is here we are with \$11 million extra.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe we are obtaining testimony from these organizations I have mentioned before our committee on a direct basis.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They have all come before the gentleman's committee for authorization.

Mr. GROSS. As I say, I do not believe we are getting these organizations I have mentioned before our committee on a direct basis and, if so, then the appropriations in this bill are subject to a point of order because we have not acted upon these authorizations this year.

If what the gentleman says is true, we could and should go into this in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. These authorizations were for the purpose of authorizing the United States to join the international organizations—and these are continuing from year to year.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, yes; they are.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And they are increasing and increasing from year to year.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs could go into this situation if it wanted to. But I think your committee has done a good job in exposing what is going on. However, I am just a little surprised that you have given them all the money they have asked for when they refuse to tell Congress how this money is being spent.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I wish we could accommodate the gentleman further in this regard, but as long as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs approves of our membership in these international organizations, then this committee feels it has no alternative but to pay our dues in these organizations.

I would like to see some activity within the House Committee on Foreign Affairs cutting down on the authorizations for these international organizations.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), is exactly correct. We are at the mercy of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As a matter of fact, we do not have any members of the Committee on Appropriations assigned to special duty at the U.N. but you do on your Committee on Foreign Affairs and they sit in on these hearings and they make the determination as to the amount of money and our participation in these organizations. But we cannot do anything about it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have suggested on previous occasions to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that if he receives an invitation to go up there to be wine and dined at the U.N. and to serve on the budget committee, as have many members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs previously, that he should accept the invitation. I expect that some good might come out of it.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean that place that has been described as a haven for "ladies of the corridors?" Is that what the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have never come across that even in any of these plays sponsored by the Department of State.

Mr. GROSS. It might be subject to being adapted to other purposes, I am not sure.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am unable to answer the distinguished gentle-

man other than to say I am not familiar with any of the corridors.

Mr. GROSS. I have a couple of additional questions, and then I will be finished if the gentleman will bear with me.

I read the hearings with respect to all of the basketball coaches, tennis players, athletic trainers, and ballet dancers that have been sent abroad by the State Department. Is there no end to this business of expending the taxpayers' money, particularly at a time like this, to send all of these trainers, ballet dancers, and athletes abroad?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I am in favor of sending good trainers, good athletes, good musicians, and good plays abroad. This whole area surely needs cleaning up, and that is what we are trying to do by the action of the committee this year.

Mr. GROSS. Since the House Foreign Affairs Committee does not move very expeditiously or at all on some of these issues, you have my best wishes for success in cleaning it up.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am not going to criticize that distinguished committee. There are a great many hard working members on that committee, including the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is true.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They sit day after day for months and months, as does the Appropriations Committee. This pending bill is 6 months in preparation.

Mr. GROSS. But I wish that committee—and I am a member of it—would spend more time delving into where the money goes than continually promoting the spending of more money. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAFT).

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I shall take just a very few minutes to direct some remarks on the subject of the \$10 million figure in the bill for the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. It seems to me that as Members of Congress we have a unique duty not only to respond to the will of the people but at times to educate and to guide that will.

Presently we are under great pressure from our constituents to cut back on Federal spending. In doing so, we must look carefully at our priorities in order that our cuts will not be made in vital areas.

But it seems to me further that no area of congressional concern should be more vital than that of equal employment opportunity. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has been in existence for approximately 5 years. During that time many thousands of citizens have brought complaints of discrimination before it. Many have benefited from its activities with jobs, promotions, and increased benefits. Some have had to take their cases to court for satisfaction. A great many are patiently awaiting decisions on their cases, because the Commission is overloaded

with work and has a considerable backlog.

The \$10 million appropriation proposed by the committee would allow the Commission to operate only at the same level that it has during the last quarter of this last fiscal year. During that time the Commission's backlog continued to grow. Many more complaints were received, were decided, or were conciliated, and with the growing backlog, the frustration of those who have been awaiting action by the Commission has grown also.

For the record, I would just like to give you some of the figures on the investigation backlog that has now been built up. At the end of the fiscal year 1968 the backlog of investigations was 1,675. At the end of fiscal 1969 it had grown to 2,556. Based on the proposed appropriation, at the end of the fiscal year 1970, with no appreciable increase in staff—the small increase would be taken up almost entirely by the pay increases involved and some other increased expenses—the backlog is estimated to go to more than 4,700 cases. This is based on an expected charge level of some 15,000.

The charge levels, too, have gone up during this period. For example, in 1966 it was expected in the first full year of operation to have some 2,000 charges. Actually there were 8,000. This grew until in 1969 it was 12,000. As I have just indicated, for the fiscal year 1970 it is estimated that it will be in the neighborhood of 15,000. I might say that while there are imperfections in the program which should be corrected, as have been mentioned by the members of the committee, the field staff output in the investigation of charges has gone up more than 10 percent per year over this period which I have mentioned.

I hope that when an amendment is offered later to increase this amount, probably to \$12,500,000, the House will give consideration to this increased caseload and to the needs that exist in this area. It seems to me this is a justifiable increase. The increase will be almost entirely used up in increased personnel for the field offices. It would provide somewhere in the neighborhood of 200 additional field personnel.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot tell people they are equal in the area of employment and then effectively deny them any recourse. We have added \$200 million to the various approaches to the crime control problem.

At the same time I point out that the frustrations that arise in lack of equal opportunity are some of the principal factors involved in the crime increase we see. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission must be provided with adequate funds. Two hundred years ago we, the citizens of the United States, declared that all men are created equal. Today we must act to insure that all men are treated as equals.

(Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. ROONEY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is anticipated that an effort will be made to eliminate on a point of order the lar-

guage contained in section 706 of this bill. If that should be the case, I propose to offer substitute language as an amendment.

First of all, let me call to your attention the language which now is provided in section 706. It is as follows:

SEC. 706. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of, or any remuneration whatever to any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at or doing research at an institution of higher education who has engaged in conduct on or after October 12, 1968, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution: *Provided*, That such limitation upon the use of money appropriated in this Act shall not apply to a particular individual until the appropriate institutions of higher education at which such conduct occurred shall have had an opportunity to initiate or has completed such proceedings as it deems appropriate but which are not dilatory in order to determine whether the provisions of this limitation upon the use of appropriated funds shall apply: *Provided further*, That such institution shall certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at quarterly or semester intervals that it is in compliance with this provision.

The language of section 706 is clear. It is intended to spell out specifically the intent of Congress that Federal funds not be made available to students or to staff members who participate in or encourage campus disorders, incite riots, and destroy property. The law is clear enough on these matters, but regrettably, it has not been enforced. It is the intent of the language in section 706 to tighten the law and to make it very clear that there must be compliance by institutions of higher learning. Specifically, it is proposed that they certify at quarterly or semester intervals, according to the system which they follow, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that they are in compliance with the law. Compliance with the law is what the Congress intended when it passed legislation to curb Federal fund contributions to those participating in campus disorders, and compliance with the law is what section 706 is intended to insure.

In the event, however, that section 706 should be stricken by a point of order, I am prepared to offer an amendment which I trust cannot under any circumstances be interpreted as legislation on an appropriations bill. It would be worded as follows:

SEC. 706. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of, or any remuneration whatever to any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at or doing research at an institution of higher education which has not certified at quarterly or semester intervals to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that it has, after reasonable opportunity, initiated or completed appropriate proceedings arising from any conduct by any such individual on or after October 12, 1968, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use

of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials, or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution.

It is, I believe, obvious that the intent is the same, and I trust, in final analysis, that the language will be as effective as that now in the bill. In other words, I believe the Congress has had its fill of campus disorders—I know this is true of the people of our country—and I hope that we can spell out in this bill beyond a shadow of doubt that, in the future, the law is not to be violated by those who receive their education or those who teach through the help of the Federal Government.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, in 1965, President Lyndon Johnson appointed a blue-ribbon panel, made up of police experts, lawyers, including several former presidents of the American Bar Association, and others who knew as much as anyone else about the nature, causes, and possible solutions of the problem of crime in America. These men were commissioned to make a thorough study of crime, as thorough as any that has ever been made, and to report back with their findings and recommendations. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice reported to President Johnson and the Nation in early 1967 with the conclusion that, and I quote:

Controlling crime in America is an endeavor that will be slow and hard and costly. But America can control crime if it will.

Of major importance in the program they outlined for controlling crime was Federal financial assistance. They concluded that the entire criminal justice system, the police, the courts, and the correctional institutions, were, as they put it, "undernourished," and that State and local governments were desperately in need of financial assistance to meet their fundamental obligation of protecting citizens from violence, from theft, and from an increasingly all-pervasive fear that threatens to make a mockery of our freedom.

In the words of the Commission:

The Federal program the Commission visualizes is a large one. . . . If this report has not conveyed the message that sweeping and costly changes in criminal administration must be made throughout the country in order to effect a significant reduction in crime, then it has not expressed what the Commission strongly believes.

This conclusion was accepted by both President Johnson and the 90th Congress. In 1968, the Congress passed legislation authorizing an initial appropriation, for the planning stages of the law enforcement assistance program, of slightly over \$100 million, and subsequent annual appropriations of \$300 million. The December 1968 deadline for planning grant applications was met by every one of the 50 States, indicating the unqualified nationwide support of the program and eagerness to participate in it. At this point, as I understand it, many States have had their comprehensive anticrime plans accepted, and are

in the process of administering initial action grants to implement these plans.

The appropriation bill under consideration today authorizes \$250,000,000 for the continuation of this program, which is administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration within the Department of Justice. This represents a cut of approximately \$46.5 million from the figure of \$296,570,000 requested for fiscal 1970 by both President Nixon and President Johnson before him. I want to take this opportunity to indicate my wholehearted support of the Federal anticrime assistance program administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. I urge not only the commitment by the Congress of the \$250 million authorized by this legislation, but the restoration of the full amount requested by the Justice Department.

I say this as both a Congressman from the State of New York, well aware of the concern of my constituents about crime, and as a former policeman. We cannot fight crime with political speeches and good intentions. Fighting crime is costly. Our police are underpaid and inadequately equipped. Our criminal courts are jammed. Our correctional system too often confirms those passing through it in criminality. We are today paying for our financial neglect of the criminal justice system in terms of ever-increasing crime rates. As a former police officer who spent twenty-three years working within this system, I urge full financial support of the law enforcement assistance program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the action which the Appropriations Committee has taken with regard to the budget for the Department of State's mutual education and cultural exchange programs.

I refer specifically to the committee's action, outlined on page 7 of the report, to provide no funds whatever for the special education and cultural projects programs. I think this is a grave mistake. Let me just mention a few of the activities carried on under this program of special education and cultural projects.

First, The Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies here in Washington, which as we all know has a fine reputation for training scholars in international studies, maintains a center in Bologna in Italy. I think it is fair to say that were it not for the contribution that we make to the center it would not exist today. Cutting out all funds for these special education and cultural projects will completely eliminate our contribution to the Bologna center.

Second, The United States makes a significant contribution to the Salsburg seminar which brings together leading European citizens with leading American educators and people from public life for several weeks in a graduate seminar on American studies. It is an immensely valuable input to increased knowledge and understanding between this country and the people of Europe. Our participation in that effort would also be eliminated.

Third, U.S. support for the Asia Foundation and the U.S. Youth Council would be eliminated as a result of this cut. In

addition, several American studies institutes, such as the American Institute of Indian Studies, the American Studies Research Center in India, the Institute of American Studies in France, would be cut off from U.S. financial support. Such organizations provide valuable opportunities for American students to study in India, France, and elsewhere as well as to bring students of those countries to the United States.

Finally, I want to mention especially some of the programs which we have been carrying on with some East European countries which will be literally extinguished because of this action.

For example, Wayne State University, in collaboration with Yugoslavia, administers a regional studies project, the object of which is to establish a center for continuous research and training in regional and urban planning in Yugoslavia.

Second, there is a project carried on between Indiana University and a Yugoslavian university under which Indiana University is helping them to establish business administration courses and management courses. I do not think I need to belabor the great contribution which can be made by making American management approaches and skills available to the Yugoslavians, both in terms of their development and in terms of our relationship with them.

These programs, Mr. Chairman, are a marvelous combination in terms of their long-range effect. They contribute enormously to the process of developing common views and attitudes between East and West and to the overall goal of expanding freedom of thought and communication. By cutting off U.S. participation in such programs we remove our most effective weapon in the struggle to expand the free market of ideas.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), to increase fiscal 1970 appropriations for the Commission from \$10 million to \$11.5 million.

I doubt that any Member in this Chamber would deny that the Commission has a continuing, serious assignment. Unless we can offer equal employment opportunities, most of the jobless in this country will not find meaningful work. And, without jobs, all we will have are increased welfare rolls, which no one wants—least of all, the jobless.

Discrimination in employment is still at the heart of the problems of our cities. It is one of the key causes of the unrest that continues to exist in this country. The Negroes and other minority groups still are shunted to menial occupations without the remotest kind of employment security. Job discrimination is the most basic grievance of our minority population. It is the main reason why the promise of America has become hollow in meaning to so many.

In its 4 years of operation, the Commission has made many strides toward the goal of nondiscriminatory employment practices. This has been done with insufficient staff, insufficient funds, and insufficient power.

The Commission's work increases in importance as our national manpower programs are expanded. Since 1964, Federal expenditures for these programs have increased some fivefold to an estimated \$3 billion in fiscal year 1969. The rise in these expenditures reflects the increasing concern and emphasis on manpower programs as a method for increasing the employability of some 2 million disadvantaged Americans.

But new skills are of no use to a black worker if his potential employer's only criterion of ability is a white skin.

The Commission is the only Federal agency explicitly responsible for nondiscriminatory employment practices. To refuse it adequate funding would directly impair the effectiveness of every Federal manpower program. It is difficult to imagine a more wasteful and ill-considered economy.

In a period of rapid economic expansion, when national manpower needs are reaching major proportions, discrimination in employment is not only a burden to the individual, but a cost to and drain on our economy. The Council of Economic Advisers in 1965, pointing to its own study of this problem, estimated the annual cost to the economy of job discrimination against Negroes alone at \$23 billion. This figure would doubtless burgeon when reestimated in 1969 and amended to include persons of other minority races. The amount requested for the operations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission vanishes by comparison. It does not take any major restructuring of our national resource priorities to permit \$11.5 million for this program, but the potential payoffs, to Americans of minority races, to our Federal investment in manpower development and resources, and to our expanding economy are immense.

Can we continue to educate and train some 2 million disadvantaged persons annually only to find that jobs are denied many of them because of the color of their skin?

Mr. Chairman, I am totally in agreement with the amendment to increase to \$11.5 million funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the next fiscal year.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON). There is no doubt that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is an agency deserving of our firmest support. In a time when study upon study documents the psychologically debilitating effects of job discrimination, the Commission bears the entire responsibility of contending with discrimination in private employment. Unfortunately, after being assigned this monumental and significant task, it has been given severely limited resources with which to do the job.

The Commission has been conscientious in executing its assignment, and the need for a substantial increase in its appropriation stems not from a desire to "empire build," but from the simple necessity of catching up with its burgeoning workload. A quick glance at the Commission's annual reports reveals that

the number of complaints filed with the Commission has steadily increased, and, at the same time, so has its backlog of cases. The backlog currently stands at some 2,500 cases and is likely to double unless the Commission is granted additional resources. All of these cases pending decision represent delays of a year and a half to 2 years in resolution of a complaint filed, and an individual who may very well have been wronged stands behind each of those complaints. It is not very difficult to understand how this situation might breed disbelief in the laws of this land and the promises made by this Government.

The manner in which the Commission operates has a great deal to commend it. The authority of State fair employment commissions is not ignored; rather the Federal agency defers to the State commissions. The Commission neither imposes quotas nor preferential treatment requirements on private employers; indeed it is specifically denied this authority by statute. Complaints are resolved through informal means and conciliation agreements are the product of consultation and cooperation between each employer and Commission personnel. Complaint proceedings are handled with the strictest discretion, away from the publicity which can sometimes force the parties involved into extreme positions. Grants are awarded to State and local fair employment agencies by the Commission in an attempt to encourage non-Federal activity in equal employment opportunity.

Statutory limitations on the extent of the Commission's power and financial limitations weaken its potential impact in an area where positive action is critical. Continuing reliance on welfare payments is not healthy for the citizens of this country, and, ultimately, must weaken the country itself. The only realistic alternative is, if not meaningful employment for all our citizens, at least the opportunity to compete for such employment on an equal basis. The history of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission reveals all too clearly that this opportunity for equal employment remains rhetoric rather than reality for all too many of this country's citizens. Given these circumstances, it is necessary that the Commission receive our deepest support. We can best demonstrate this support through a realistic appraisal of the size of its task and the resources it needs to carry out its legislative mandate in a way that will bear results.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H.R. 12964, would appropriate funds for fiscal year 1970 to the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce; the Judiciary, and related independent agencies.

While there are several appropriations recommended by the Committee on Appropriations which merit discussion, I will limit my remarks to two specific items for which the appropriations contained in H.R. 12964 must be increased if title IV and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are to be fully enforced.

The first item is the \$10 million appropriation recommended by the Appropria-

tions Committee for the activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission during fiscal year 1970.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is responsible for carrying out title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids discrimination in employment. The goal of the EEOC is eliminate discrimination in employment in the private sector. This goal is pursued in several ways by the Commission, including the investigation of complaints of discrimination and, if the Commission finds "reasonable cause" for action, attempted conciliation of complaints, technical assistance by which employers subject to title VII are encouraged to voluntarily comply, cooperative programs with State and local fair employment practices commissions, and consultation with other Federal agencies charged with enforcing equal employment opportunity.

While it is true, as the committee report on this bill notes, that the \$10 million appropriation recommended by the Appropriations Committee represents an increase of \$880,000 over EEOC's fiscal year 1969 appropriation, the sum recommended is simply not adequate to the task of rooting out employment discrimination in the private sector. During the hearings on this bill, the former Chairman of the EEOC, Clifford Alexander, testified that since the beginning of the Commission in fiscal year 1965, "budget and staff resources have proven inadequate to deal with the inflow of complaints from citizens under title VII." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce; the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1970, part 4, page 332. Chairman Alexander estimated that, because of inadequate funding, the Commission will enter fiscal year 1970 with a backlog of over 2,600 investigations and over 2,800 conciliations.

This backlog results from the fact that the Commission has lacked the resources to compile the required statistical data and tabulating and analytical materials needed to support the enforcement program and, additionally, has not had sufficient staff to take positive steps against those employers, unions, and apprentice programs with demonstrable patterns of discrimination. Chairman Alexander testified that, if granted adequate resources, the EEOC could make substantial progress during fiscal year 1970 by integrating existing data systems from the EEOC and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance into a unified data base which could be used to identify areas of employment in the private sector where progress could most readily be attained. As Mr. Alexander pointed out, "The estimated costs" of achieving this progress "are exceedingly modest in relationship to the anticipated benefits."

The largest single increase over fiscal year 1969 requested by the Commission for the current fiscal year is for additional investigative positions required to reduce the current backlog of complaints and conciliations and to cope with the rapidly expanding workload. In my view, such an increase is not only justified but

imperative if the Commission is to fulfill the role assigned to it under title VII.

I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has agreed to accept the Joelson amendment which would increase the appropriation to the EEOC from \$10 million to \$12.5 million. However, this sum still falls over \$3 million below the \$15,905,000 requested by EEOC. I would hope that more money will be provided so that EEOC will have sufficient resources to vigorously enforce title VII prohibitions against employment discrimination.

Second, the appropriation of \$12 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee for carrying out title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 must be increased. The Office of Civil Rights in the Office of Education has requested an appropriation of \$20 million, \$8 million above the sum requested by the committee. Under the program supported by these funds, special training grants and contracts are awarded to school boards and to training institutions to help pay the costs of training school personnel and for professional services to deal with problems of desegregation.

The importance of the title IV program, and the need to expand its effectiveness, was pointed out by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in March of 1968, which said:

We believe that the Title IV program should be reoriented and expanded into a major Federal effort to provide comprehensive aid to support State and local desegregation projects.

More than 40 percent of the \$20 million requested by the Office of Education for Civil Rights Education is to increase support for projects of this nature.

As Dr. James Allen, the U.S. Commissioner for Education, stated during the hearings on H.R. 12964:

The task to be accomplished has just begun.

His estimation of the work which remains to be done reinforces the need to increase the appropriation for civil rights education to the full \$20 million requested by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. According to the Office of Education, only 20 percent of the Negro children in the South now attend desegregated schools. A large part of even this progress, according to Dr. Allen, represents school districts that were relatively easy to desegregate. The truly difficult situations, according to the Commissioner, remain to be tackled.

If the promises made by Congress in the 1964 Civil Rights Act are to have meaning, substantial resources must be committed to the task of eliminating discrimination in all areas of our society and especially in education. The goal of an equal opportunity for all Americans—regardless of color—is implicit in the Civil Rights Act. Congress must recognize, however, that legislation is not in itself sufficient. If equal opportunity is to be achieved in education, and, for that matter, in employment, adequate financial support must be committed to programs designed to achieve the end embodied in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. To do less will only increase the frustration

which inevitably occurs when the promises of progress made by the Federal Government are not accompanied by a commitment to spend whatever amount of money is necessary to fulfill those promises.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) to increase the fiscal year 1970 budget of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. When title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was written, the Commission it established was not intended to be eternally crippled by lack of funds. The ideals title VII set forth and the goals it established were not incorporated into law just to be so many words in the United States Code.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's operation can be meaningful only if it is current. Yet the present inadequacies and inefficiencies of the Commission—the lack of staff, the shameful length of time it takes to approach settlement of complaints, the serious percentage of failures to conciliate—prevent this from being a reality.

We all know that the EEOC is weak by its lack of statute. It does not have cease and desist powers, and it can conciliate only through moral suasion. But it is also weak because it has been financially starved by the Congress so that it cannot even exercise the limited powers it has been given. Today, we can at least go part way toward eliminating this second disgrace by supporting Mr. Joelson's amendment. We can afford to go no other way without being hypocrites.

Mr. RARICK, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 12964 bears the very innocuous title, "Making Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

It is the "for other purposes" that removes this bill from the category of a routine funding of governmental operations.

Buried in the bill we find some of "the other purposes" to be—

Obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations	\$130,187,000
Community relations services.....	3,077,000
Minority business enterprises.....	1,200,000
Commission on Civil Rights.....	2,650,000
Civil rights education, HEW.....	12,000,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.....	10,000,000

Experience teaches that an informed people invest their money where their hearts lie. If this be true it must come as a crushing disillusionment to those American taxpayers and people who still think we are fighting communism that this same bill authorizes a measly \$344,400 for the Subversive Activities Control Board which bears the awesome responsibility of informing the American people who the dangerous subversives are in our country.

Compare the Subversive Activities Control Board appropriation of \$344 thousand to the civil rights education fund of \$12 million. The latter purports to be for "training of school personnel

and for professional services in dealing with the problems of desegregation," but those of us who have watched HEW in operation know that "training" means "guidelines" means "forced compliance." I voice the feeling that moneywise our people at home will conclude we in Congress are 36 times more determined to fight them than we are to protect them from the ever-growing threat of Communist tyranny.

This bill has been decorated like a Christmas tree to place Members on the horns of a dilemma—if one wants to vote for the good he has to go along with the bad. Sooner or later enough Members will tire of this political hocus pocus and insist that appropriations bills funding Government operations be taken up individually or by related categories so there can be a meaningful vote to better voice the constituents' feelings at home. Until that day arrives the only way to express disapproval of the freeloaders in the bill is to vote against the entire measure.

If Members start voting against these conglomerate appropriations mixtures, I think the day not far off before we can have the opportunity for selective voting on individual appropriations. If this bill fails it will not be the defeat of all the programs, because we all know the Appropriations Committee will be back on Monday morning with a revised bill amended to remove some of the most obnoxious features.

I do not want my people to think I would be a party to any such "pig in a poke" deal. I am constrained to oppose the bill as is and cast their vote "no."

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 12964, the bill which would appropriate \$2.53 billion for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1970.

The world is spellbound by America's epic achievement of landing a man on the moon by means of Apollo 11 and its undaunted crew. Despite our acknowledged leadership in the space program and our remarkable advances in the physical sciences, it is to the eternal credit of this Nation that it also recognizes, and is doing something about, the urgent needs in the areas of human relationships encompassed by the social sciences. In terms of the legislation we are now considering, our concern for the improvement of relations among the peoples of this world is nowhere more clearly shown than in a modest sum which has been included in the Department of State appropriations.

I refer, of course, to the appropriation for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Honolulu, Hawaii. For the continued operation of the center, H.R. 12964 includes the sum of \$5.26 million, the full amount of the revised budget estimate and the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal year 1969.

The money, which indeed represents an investment in every sense of the word, will make possible our continued efforts toward the objective of promoting better relations and understanding between the United States and the na-

tions of Asia and the Pacific. This cultural and technical interchange program is carried out by grant to the University of Hawaii which operates the center and administers grants, fellowships, and scholarships to qualified persons to engage in study or training at the center.

Since its creation in 1960, very close in point of time to the space program impetus provided by the late President John F. Kennedy in his pledge to land an American on the moon before the end of this decade, the East-West Center in Hawaii has become an effective institution and a showcase of international friendship. The center has provided the vehicle for this Nation to reach out laterally to other countries here on earth, even as Apollo 11 has served as the vehicle to reach into space and land, not one American but two Americans on the moon. As a giant step forward in international relations, the East-West Center has become one of America's most significant contributions toward better world understanding and one of her best investments in world peace.

Mr. Chairman, by approving the East-West Center appropriation for fiscal year 1970, we will be giving continued life to an America-conceived institution which today is recognized as a highly valuable international asset.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, the debate in the Committee of the Whole on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill was so abbreviated that I inadvertently missed the opportunity I had intended taking to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), a question or two about funding for the Office of State Technical Services within the Department of Commerce.

The State Technical Services Act of 1965 created a cooperative Federal-State program to establish and maintain technical services programs that would encourage the application of science and technology supposedly in such a way as to stimulate industrial use of the new techniques that have been largely obtained through Federal research programs of one kind or another. The intent was to reach, through this program, a cross-section of all business and industry, small as well as large, in the hopes of thereby obtaining a broader application of the fruits of Federal research than would otherwise be possible.

During the last 4 years, the Congress has appropriated \$20.8 million for this program which has begun to show that it is useful in the development of new ideas—and new businesses—that redound to the general benefit of our economy. Through university and industrial cooperation, it has stimulated noncredit short courses, workshops and seminars for engineers and technical people in the communities where they live and work to help them, as individuals, keep pace with the rapid advances of science and technology that mark the vitality of America today. In many instances, because of the travel problems and time problems that would otherwise pertain, such up-grading courses would not otherwise have

been available to such engineers and technicians.

It is true that this program has been slow to get off the ground and that it was greeted with some skepticism on the part of both industry and the academic communities in some areas at the start. It is also true that its potential benefits have not been applied evenly across the Nation. But, certainly in my State of New York, as in many others, we are just beginning to realize the true potential of a cooperative venture of this sort. In my own district, I know what has been achieved through this program for the benefit of smaller firms that cannot afford their own R. & D. programs, and for small shops that, in the ever-fiercer competition with "big business," could make good use, for another instance, of computer facilities or tape-controlled machines, but have been wary of their competence to do so as well as of the initial cost and complexity involved in trying.

I have received a good many letters from individual engineers and technicians in support of this program, people who have had benefit therefrom, especially in those smaller or more-rural communities where easy access to seminars and the like at centers of higher education is simply not available.

And I have seen enough, on my own, to know that the program is beginning to achieve its intended results, and is worth maintaining.

Now, the budgetary situation is this: For fiscal 1969, a total of \$5.3 million was appropriated—to be applied mostly on a State-matching basis—but for fiscal 1970 the budget request was only for \$290,000 for the continuing expense of administering the State and special-program grants awarded from fiscal year 1969 and prior year funds. This amount the subcommittee recommended and the House has now approved. But the future of the program has obviously been left very much in doubt. The subcommittee's hearings indicate that the Secretary of Commerce has ordered an independent study of the program's overall effectiveness, to be made by Arthur D. Little, Inc., with a report due therefrom next month. As Secretary Stans told the subcommittee:

If (the program) has real merit, we may need to reverse our reduction . . .

I would personally hope this would be the case and we should know in a month or two. But, in the meantime, I do feel it unfortunate that the subcommittee and the administration, did not see fit to recommend a further appropriation for the purposes of keeping the program alive during the period of reevaluation. There are some held-over funds, of course, but as best I can find out these will be all expended well before the end of fiscal 1970, if not by the end of calendar 1969. If this is the case, and if the other body does not reconsider the situation, and take a more careful look at the program's accomplishments to date as well as its promise, then I fear the momentum here that has finally been achieved will be dissipated. In the long run even considering our current budgetary

dilemma, I do not believe that to be in the national interest.

I would therefore express the hope, Mr. Chairman, that the other body will inquire more deeply into this matter than we have, and that it will reconsider our rather hasty action to save some money and to approve what Mr. ROONEY saw fit to call a "wholesome decrease" from last year's appropriation.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which would increase the appropriation to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The \$15.9 million which was requested cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered unreasonable or improper in light of the fact that this Commission's responsibility covers some 44 million workers. And that responsibility is to protect the most basic right of every American—the right to work at any job for which he or she is suited, in order that he might support his family to the best of his ability.

EEOC cannot possibly discharge this responsibility in the best interests of the people, the economy, or the Nation with the \$10.1 million budget approved by committee. Funding in this amount, due to rising costs, would barely allow the Commission to keep up the level of compliance activity achieved in the past year, activity which included grappling with a backlog of complaints that is large and growing.

The backlog itself is a legacy of the Commission's first year of operation, for which the Congress anticipated and provided funds for handling of about 2,000 complaints of job discrimination. Instead, EEOC during that year was inundated with over 8,000 charges—legitimate grievances from American citizens who believed they had been discriminated against in job hiring or promotion simply because of their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In each succeeding year, the backlog has continued to mount, in spite of increased compliance productivity on the part of the Commission. It grows, on the one hand, because more and more people, thousands more, are coming to EEOC each year for help and, on the other hand, because each year the Congress has failed to provide a realistic appropriation, one that would meet the critical need that is so clearly present.

We cannot afford to put it off any longer. I most strongly urge that this be the year in which we take care of this vital unfinished business. With the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, a commitment was made to America's minority groups and women workers—on behalf of all the people—a commitment that the Government is wholeheartedly in support of nondiscrimination in employment and will work, through the efforts of a Federal agency, toward the achievement of this ideal. The least we can do now is to adequately fund the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to perform the task we assigned it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

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

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION
SHIP CONSTRUCTION

For construction-differential subsidy and cost of national-defense features incident to construction of ships for operation in foreign commerce (46 U.S.C. 1152, 1154); for construction-differential subsidy and cost of national-defense features incident to the reconstruction and reconditioning of ships under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1154); and for acquisition of used ships pursuant to section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1160); to remain available until expended, \$200,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language of the bill, on page 31, lines 13 through 24, as an appropriation not being authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that he begin with line 14.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would amend that to line 14, because there are further provisions alluding to the Maritime Administration.

I make a point of order against lines 14 through 24.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that because of existing conditions, where we do not have authority in law for even the \$15,918,000 requested by President Nixon's Bureau of the Budget for ship construction, I shall have to agree that there is merit to the point of order of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I believe the RECORD should show that the distinguished gentleman from New York has made a great effort to improve America's maritime posture and by his work in seeking to provide enough money to make a meaningful effort to keep American ships on the high seas and the American flag flying he has done something that this House, the Congress, and the Nation should appreciate and applaud.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

APOLLO 11

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield briefly to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to announce to the Congress that the epic voyage of Apollo 11 is now successfully completed at this moment. The astronauts are now on the hanger deck of the carrier *Hornet* and they are all in fine shape and good spirits.

The United States is now first in space. We Americans and we in the U.S. Congress are very proud of our three U.S. astronauts today.

Americans have every reason to be proud as a people of this fine accomplishment and the technical excellence involved.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in being constrained to admit the validity of the point of order, I should like briefly to say that this point of order would not at all have been successful previous to last year, were it not for the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries action which now requires annual authorizations. Both this year and last year we have come to the floor with this bill with substantial money provided for the construction of additional new ships for our merchant marine, and I have had to stand here and admit the validity of a point of order against the funds carried in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order since others are being heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard.

Mr. GROSS. Let the RECORD show, regardless of any other consideration, that the point of order is conceded.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The point of order is conceded, with all those considerations.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAYS). The gentleman from New York concedes the point of order, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I share the sentiments of other Members who believe that America needs a strong merchant marine, and as such deeply regret that a point of order was made against the funds provided in this bill for our maritime program.

I realize, of course, Mr. Chairman, that there are members of the Committee on Appropriations who have never been happy with the fact that the House, in its wisdom, saw fit to provide the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with authorizing authority. In this connection, what happened last year, and again this year, could have been deliberate efforts to embarrass the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Last year, as this year, in the other body the House-passed authorization bill was delayed. Under these circumstances, why a rule waiving a point of order on the maritime appropriation was not requested is hard to explain.

Whatever the reason, to me at least, the Appropriations Committee could be shown at fault.

Mr. Chairman, it would be unfortunate if a feud developed between the two committees over jurisdiction. That would be detrimental to our American merchant marine. It is the merchant marine that stands to suffer and no one's pride or personal vindication is important.

Before long the administration will come in with a new maritime program. I believe it will call for construction of more ships which will take more money. The House authorization which we passed anticipated such a new program and I can now only hope that any damage arising as a result of this point of order will be undone by prompt and well-considered action in the other body.

(Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given

permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I would just like the RECORD to show that the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, in accordance with its legislative responsibilities, held extensive, in-depth hearings commencing on April 15 on the authorization of appropriations for certain maritime programs in the Department of Commerce. Every responsible witness in this area was heard by this committee, which then reported the bill, H.R. 4152, out on May 7. On Thursday, May 15, the House passed the maritime authorization bill by voice vote.

Our position in this authorization bill was substantially upheld by the Senate Commerce Committee in the bill it reported out. Unfortunately, the Senate has not been able to consider and pass this measure apparently because of the priority consideration given to the ABM problem. This is indeed unfortunate because it presents exactly the same situation which prevailed last year.

As all undoubtedly recall, the appropriations bill for State, Justice, and Commerce was brought up on the floor before the authorization was passed by the House and signed by the President, and points of order were made deleting key provisions of the maritime authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret this whole legislative tieup. I regretted it last year and said so on this very floor. I think it is especially deplorable that the same thing is happening again and that it puts in jeopardy the United States merchant fleet which, as we all know, is struggling for survival. Many of us here in Congress have worked hard to help this floundering industry and it is frustrating to see this work blocked by these technicalities. The Appropriations Committee knew full well that the authorization bill has not passed the Senate, and it knew full well what happened last year—at the very least a rule could have been requested waiving these points of order—yet this was not done.

I just want the RECORD to show that the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has discharged its obligations with respect to these maritime authorization-appropriations procedures. If this process is crippled and the hard-pressed U.S.-flag fleet forced further to the wall, I submit that the fault lies elsewhere.

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

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that we have to suffer this temporary setback in something so vital to our Nation's defense and economy.

Congress now obviously is aware of the sad plight of our merchant marine and is now ready to do something about it. Due to a parliamentary situation, we will have to delay taking remedial action until the other body passes the authorization bill. As soon as this is accomplished, this necessary funding can be included in their appropriation bill. I hope this will be done as quickly as possible.

I am delighted, however, to see that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to fund this program in the manner

which it has. They have approved an unprecedented \$200 million for new ship construction. With the \$100 million carryover from previous years, this will allow a total sum of \$300 million for this purpose for the next fiscal year.

The Maritime Administration will decide the type and number of vessels to be built, but we estimate this will provide funding for 30 to 33 new ships.

This is a good start, but it is only a start. Our Nation has got to have a long-range shipbuilding program which will regain our status as a major seapower on the high seas. By the end of the next decade our prestige as a powerful Nation will be enhanced, but this is not the reason for this emergency program.

Our country is essentially an island greatly dependent on international commerce to sustain its economy. We cannot continue this commerce without ships and our present fleet of American-flag ships is old and fast dwindling. Nor can we place our dependence on foreign-flag ships which we have to do at the present time. American-flag ships now carry only about 5 percent of our own international commerce. Foreign flags must carry the balance. The uncertainties of international harmony make this a precarious dependence at best. And then too—and this is of vital importance—our military preparedness and defense is vitally affected by the absence of an adequate merchant marine. We can fly our troops whenever they are needed, but they have to be supplied by ships—American ships. If we lose this capability—and we are losing it now—we jeopardize the security of our Nation.

These are some of the reasons why we must start a new national maritime program right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission established by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$700,000 for payments to State and local agencies for services to the Commission pursuant to title VII of the Civil Rights Act, \$10,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 45, line 17, strike out the figure "\$10,000,000" and substitute therefor the figure "\$11,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey, is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, as far as those of us on this side of the aisle are concerned, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey is acceptable.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, as far as the minority is concerned, we will accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I stand to endorse the amendment offered to this appropriation bill, H.R. 12964, which would provide additional funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

It was in 1941 that the first order requiring that nondiscrimination clauses be inserted in Government contracts was issued—by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Every subsequent President adopted the same policy.

Finally, when Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it included a formal statement of "equal employment opportunity" embodied in title VII of the Act prohibiting discrimination in hiring, upgrading and all other conditions of employment. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—composed of five members appointed by the President and approved by the Senate—was established as a result of title VII. The Commission's responsibility is monumental—to assure that all Americans will be considered for hiring and promotion on the basis of their ability and qualifications without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Still, discriminatory practices run rampant, not only outside but within the mechanism of this Federal Government. The law was written, the law was passed and the law is clear—that job discrimination is illegal. People across this Nation who know the need for justice in employment opportunities have taken the Congress at its word, and no longer do they silently tolerate job discrimination and employment injustices. They seek relief and they call upon this Nation to stand behind the law. They do not understand that laws can be turned into meaningless rhetoric, if the Congress or the administration chooses to deny funds for implementation of the law. This, Mr. Chairman, is regretfully and tragically the hoax perpetrated by the inadequate funding of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Chairman of the EEOC, William H. Brown III, has stated that the Commission is running 18 months behind in processing complaints of job discrimination. Funding is not the only factor inhibiting the effectiveness of the EEOC to seek respect for the law, but it is a crucial factor which, until resolved, cannot be overcome by any other legislative revisions desperately needed and sought.

The Commission occupies a hotbed of controversy, subject to criticism for not accelerating equal employment opportunities, subject to criticism for harassing employers by persons who see no need for the law in the first place. I sympathize with the difficulty this Commission will have in maintaining any sort of acceptable posture—particularly under an administration which has yet to make any strong stand for civil rights guarantees,

But I have more sympathy for the victims of job discrimination who will have no effective recourse.

Surely, the body of the House can see fit to appropriate money to make good the promises that every man in this Nation shall have a chance to become a part of society. If there is any serious intent of this Nation to solve problems constructively within the workings of the American system, that intent must be verified by commitment to the law of the land. Without sufficient funds, the intent of title VII of the Civil Rights Act is meaningless.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Might we have some explanation for this increase in this appropriation?

Mr. JOELSON. Well, I had not intended to speak on it in view of the fact that both sides agreed to the amendment. The revised budget recommendation to the agency from the administration was \$15.9 million. So that in appropriating, as I suggest, \$11.5 million, we are still considerably below the recommendation of the administration of which the gentleman is a part.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that part of it. As the gentleman says, it is still below the budget recommendation, but why should it be increased above the committee figure?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield to me for the purpose of responding to the question which has been posed by the gentleman from Iowa?

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am one who went for the \$10 million in the committee. However, I have had an opportunity to get more detail as to the workload of this agency and what is necessary in order for it to perform its duties. After discussions with members of the agency, I find that there is some validity here in increasing this amount. Now, I think it might not be wrong to go into a little of the history through which we went last year. This is why, to be perfectly frank, we reached a compromise arrangement at this time. We, of course, recognized that the gentleman had an amendment before and I did not agree to vote for a \$1 million increase. The gentleman and I did not make the compromise last year, but we made it this year. In my opinion it will be better for everyone concerned to stick with this with the situation as it is at this time. I further feel that the caseload of this agency will justify the action which we are about to take.

Mr. JOELSON. I recall that last year I offered an amendment containing a larger figure and that the gentleman from Michigan suggested a compromise which I did not accept. As a result, we got nothing. I in the space of a year learned slowly, but I do learn, and I thank the gentleman for his support at this time.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment to provide additional funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The amendment is sound and is needed. I am glad the gentleman has taken this initiative and I hope it will have broad support from both sides of the aisle.

Discrimination in employment practices is indeed one of the most pervasive and serious problems which we, as a nation must face today. Our efforts on behalf of minorities and women cannot be minimized or decreased. For far too long, millions of Americans have been unjustifiably and senselessly denied equal job opportunity because of their race, creed, national origin, or sex.

It was not until the passage of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act that any hope existed for these individuals. We have now given them this hope; let us not fail in our responsibility to insure its implementation.

Considering that the investigation backlog of the Commission is now at approximately 2,500 and is increasing, how can we, in good faith, expect the Commission to fulfill its statutory responsibilities under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by only providing an appropriation which fails to increase their ability to handle these cases expeditiously.

I respectfully submit that an appropriation which does not provide for the Commission's effectiveness in minimizing this backlog will, in the end, be much more costly to our Nation. We can no longer afford to postpone a confrontation with job discrimination.

Under present conditions, there is minimal satisfaction to an individual whose complaint is 18 months in the processing. Can we, as legislators, seriously contend that we have done our best in providing for the implementation of title VII as long as the individual's remedy is delayed for over 1 year? Can we, as legislators, seriously expect the Commission to fulfill its statutory obligations if we do not provide sufficient staffing?

The mandate of title VII is clear. Let us not fail to fulfill our promise, so long in its coming, but so necessary in its effect.

Other steps must be taken to strengthen the EEOC—such as the passage of legislation I have introduced with Congressman HAWKINS to give the Commission power to issue cease and desist orders. But the most essential step is sufficient operating funds. I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may make a statement in justification for the increase in the appropriation for this agency which I gave to the House in a discussion of the bill just a while ago.

There has been a large increase in the backlog of last year from about 1,500 investigations up to 2,500 investigations. Further, it is expected that with this increased appropriation we can still expect this backlog to go to something near 4,500 cases next year. The number of investigations is going up and the appropriation of additional funds is needed in order to provide additional field office personnel.

Mr. JOELSON. The gentleman from Ohio has made the speech which I intended to make.

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

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for offering this amendment. The gentleman indicated to me a short while ago that he would do so. I think it is a most valuable contribution which the gentleman is making.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is this addition designed to cover any unusual purpose?

Mr. JOELSON. It is designed, as I understand it, to catch up with the tremendous backlog. They are now 18 months behind.

Mr. GROSS. But it is for no unusual purpose that this money is being requested?

Mr. JOELSON. The answer is no specific case.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this, I am one who proposed the allowance of the full amount in the markup. There is a request for \$1,470,000 for travel as compared with only \$615,500 in the current year. Would the gentleman agree that that travel should be kept at that amount? When I say the current year, I mean the past year that ended June 30.

Mr. JOELSON. I certainly feel that it should, and I think the legislative record here will so indicate, and that is the reason I did not request more money than I did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the report that the request for

funds for the United States-Mexico Commission for Water Development and Friendship were not approved, and that nothing was appropriated for this; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman is correct. There were a number of the members of the committee who felt that, since we have not had any recent war with Mexico or the Mexican people, and that we Americans and Mexicans are living in amicable relations, that we did not want to create a war or any incident down there along the border. The committee saw no necessity for expending all this requested money, \$1.5 million, for this Commission.

It is only this morning in the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill that an interagency committee on Mexican-American affairs was approved in the amount of \$510,000.

Mr. KAZEN. What the gentleman is referring to is for money to be spent among the related agencies for Mexican-American affairs within the United States. This is a different item altogether.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. KAZEN. All right, sir.

It is something entirely different from the Commission.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, it depends on how one looks at it.

Mr. KAZEN. It surprises me that the chairman does not know of the work of this Commission. We certainly do not want war with Mexico and we certainly have not had that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We have not had trouble with Mexico since about 1916, as I recall, with Pancho Villa.

Mr. KAZEN. I would call to the attention of the gentleman that that is a fact because of the work being done along the borders that is very, very important to this country.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would suggest to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas, that he read the testimony on this item before the subcommittee, which is in the printed hearings.

Mr. KAZEN. What did that testimony show? What does it show was the testimony of this Commission?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It indicated that the committee should be sent to St. Elizabeths if it tried to appropriate a nickel for this Commission.

Mr. KAZEN. Is this what the representatives of the Commission showed in their testimony?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think that they said that. I probably said that.

Now the gentleman knows that the people over there in the State Department agree that this is a ridiculous request—\$1,500,000 for something that we might never get off the books again. Now is the chance to get it off the books.

Mr. KAZEN. I just want to get in the RECORD the basis for the committee turning it down. If you say it was the Chairman of the Commission who made that statement—I will accept it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman would just take a copy of the

printed hearings, and I have one here for him, he can find out exactly who testified and what was said.

Mr. KAZEN. I just wanted something in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Chairman—that people representing this Commission made this statement that this Commission was not worth the money that they were asking for. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. KAZEN. That someone appeared before your committee representing this Commission and said that the Commission was not worth the amount of money that they were requesting.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Someone else suggested it, I thought.

Mr. KAZEN. I thought, Mr. Chairman, that you said this was in the testimony before your committee. I asked the distinguished gentleman if he meant it was someone who was representing and in favor of the request for this Commission who made this statement that the money was not needed for this Commission and that they should not appropriate a single penny for it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, no; I do not believe I said that. I was quoting someone that the gentleman knows who thought that \$400,000 would be tops for this Commission. But they are here asking for \$1,500,000 and the committee felt that they were not worth 15 cents.

Mr. KAZEN. I just wanted to get the record straight as to who was testifying before this committee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The record is in the printed hearings and if the gentleman would only pick up one of these volumes of printed hearings and read it, he will be thoroughly familiar with it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the spending in this fiscal year of almost \$480 million more than was approved for the State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies last year. Regardless of the purposes of the increases, this is far too much. This is not the way to fight inflation. If the increases represent new and necessary expenditures then some of the old programs ought to have been cut to accommodate the priorities.

We simply cannot go on spending at this rate and expect anything but national insolvency. I have no alternative but to vote against the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had

directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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, and was read the third time.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 366, nays 31, not voting 35, as follows:

	[Roll No. 122]	
	YEAS—366	
Adair	Caffery	Fallon
Adams	Camp	Farbstein
Addabbo	Carter	Fascell
Albert	Casey	Feighan
Alexander	Cederberg	Findley
Anderson,	Chamberlain	Fish
Anderson,	Chisholm	Fisher
Anderson,	Clancy	Flood
Anderson,	Clark	Flynt
Andrews, Ala.	Clausen,	Foley
Andrews,	Don H.	Ford, Gerald R.
N. Dak.	Clawson, Del	Ford,
Annunzio	Clay	William D.
Ashbrook	Cleveland	Foreman
Ashley	Cohelan	Fraser
Aspinall	Collier	Frelinghuysen
Ayres	Collins	Frey
Baring	Conable	Friedel
Barrett	Conte	Fulton, Pa.
Beall, Md.	Conyers	Fulton, Tenn.
Belcher	Corbett	Galfanakis
Bell, Calif.	Corman	Gallagher
Betts	Coughlin	Garmatz
Blaggi	Cowger	Gaydos
Blester	Cramer	Gettys
Bingham	Culver	Gialmo
Blanton	Cunningham	Gibbons
Blatnik	Daddario	Gilbert
Boggs	Daniels, N.J.	Goldwater
Boland	Davis, Wis.	Goodling
Bolling	Delaney	Gray
Bow	Dellenback	Green, Oreg.
Brademas	Denney	Green, Pa.
Brasco	Dennis	Griffiths
Bray	Dent	Grover
Brock	Derwinski	Gubser
Brooks	Devine	Gude
Broomfield	Diggs	Haley
Brotzman	Dingell	Hamilton
Brown, Calif.	Donohue	Hammer-
Brown, Mich.	Downing	schmidt
Brown, Ohio	Dulski	Hanley
Broyhill, N.C.	Duncan	Hanna
Burke, Fla.	Dwyer	Hansen, Wash.
Burke, Mass.	Eckhardt	Harsha
Burlison, Tex.	Edmondson	Harvey
Burlison, Mo.	Edwards, Calif.	Hastings
Burton, Calif.	Edwards, La.	Hathaway
Burton, Utah	Ellberg	Hays
Bush	Erlenborn	Hébert
Button	Esch	Hechler, W. Va.
Byrne, Pa.	Eshleman	Heckler, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Evans, Colo.	Helstoski
Cabell	Evins, Tenn.	Hicks

Hogan	Mize	Scheuer
Hollifield	Mizell	Schneebeli
Horton	Mollohan	Schwengel
Hosmer	Monagan	Scott
Hull	Moorhead	Sebelius
Hungate	Morgan	Shipley
Hunt	Morse	Shriver
Hutchinson	Mosher	Sikes
Ichord	Moss	Sisk
Jacobs	Murphy, Ill.	Skubitz
Jarman	Murphy, N.Y.	Slack
Joelson	Myers	Smith, Calif.
Johnson, Calif.	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Johnson, Pa.	Nedzi	Smith, N.Y.
Jonas	Nelsen	Snyder
Jones, Ala.	Nix	Springer
Jones, Tenn.	Obey	Stafford
Karth	O'Hara	Staggers
Kastenmeter	Olsen	Stanton
Kazen	O'Neill, Mass.	Steed
Kee	Ottinger	Stelger, Ariz.
Keith	Passman	Steiger, Wis.
King	Patten	Stubblefield
Kluczynski	Pelly	Stuckey
Koch	Pepper	Sullivan
Kyl	Perkins	Symington
Kyros	Pettis	Taft
Landgrebe	Philbin	Talcott
Landrum	Pickle	Taylor
Langen	Pike	Teague, Calif.
Latta	Pirnie	Thompson, N.J.
Leggett	Podell	Thomson, Wis.
Lloyd	Poff	Tierman
Long, Md.	Pollock	Udall
Lowenstein	Preyer, N.C.	Ullman
Lukens	Price, Ill.	Van Deerlin
McCarthy	Price, Tex.	Vander Jagt
McClary	Pryor, Ark.	Vanik
McCloskey	Pucinski	Vigorito
McClure	Purcell	Waggonner
McCulloch	Quile	Waldie
McDade	Quillen	Wampler
McDonald,	Rallsback	Watkins
Mich.	Randall	Watson
McEwen	Rees	Watts
McFall	Reid, Ill.	Weicker
McKneally	Reid, N.Y.	Whalen
McMillan	Reifel	Whalley
Macdonald,	Rhodes	White
Mass.	Riegle	Whitehurst
MacGregor	Roberts	Whitten
Madden	Robison	Widnall
Mahon	Rodino	Wiggins
Mailliard	Rogers, Colo.	Williams
Mann	Rogers, Fla.	Wilson, Bob
Marsh	Ronan	Wilson,
Martin	Rooney, N.Y.	Charles H.
Mathias	Rooney, Pa.	Winn
Matsunaga	Rosenthal	Wold
Mayne	Roth	Wolf
Meeds	Roudebush	Wright
Melcher	Roybal	Wyatt
Meskill	Ruppe	Wydler
Michel	Ruth	Wylie
Mikva	Ryan	Wyman
Miller, Calif.	St. Onge	Yates
Miller, Ohio	Sandman	Yatron
Millis	Satterfield	Young
Minish	Saylor	Zablocki
Mink	Schadeberg	Zion
Minshall	Scherle	Zwach

NAYS—31

Abernethy	Flowers	Montgomery
Bennett	Fountain	Nichols
Bevill	Fuqua	O'Neal, Ga.
Brinkley	Gonzalez	Patman
Buchanan	Griffin	Rarick
Chappell	Gross	Rivers
Colmer	Hagan	Stephens
Daniel, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Thompson, Ga.
Dickinson	Henderson	Utt
Dowdy	Jones, N.C.	
Edwards, Ala.	Lennon	

NOT VOTING—35

Abbott	Dorn	Morton
Anderson, Ill.	Hall	O'Konski
Arends	Halpern	Poage
Berry	Hawkins	Powell
Blackburn	Howard	Reuss
Broyhill, Va.	Kirwan	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Kleppe	St Germain
Carey	Kuykendall	Stokes
Celler	Lipscomb	Stratton
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Lujan	Tunney
de la Garza	May	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Poage with Mr. Kleppe.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Abitt with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. May.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FOUNTAIN, and Mr. PATMAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE COMMENDATION AND GRATITUDE OF THE HOUSE TO THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE NATIONAL SPACE PROGRAM ON THE OCCASION OF THE APOLLO 11 MISSION

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 487) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 487

Whereas the United States has completed its first decade in space, with the combined talents of Government, industry, and education having been effectively employed in the space program to open a new frontier; and

Whereas in the development of the space program science and technology have been brought to new levels of achievement, and inspiration and intellectual stimulation have been generated not only for the people of the United States but for the entire world; and

Whereas the mission of Apollo 11, representing as it does the first real step by mankind into the universe beyond the planet on which we live, is not only a great adventure but demonstrates substantial progress toward the achievement of the objectives originally expressed in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958; and

Whereas the achievement of these objectives—the expansion of human knowledge,

the improvement of aeronautical and space vehicles, the development of information useful to our national defense, and the preservation of the United States' role as a leader in space science and technology and its application for peaceful purposes, with international cooperation in the peaceful application of the program's results—has importance for our Nation far beyond the specific areas of science and technology to which the program directly relates; and

Whereas this mission provides a uniquely appropriate occasion for expressing public appreciation of the past achievements of the space program and public recognition of the potential of such program for benefits to mankind in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commends the magnificent team of men and women throughout the United States and the world at large, in Government, industry, and education, who have contributed so much to the accomplishments of our national space program; and expresses gratitude and appreciation, for itself and on behalf of the American people, for the outstanding dedication and tireless effort of all those who have been associated with the Apollo program in general and the Apollo 11 mission in particular.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Today we have seen the consummation of the ambitious statement made by President Kennedy less than 10 years ago that we would put a man on the moon and return him safely to earth within the decade of the 1960's. This has been a great accomplishment.

Those of us who are privileged to be alive today will pass this on to our children and our grandchildren, and they in turn will brag about the fact that we were here.

The flight of Apollo 11 is perhaps the greatest secular achievement that the world has ever seen. I do not have to tell you that. You have followed the adventure very closely. I am happy to say that these men are now back on the planet earth. They are in the quarantine van. For the 22d time we have sent men into space and brought them back.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are a proud and happy people today. The safe splashdown of the Apollo 11 in the Pacific Ocean has brought to an end the most amazing journey in man's history.

As ranking Republican member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, as well as the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, I know what a tremendous effort has been made by so many people over the years to bring about the successful flight of Apollo 11.

The courage, creativity and competence demonstrated by every individual on the NASA team is a tribute to our American heritage.

Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins are to be congratulated in the manner in which they accomplished man's first lunar landing,

and the entire NASA team is to be commended on the successful completion of this mission.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I shall be happy to yield to our distinguished Speaker, but before doing so I would like to say that the gentleman in the well, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is as much responsible for the establishment of NASA and the space effort as any man in the United States.

He chaired the ad hoc committee that put together the space law and I am very happy to yield to him now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are all very happy with the successful accomplishment of this most difficult, sensitive, and historic feat. Not so long ago it was thought to be impossible, but this shows what America can do—the brains and ingenuity of Americans and the courage of Americans.

We all watched the commander, Nell Armstrong, and Colonel Aldrin when they were walking on the moon carrying out their very dangerous and historic mission, and we all watched Lieutenant Colonel Collins when he was in close proximity, performing his very difficult and delicate task and duty in connection with the two astronauts who actually landed on the moon.

The entire world paused—that part of the world in particular who were permitted by their governments to know of the mission to the moon and of the accomplishments that resulted therefrom. The entire world admired what these three men did and also admired the thousands of others who contributed to the successful accomplishment of this mission.

All of America is proud, and justly so. Without going further into detail on this occasion, I think it is only proper that these three brave Americans be properly recognized by the Congress of the United States. I have conferred with the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) and the leadership on the other side, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), and I have also talked over the telephone with the majority leader of the Senate, and I know that the minority leader of the Senate would be in complete accord, and it is our intention after the recess, which will be the earliest time possible, to accord these three distinguished gentlemen, these Americans, the fullest recognition that the Congress of the United States can afford to them by inviting them to attend a joint meeting of the Congress of the United States. I think this is an appropriate time for me to make this statement and to make this announcement. I know that NASA will cooperate in every way possible.

So, again, we are proud of them. I know I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues in the House and the sentiments of all Americans in extending to them our congratulations and in thanking God that He, in his wisdom, guided and directed and protected them, not

only in their dangerous journey to the moon, but also in their successful arrival back in the United States.

I also congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for the outstanding legislative leadership given through the years in the successful accomplishment of this mission to the moon.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California permit me to yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear that these three brave astronauts—Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins—will be invited to address a joint meeting of the Congress shortly after their return in the month of August. This is one way in which we can dramatically express to them our gratitude and our appreciation for their heroic effort and their scientific achievement.

As I was watching, on the memorable night of Sunday, the step-by-step movement of Neil Armstrong from LEM onto the moon, naturally I was proud of him and all those associated with him in this magnificent team effort.

But I believe it would be appropriate also to mention at this point that my memory went back to a sad and tragic episode of our space program. I believe it was January 1967 when I was notified, as all others connected with the program in one way or another were notified, that three equally brave astronauts had lost their lives in a tragedy at Cape Kennedy. It made a particular impact on me, because Roger Chaffee, one of the three, came from my home town of Grand Rapids, Mich. Roger Chaffee lost his life, as did Gus Grissom and Ed White on that occasion.

As one would imagine, that tragedy, the loss of Roger Chaffee's life has left an indelible imprint on our community because he was an outstanding young man and he represented all that was the best in our Nation. The fine parents of Roger Chaffee were deeply affected by the loss of their wonderful son. However, they, I am sure, have been as proud of what Neil Armstrong and his associates have done, even though their son, Gus Grissom, and Ed White lost their lives in the program.

I wish to say that we on our side wholeheartedly concur in the resolution offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. This is a way the Congress can express its gratitude and our appreciation for what has been accomplished not only by the three astronauts themselves but also by all those associated with the program.

This is truly and typically an American achievement which deserves the highest commendation by those of us elected to the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very

much the remarks made by my distinguished friend.

In conclusion, we are looking forward, at the coming joint meeting, to meeting and honoring these distinguished Americans who have brought great credit not only upon themselves and their families but also upon our beloved country. Their accomplishment, as we look into the future, will be a marked contribution toward a better pathway for mankind.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the majority leader, a former member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, join the distinguished Speaker, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics in expressing our congratulations to three brave, great, and talented men who are also Americans.

I join the entire world in offering a prayer of thanksgiving to almighty God that these men have safely returned after successfully accomplishing their mission. What they have done is a part of the miracle of America—the strength, the ingenuity, the dedication, which this great Republic is capable of putting into any task. Our great space team not only accomplished its mission but achieved a splashdown almost on the precise second for which it was programmed when the mission was first setup.

If the world lasts a million years, men will still have to say that it was the genius and courage of America that first conquered the mysteries of outer space. We are thankful not only as Americans but as human beings that these three extraordinary men have done this on behalf of our country and mankind.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, a decade ago, the thought of two Americans setting foot on the moon before 1970 seemed absolutely unbelievable. Curiously, the magnitude of this achievement is such that Sunday night's moon walk still seems unbelievable. Man has progressed so far and so fast in so short a time, I hesitate to predict the wonders that await us during the next decade.

The moon landing is more than a tribute to astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, and is more than a tribute to the efforts of those so completely engaged in our space efforts. The moon landing is a tribute to our entire system of free enterprise, a system where man is spurred on to greater and greater achievements because he reaps the rewards of his own labor.

Three Delaware firms deserve special recognition for their own major contributions to the success of the space flight. ILC Industries in Dover has been under contract to the National Aeronautics and

Space administration for almost 4 years to produce all the space suits used in the Apollo series. The commemorative stamp for Apollo 11 will show an astronaut wearing an ILC suit. I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a brief advertisement that appeared in the Delaware State News on Monday, July 21:

TAKE ONE GIANT STEP

The first step onto the lunar surface by Neil Armstrong was truly a giant step . . . for mankind . . . for our country's technology in the eyes of the world . . . and for thousands of individuals in our space industry.

This giant step was made possible through years of effort by a hard-working, dedicated team—people in industrial firms who have assisted ILC Industries during our years as prime contractor to NASA for the Project Apollo space suits.

We congratulate astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins and the entire NASA-Industry team for their outstanding accomplishments. We are proud to be associated with them and we are especially proud of our role in Project Apollo.

Apollo 11 represents a "bench mark" in space progress but it is also the first of a series of scheduled lunar landings. With each subsequent flight and exploration comes new data, new requirements and new challenges. To meet present challenges and those to come ILC Industries will continue to supply the best available equipment. We are committed to an intensive, long-range program of continually improving equipment and we plan to play a vital role in man's future conquests of space.

Hercules, Inc., based in Wilmington, has actually been involved in our space program since 1915, when the company provided smokeless powder for Dr. Robert Goddard's exploratory rocket flights. It was a Hercules motor that boosted the third stage of Pioneer I into orbit, in 1958, and Hercules motors have powered a total of more than 100 unmanned space flights. Hercules has provided oxidizer for all Apollo flights, producing 35,000 pounds of oxidizer for Apollo 11 alone. And a subsidiary of Hercules produced almost 60 miles of wiring for the Apollo 11 command module and lunar module.

The other Delaware company that should be saluted is E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., which had a hand in many different areas of the command module and the Eagle, the craft which rested on the Sea of Tranquility. An article from the Wilmington Evening Journal, July 21, 1969, sums up Du Pont's role quite well:

DU PONT KEEPS TRIO WELL SUITED—SEVEN DEPARTMENTS AID APOLLO CREW

Products manufactured by seven Du Pont Co. departments will be aboard Apollo 11.

In the moon suit, each of the 21 layers either contains or is made entirely of products developed by Du Pont.

Nylon provides strength for restraint layers, while neoprene-coated nylon is used as bladder material and ripstop in the pressure garment. Non-woven Dacron polyester fiber is spacer material between layers of aluminized Mylar polyester film, which provides thermal protection.

Aluminized Kapton polyimide film is also used for thermal insulation. Fiberglass coated with Teflon TFE fluorocarbon, forms an outer layer, more than half of which is covered with fabric of Teflon yarn for abra-

sion protection. Nomex high temperature nylon provides an inner protective layer.

Aluminized Kapton and Mylar cover the exterior of the Lunar Module to provide protection against the extreme heat and cold. Kapton is used as electrical insulation on 14 miles of wiring in the module. Inner wall panels of the Command Module are made of Pyralin polyimide impregnated sheets.

When not in their spacesuits, astronauts wear white coveralls of Teflon fiber. TFE monofilament is used in a Velcro patch on the soles of the astronauts' footwear which enables them to position themselves in the weightless environment.

As the LM approaches the lunar surface the astronauts will use telescopically photographed lunar landing maps printed on Cronopaque polyester print film.

Couches in the command module are made of Armalon TFE-fluorocarbon-coated glass fabric; felts of similar material are used as gaskets. More than 15 miles of wiring in the module is insulated with Teflon TFE fluorocarbon resin.

High strength hydrogen peroxide is used to power attitude controls. Ludox colloidal silica serves in the booster's thermal insulation and Freon fluorocarbon propellant is used to pressurize the capsule's fire control system.

Parts incorporating polyimide resin—a high temperature resistant plastic—are used throughout the command module in applications such as circuit breakers, scuff covers and food boxes.

The movie and TV cameras astronauts will use on the lunar surface depend on Vespel precision parts of polyimide resin.

Krytox fluorinated grease and oil, which have no ignition point, are used as lubricants in the moon suit and in Command and Lunar Modules.

When the capsule and its passengers have returned from the lunar surface, parachutes of Du Pont nylon will cushion their splashdown.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, today three men have returned safely from a successful flight to the moon. While many of us, myself included, have expressed serious doubts about the necessity and the expense of our huge space program, I am sure I speak for all Americans in expressing gratitude to God for their safe return and pride in their magnificent accomplishment.

The number of scientific byproducts from our space program, which may well revolutionize our way of life, is impressive. Because of our space program, we have put satellites in orbit for instant communication with the world, developed fantastic new computers, accomplished great things in the miniaturization of electronic equipment and have made great breakthroughs in weather forecasting. And these are just four of many examples I could name.

In addition, the landing on the moon and future explorations will greatly expand man's knowledge about himself and the origin of his earth. It may also help him to preserve his planet.

Finally, I sensed in scenes across the Nation a new spirit of unity and purpose, at least for the moment. Perhaps the flight of Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins can fulfill President Nixon's hope of "bringing us together."

Besides the progress we have already made, scientists tell us of the potential for many more achievements. I have heard that in the zero-gravity conditions of a manned orbiting laboratory a

new structural material, lighter in weight but stronger than anything yet known, can be produced. We will increase our knowledge of earthquakes, leading to a day when perhaps we can predict or even prevent them.

In all of this, Purdue University has made significant contributions. This great educational institution is located in West Lafayette, Ind., within the Second District, which I am privileged to represent.

Neil Armstrong, the first man to set foot on lunar soil, is a 1955 aeronautical engineering graduate of Purdue. Two of the men who lost their lives in the tragic launching pad fire of 1967, Virgil "Gus" Grissom and Roger Chaffee, are also Purdue men, as is Eugene Cernan, whose achievement aboard Apollo 10 paved the way for Apollo 11's success.

Purdue's faculty has also contributed mightily to the NASA program. Dr. Donald Stullken, a Ph. D. graduate of Purdue and a former faculty member there, was the man in charge of the recovery program, the final step in the safe return of America's spacemen. Dr. Gerald A. Leonards of Purdue assisted in the design of the lunar module's landing gear. Dr. Leonards, with five other Purdue professors, also designed the soil sampler which will be used by the men of Apollo 12 to bring back an uncontaminated sample of lunar soil. The other five men who developed this sampler are Profs. William H. Perloff, Edwin J. Kirsch, William Baron, Joseph Modrey, and Kenneth E. Botkin. Also, Dr. Joe Waling, associate dean of the Purdue Graduate School, is the regional secretary of the University Space Research Association.

Purdue's famous astronaut and Purdue's professors are only part of the story. This great Indiana school has also educated many other men who have gone on to contribute quietly, but effectively, to our lunar achievement. Purdue graduates involved in the NASA program include:

Alpha R. Bond, chief of the Resources Management Branch, Marshall Space Flight Center; Ervin S. Boothman, project engineer, Marshall Space Flight Center; Gene T. Bridwell, manager, Saturn V S-II Stage Propulsion Subsystems, Marshall Space Flight Center; Alfred N. Caves, flight management, Spacecraft Operations Branch, Goddard Space Flight Center; James E. Dening, Data Requirements Information Systems Branch, Kennedy Space Flight Center; Richard E. Dozung, technical management specialist, Office of Manned Space Flight; Charles E. Foggett, aerospace engineer, Manned Space Flight Center; Joseph M. Haas, quality engineer, Quality Assurance Directorate, Kennedy Space Flight Center; Donald Lovall, aerospace technician, Information Systems Branch, Kennedy Space Flight Center; Clyde Metherton, launch flight operations planner, Launch Operations Directorate, Kennedy Space Flight Center; George E. Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, Washington; Ronald D. Paulus, special assistant for Inter-Center Configurations Management, Kennedy Space Flight Center; John R. Schaibley, ex-

ecutive assistant to the Apollo Program Director, Washington; Robert J. Schwinghamer, Jr., chief materials director, Astronautics Laboratory, Marshall Space Flight Center; James R. Shaw, flight systems engineer, NASA; Leland D. Smith, procurement analyst, Marshall Space Flight Center; James J. Taylor, chief, Advanced Mission Studies Section, Manned Space Flight Center, and Robert K. Wolf, mechanical engineer, Marshall Space Flight Center.

From this impressive list of Purdue men who have done so much for our space program, it is obvious that when I congratulate the men of Apollo, I also congratulate Purdue University.

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the world has never been so united in its emotions as it is today as we hail the astronauts of Apollo 11 on their safe return from the moon. Each successive step in this venture has made the event more incredible, more historic, and more indicative of what can soon be done. The landing on the moon, the moon walk, the takeoff from the surface, the redocking with the command module and now the safe reentry and landing: as great as each of these events were in and of themselves, each succeeding one made the previous one that much greater.

It is a tremendous tribute to our technology that we achieved any of these successes, but the totality of them is what awes us today. At no point did we fail. We set out to place men on the moon and to bring them safely back from the moon and this we did. The elements of planning were impeccable: from the facts as they were known the men of Apollo drew the proper conclusions and made their preparations accordingly. The possible contingencies which might arise in such an unfamiliar situation stagger the imagination. It is to the everlasting credit of the men responsible that in the event their plans were not found wanting.

Nor did the mechanics of Apollo 11 ever falter. Engines which had never fired in space did so faultlessly. No gadget broke, no dial failed to register, no wire failed to conduct. Apollo 11 was astonishing in its complexity and hence the more astonishing still in the infallibility of its machinery. The craftsmanship responsible must certainly rank with the finest in the world that has ever been produced.

Of course, much had to be left to the judgment of the astronauts themselves and they shouldered this burden in a way that makes us all proud to be their fellow citizens. While the world waited Neil Armstrong skillfully navigated the lunar module across a hundred yards of rocky terrain to a perfect soft landing. Intrepidity has always been the hallmark of the pioneer and it was present in full measure this week despite all of the scientific trappings.

The sky is no longer the limit for man. We watched on Sunday night as the astronauts moved freely and proudly in an alien environment. Far from what the social scientists would term their natural habitat, the space explorers established that man is a more marvelous and versatile creation than we had ever

thought. Our spiritual horizons have always stretched to eternity; now our physical horizons do so too.

The potential of man is immeasurably expanded by that moment in which Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin first hopped across the face of the moon.

The competence of all the men involved; the men who planned; the men who built; the men who flew has earned our applause and inspired our confidence. But I think that we all held our breaths and silently prayed this morning that this last vital step might go well. It has indeed.

All of the countries around the globe are now our neighbors more nearly than ever before and while we celebrate mankind's triumph together and congratulate those to whom this success is owed, it is meet that we remember the higher thanks which we owe to Him who granted to us our talents and stood with each of us during this crucial moment in the life of man.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today, the 24th of July, 1969, is one of the great days in history. Not only does the day mean the safe recovery of our three brave astronauts from the moon, but this day marks the 122d anniversary of Mormon pioneers who entered the Salt Lake Valley in 1847.

The Mormon pioneers—who traveled the many miles from Nauvoo, Ill.—suffered the pains of hunger, disease, and even death as they crossed the treacherous mountains, the barren plains, braved the cold during the winter, to finally end their journey as Brigham Young announced, "This is the place."

Now, today, other pioneers in space have safely come back to earth. I think the two events this day somewhat parallel each other—the Mormon pioneers who made the "desert blossom as the rose" in the Salt Lake Valley—and our astronauts who pioneered the surface of the moon, which may make way for mankind to progress with civilization even further than we have before—certainly should receive the tribute of a grateful nation.

My ancestors crossed the plains in covered wagons to begin a new life. Now, our colleagues have crossed space to perhaps a new way of life on other planets.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for this resolution honoring the people and institutions that made possible the astonishing success of our space program.

No one person—nor any group of persons—can claim exclusive credit for the lunar landing. Apollo 11's historic mission took the pioneer work of visionaries like Kepler, Tsiolkovsky, and Goddard—men who were hooted at in their own time. It took the work of contemporary theoreticians such as Wernher von Braun, John Houbolt, and Charles Draper. It took the work of literally millions of scientists, administrators, technicians, and other workers associated with NASA and private industry.

Special credit should go to Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins, and NASA's administrators, but we should keep in mind that this staggering achievement is the end product of cen-

turies of work by millions of people in virtually every part of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include with my remarks editorials published by the Springfield, Mass. Daily News and the Springfield Union, and a New York Times column by James Reston—all discussing the significance of the lunar landing.

The editorials follow:

A GENESIS IN SPACE

Man's first landing and exploration of the moon is a genesis which begins to cut the universe down to human size and opens the way for the exploration of other planets by future generations.

Astronaut Neil A. Armstrong—the first man on the moon—described his initial step on the lunar surface as: "One small step for man—one giant leap for mankind."

President Richard M. Nixon, speaking from the White House to Astronauts Armstrong and Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., summed up the feelings of millions of Americans and countless millions the world over when he said: "Because of what you have done, the heavens have become part of man's world."

However, the historic Apollo 11 flight is a dramatic ending point just as much as it marks the beginning of a new space era.

Up until 10:56 p.m. last night when Astronaut Armstrong stepped gingerly off the lunar module ladder onto the dusty surface of the moon, man had been bound by the fears of the ages which warned him that the moon is a dark and forbidding place which contains all kinds of unknown perils.

Despite all his scientific knowledge and the amazing workings of his computers, man was an explorer into the unknown on this mission to the moon—just as Columbus, the polar explorers, the American pioneers, and Charles Lindbergh embarked into mysterious and uncharted regions with no assurances that they would succeed.

Astronauts Armstrong and Aldrin discovered, in the short space of only a couple of hours, that the moon is not such a terrifying place after all. Moving cautiously at first, they soon began to bounce around on the lunar surface with an almost reckless abandon which highlighted an amazing live telecast to astonished earthlings.

This was the ending point on the Sea of Tranquility landing site—the signal from the moon to earth that man had cut himself loose from centuries of fears which chained him to this planet.

It would, however, despite the vast implications of the first moon touchdown and lunar exploration, be premature to say that man has "conquered" the moon.

The Apollo 11 mission itself still has a number of difficult maneuvers to perform before Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Michael Collins, the command module pilot, return safely to earth.

And, although the first lunar exploration surpassed the success-expectations of everyone concerned, a series of other Apollo flights will be needed to tell us all we want to know about the moon's surface. Subsequent missions will expand, also dramatically, on this initial Eagle-Columbia probe.

Meanwhile, the U.S. space program must be reviewed as a cumulative effort despite the glory which properly belongs to Apollo 11.

It was only a shade over eight years ago that the United States sent its first man into space when Navy Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard Jr. ventured forth on the first suborbital flight in Freedom 7 on May 5, 1961.

John H. Glenn Jr. became a national and global hero on Feb. 20, 1962, when Friendship 7 orbited the earth three times in less than five hours.

And, only last December, Astronauts Frank Borman, James A. Lovell Jr. and William A.

Anders became the first men to orbit the moon.

Every astronaut who has flown into space in the Gemini and Apollo programs has been a pioneer in the truest sense of the word. And the thousands of scientists who have spent untold hours at their drawing boards, in the laboratories, and at the computers have been coequal pioneers.

America and the world salutes the first men on the moon. But, even more, we pay tribute to man's will to know and conquer his universe—a determination which has joined all of us together as pioneers who share this space triumph of Apollo 11.

FOOTPRINTS ON THE MOON

Probably the most spectacular—possibly the most significant—achievement of mankind is now on the record. What this "Year of the Moon" will mean to future generations is difficult to imagine. But for now the voyage of Apollo 11 has spread a kind of excitement that knows no boundaries. The world is paying tribute to the courage of Astronauts Aldrin, Armstrong and Collins, and to this nation's leadership in space.

The question of whether man, with his present knowledge and inventive capacity, can walk on the moon and survive there for a limited period, at least, has been answered clearly in the affirmative. But there was, it seemed not much doubt on this score. More speculative has been the ultimate relationship between man and the earth's only satellite. That broad and complex question is still unresolved.

Physically, the moon is a dismal place in the context of man's existence on earth, and its use as anything more than an interesting place for a very brief visit may continue in doubt for some time. Some scientists believe the moon will never be anything but an inhospitable slag pile, as far as man's survival there is concerned. With no atmosphere, the lunar surface is open to the full impact of space radiations. Temperature ranges from 260 degrees Fahrenheit below zero to 240 degrees above. Meteoroids can slam into the moon at 45 miles per second.

If the expense of getting a man to the moon was out of all proportion to the benefits, as many Americans have felt, it would be dwarfed by the expense of keeping a manned laboratory—or a colony of settlers—there for a prolonged period. Special shelters, perhaps under the surface, would probably be necessary, to say nothing of all the sophisticated life-sustaining equipment that would be needed. Even then, unsuspected hazards could make such a project completely unrealistic, and the moon might have to be written off as valueless for any human activity.

What the Apollo 11 astronauts have found may, in fact, determine the shape of whatever space exploration there is to be in the future—whether the moon can be used as a staging area for deeper space probes and whether there is anything to be derived from manned exploration of the moon itself. The Soviet Union may have suggested the better way—the gathering of materials by robot vehicles that can be sent to the moon and brought back.

The philosophy that man was never meant to venture to another celestial body may be supported by the obstacles he encounters. On the other hand, he was endowed with qualities that have enabled him to go as far as landing on the moon. The same qualities will determine what more he can do—but more importantly, what he should do.

THE MOON AND 1976

(By James Reston)

One of the lessons of the present spectacular voyage to the moon is that the American mind and the American political system seem to need great challenges and clear goals to work at their best.

Humiliations and disasters help, too. The American people are watching this flight with their uttermost pride, but it was the hurt to their pride—first in the Soviet Sputnik I flight of 1957 and then in Yuri Gagarin's first human venture into space in 1960—that created the psychological and political conditions for the United States decision to go to the moon.

Even then, President Kennedy might not have aimed so high as the moon if it had not been for his disastrous gamble at the Bay of Pigs. After that it was clear that something had to be done. Thus the formula for success: disaster, challenge, and a vivid objective to be achieved by a date certain.

THE NEW GOAL

Fortunately, these same ingredients exist for another great adventure in the seventies. It would be hard to describe our race relations as anything but a disgrace, and Vietnam makes the Bay of Pigs look like a regrettable incident. The challenge to the American pride, imagination and organized intelligence of these stains on the national record is clear and the two hundredth anniversary of 1776 is just close enough and yet far enough away to give us a definite target in time.

THE COMPLICATED JOURNEY

It is, to be sure, a more complicated journey. It is harder to concentrate the mind on creating a just and decent society than it is to mobilize the intelligence and machinery to rocket to the moon. Human nature is more volatile and less predictable than the chemicals, fuels, and measurable mathematics of rockets and electronics. Still, the challenge is clear and the anniversary of the nation's birth has emotional and political possibilities that should not be underestimated.

In July of 1969, we are just seven years away from the 200th year since the Declaration of Independence. That is two years less than the time between the decision to go to the moon and the present culmination of that decision, but it is a goal of great historical significance, and it provides an opportunity to channel the energies and talents of the American people toward the national purpose and ideal.

This is not a new idea. Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon have all talked occasionally about it. The citizens of Philadelphia naturally led the parade, and committees of distinguished citizens have been formed all over the country to prepare for the great celebration.

But it has not yet become a central point and aim of national policy and is not part of the conscious public mind. The funds, the brains, the organization that went into the objective of going to the moon have not been mobilized and directed toward achieving certain definite social and economic objectives, and this is a missed opportunity.

THE PRESIDENT'S OPPORTUNITY

There is an enormous difference between appointing committees for a celebration seven years away and setting a goal for achieving definite national, state, and community goals. It takes leadership from the White House, organization and funds to create a national awareness of problems to be solved in thousands of communities by July of 1976, but this could be done.

It is much more difficult than persuading the Congress to appropriate funds to beat the Russians to the moon and then organizing the scientists, engineers and industry to produce the machines and train a limited number of brave men.

THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM

Landing successfully on 1976 involves making the voyage and the goal, or at least the question, clear to the leaders of every community of the nation, but the thing could

be done. Not with the precision of the astronauts, to be sure, but greatly to the achievement and redemption of the ideals of the American Declaration.

If done, this might be more important to the Republic in the end than landing on the moon. But the moon project may have given us the key. It had imagination. It mobilized intelligence. It had a specific goal within a specific time, and the goal was to do something no man had ever done before.

Maybe the analogy is wrong. Space science and political science could not be more different. But the whole idea of America was to create a society nobody had ever created before, and it could be that the moon-men, with their concentration, purpose and time-schedule have shown us the way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in support of House Resolution 487 and to join my colleagues in expressing gratitude for the Apollo 11 astronauts' safe return to this earth. This has been as exciting and as historic a week as any that our Nation has ever known. A Chinese philosopher said, "May we live in interesting times." We can be thankful that we have that privilege.

In watching the launching of Apollo 11 at Cape Kennedy, I was impressed by the tension, the excitement, the jubilation, and cheers as the rocket left the earth and thundered into space. I thought of the fact that this missile weighed 6½ million pounds, which is the equivalent of over 2,000 automobiles, each weighing 3,000 pounds. I thought of a statement that Astronaut John Glenn made when he was speaking to a joint session of Congress, that he was glad that pride in this country and its accomplishments is not a thing of the past. I believe that the space program has done much to restore American prestige in the eyes of the world and to make people in other nations proud of this Yankee daring, with the whole world watching. At Cape Kennedy, I studied carefully an Apollo capsule. The crowded quarters increased my sympathy for the men who had to live in the capsule for over a week. The compact mass of switches and control gadgets increased my respect for the knowledge of the astronauts who operate them.

The question has been frequently asked, "Why spend so much money on space exploration, while millions on earth are in need?" Of course, the space money goes to American industries, businesses, and individuals, and much of it comes back to the Federal Government in taxes. Also, the space program is tied closely to our national defense efforts. Had Hitler perfected the V-2 rocket a few years earlier, he likely would have won World War II. The nation with the most know-how in space is apt to be the one most powerful militarily on earth.

Also, it is this advance in science and technology which has produced for America our dynamic industrial economy. It has made America the economic powerhouse of this century. Without it, our economy could be like that of China or India or Central America. This advance in technology and know-how has enabled most American citizens to rise above the poverty level and to share in the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any people. Scientific and technological development must continue.

One lesson that we can learn from the last week is that our Nation can accomplish wonders when there is a total national commitment and when people are willing to work together. A total of 17,000 industries and businesses, and a total of one-half million people had a part in developing the Apollo 11 missile and in making the trip to the moon possible.

I believe that even greater accomplishments can be made in the space field if the other technically-advanced nations joined the United States in future space exploration. Today I became a cosponsor of a concurrent resolution, inviting other nations to join ours in future space efforts. I believe the time is right for national rivalry in the realm of space to be put aside and for a truly international space effort to begin.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to take this historic occasion to wish our astronauts a safe journey home and compliment them—and the thousands who contributed to their voyage—on their majestic achievement. This is truly a triumphant hour for the human race.

The first landing of men on the moon has been brought about through unexcelled organization and hard work. It is living testimony to the unlimited potential of human ingenuity diligently applied.

Many of us would recommend, however, that in future space projects the United States seek a greater balance between manned and unmanned operations Earth Resources Satellites—ERS—hold great promise. Among their uses are monitoring crops and water resources, precise, long-range weather forecasting, and guidance for navigational traffic. An accelerated ERS program would yield an immediate return on the taxpayers' investment.

And surely, Mr. Speaker, as we are exploring space we should also be able to investigate the dark labyrinth of human fear, poverty, and violence. Surely, in the light of today's achievements, man has the needed technology to raise the poor, the sick, the dying, and the persecuted here on this earth to a more livable existence. I would hope that we might apply that same devotion and organizational know-how to the ponderous social problems now confronting us, and vow that there, as with the moon landing, hopes will become plans, and dreams will become destiny.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this first landing of human beings on the surface of the moon is surely one of the great events in all of human history. Only a few short years ago the idea of having men travel in space seemed fantastic.

That this is an enormous technological achievement is obvious. Needless to say it has come about only as a result of many years of hard work by thousands of dedicated scientists, engineers, administrators, and skilled workers.

It is, however, more than merely an illustration of scientific genius. It represents a new venture of the human spirit.

Sunday, July 20, 1969, will be marked forever as the day man transcended the

bonds of his nature and his environment, and the human race entered a new era leading to realms beyond comprehension and even beyond imagination. Now one can believe that the limitations to the accomplishments of man are set only by the limitations of the human spirit.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we thank God for the safe return today of our three heroic astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins.

We cannot visualize the extensiveness of the progress made in the world of science and technology, because of this moon landing and subsequent reentry. And we are probably incapable of comprehending how much prestige this voyage to the moon will bring to our Nation.

Man's exploration of the moon, the flawless flight of Apollo 11, is the most monumental and significant achievement of this youthful Nation and possibly of the entire world.

I feel especially proud today that our space efforts have been so successful and that I am privileged to live in this great land at the time of this remarkable and historically unequalled experience.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 487 introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. MILLER, one of the great leaders in our national space program. It is indeed appropriate that the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) should on the occasion of the return of our three brave astronauts from the moon cite the participation of all Americans in this great undertaking. The Apollo program has required the effort of over 400,000 talented people throughout the United States and the world. At the peak of the Apollo effort over 20,000 contractors and subcontractors throughout the United States and the free world have made major contributions to this magnificent achievement.

Today we stand on the threshold of a new era in science and technology. I need not remind my colleagues that science and technology is one of the basic ingredients that makes our Nation great. Without this Nation's acceptance of the challenge to seek new knowledge and to utilize it for the betterment of mankind we would not be in the position to offer hope for improved opportunities for all the people of this world.

The flight of Apollo 11 has demonstrated man's capability to learn and work in a new environment. Millions of Americans have contributed to this effort. Our universities, industry, and Government have teamed to apply the knowledge developed by our fundamental researchers and with that have built a complex but practical system for space exploration and its ultimate utilization.

It is significant to note that one of the experiments conducted on the moon to analyze the solar winds was an experiment developed and provided by the Swiss. Even today we have the beginnings of international cooperation in our national space program. We already have cooperated with over 20 countries in cooperative project agreements in space sciences. We work today with 72 nations

in ground base space related programs. Apollo 11 points the way to bringing nations throughout the free world even more intimately into our space effort.

The flight of Lunar 15 at the time of the Apollo 11 lunar landing and the exchange of information between astronaut Frank Borman and Soviet officials give hope, at least, that our national space program can provide the ground on which international understanding may be improved.

It is my view that our space program is already contributing significantly to the growth and well-being of our society. Through NASA's technology utilization program over 900 innovations developed from the research and development of our national space program are finding applications in our industry.

A strong basis and fundamental research is being supported through our national space effort in our educational institutions throughout this country.

Today we take communications satellites and weather satellites for granted but the potential for the utilization of space for scientific exploration has only begun to be realized. We are at the point in our space effort where it will be necessary to make major decisions on our future directions. We have the capability to explore the solar system by means of automated or manned spacecraft. We have the opportunity to utilize near space for the benefit of mankind in various resource applications.

We may find it valuable over the next several decades to send men on voyages within our solar system. In the next few months and years we should build on the achievements of Apollo 11 and its predecessor flights to assure a balanced national space program.

So today we salute not only astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., but also all the people of America in the fulfillment of our national goal of a lunar landing in this decade set by President Kennedy only 8 short years ago.

We welcome those brave men back to earth and thank God for their safe return.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a licensed airplane and helicopter pilot, I have witnessed many great experiences in the air, but the successful landing of our astronauts on the moon with the Apollo 11 mission was the greatest expeditionary thrill of my life.

I want to join our beloved Speaker, Mr. McCORMACK, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. FORD, and our great majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. MILLER, and all of my colleagues in offering humble congratulations to these brave Americans on this most magnificent feat. I know all of the people of the 21st Congressional District in southern Illinois are rejoicing with the rest of the Nation in this historic event.

We will all be looking forward to the joint session of Congress at which time we can personally extend our felicitations, thanks, and best wishes.

A new day has dawned in America.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, they are home; Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins are home at last and the en-

tire Nation—perhaps the entire world—can breathe a sigh of relief.

How can we ever thank these men? How will we ever adequately recognize the thousands of faceless technicians who made this magnificent gift possible? Their gift to mankind is not fully recognized; they have presented us with technological advancement that will have impact on every American life.

We are a proud Nation and it is my fervent hope that we will translate this pride into action. Let us help the world keep peace with this "giant leap for mankind." Some results have been immediate; we know well the way our space technology has been integrated into the field of medicine, for example.

This is indeed a compliment to the military, industrial, and scientific complex.

Mr. Speaker, we are extremely proud of the chairman of the House committee, the Honorable GEORGE MILLER, and of his understudy, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE. We are proud of the work of Dr. Thomas Paine, NASA Administrator—and of Dr. George Mueller, Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight.

I also know this Nation owes a special thanks today to former President Lyndon B. Johnson for the way he—more than any other man in America—insisted on embarkation of this program and who literally pushed the Congress into this great adventure as a U.S. Senator, as Vice President, and as President. Without his early leadership and without his strong recommendations to President Kennedy, I wonder when and if we would have reached the moon. We have dared the heavens and we have won. To President Johnson, our Nation again says "thank you," for your contribution.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and to join my colleagues in extending congratulations to the three brave astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Mike Collins, and Edwin—Buzz—Aldrin, who only a few hours ago successfully completed their mission to the moon. I wish to congratulate also those who played a supporting role in launching and returning Apollo 11 safely to earth, for certainly without their effort the mission could not have been accomplished. The success of the American miracle was, indeed, the result of a beautiful team effort.

It is with especial pride that I call the attention of the House to the major role which my own State of Hawaii has played in our Nation's space program. Many citizens of the Aloha State actively participated in the preliminary scientific investigations, in tracking and communications, and in the recovery process.

Working in 14-hour shifts, 115 technicians at the Kokee Tracking Station on my native island of Kauai formed an important link in the global network responsible for tracking and communicating with Apollo 11. It was at this station back in 1965 that Astronaut Neil Armstrong, who was then a part of the Kokee tracking team in the Gemini mis-

sion, waited in eager anticipation for his epic voyage to the moon.

During last Sunday's historic moonwalk, specialists at both the Palehua Solar Observatory above Barbers Point on Oahu and the University of Hawaii's observatory on Haleakala, Maui, made a careful watch on solar flares capable of producing storms which could have threatened the astronauts. Had a solar flare developed, radiation emanating from it could have showered the astronauts with dangerous charged particles if they happened to be outside of the lunar module's protection.

Participants in Hawaii also played prominent roles in the functioning of the two pieces of scientific equipment left by the astronauts on the moon's surface. One of these instruments, a solar-powered seismograph designed to radio back data on future moonquakes or meteoric disturbances, was conceived by Dr. George H. Sutton, professor of geophysics at the University of Hawaii. This instrument could, among other things, help reveal whether or not the moon has a liquid core.

The well-publicized laser beam experiment designed to enable scientists to measure the precise distance between the earth and the moon was carried out by a team of University of Michigan scientists operating in Hawaii. From atop Mount Haleakala on the island of Maui, the Michigan astronomers were able to transmit and catch the beam of laser light reflected from the mirror-like device installed by the astronauts on the lunar sphere.

In the near future the University of Hawaii's Agronomy and Soil Science Department may play a significant role in characterizing the moon soil brought back to earth by the Apollo astronauts. Having the necessary technical equipment and personnel, the department has already submitted a request for samples to NASA officials.

With the splashdown taking place in the Pacific, military units from Hawaii played a vital function in the recovery operations. Carrying President Nixon, among other notables, the aircraft carrier *Hornet* served as the prime recovery ship for the Apollo 11 astronauts. Among the first to welcome back the astronauts from their historic mission was a team of Naval swimmers led by Lt. Clancy Hatleberg, who assisted the astronauts in their required contamination procedures before boarding the *Hornet*.

Pararescuemen from Hickam Air Force Base near Honolulu, were responsible for securing the flotation collars to the module to insure the safe recovery of the lunar spacecraft. When the *Hornet* docks at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, the astronauts will be winging back to Mission Control in Houston sealed in a van aboard an Air Force C-141 from Hickam.

On this epic day the people of Hawaii are certainly proud in extending their warmest aloha and sincere congratulations to the three courageous astronauts, to the dedicated people who comprised the Apollo mission team, and to their fellow Islanders who shared in the success of man's historic journey to the moon.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speak-

er, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a historic day. I join in supporting this resolution. I join in congratulating the brave astronauts for their herculean accomplishment on behalf of all mankind. I join in congratulating the chairman, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, and the members of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

If we have learned one lesson from this monumental feat, it is the lesson of total commitment. We are now entering into an era of total commitment. We have seen what man can do when he makes up his mind to do it. It has been the excellent leadership of the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, who time and again came before this Congress and defended the program, telling us what could be done if we supported this program.

It would be my hope that all Members of this Congress would gain inspiration from this in addressing ourselves to the problems of America today, whether they be in the field of education, health, housing, the feeding of the poor, the bringing of an end to hostilities, and in working toward an era of tranquillity where man can exist without destroying himself. If we have learned anything—and the world desperately needs this lesson—it is that with the achievement of these men and all of us in Congress working together in a total commitment, we can reach the heights.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the only Ohioan on the floor, I should like to say one word in parochial pride about Neil Armstrong and the fact that the first man to set foot on the moon is an Ohioan, just as John Glenn was the first American to orbit in space, and also is an Ohioan. In making that footnote to this historic occasion, I should like to add that when I was growing up as a young man, there used to be a radio show about Jack Armstrong, the All-American boy.

It occurs to me that all Americans today feel that Neil Armstrong is an All-American boy. However, at this moment in history I am sure that we would echo the sentiments that many others have already expressed that Neil Armstrong, Colonel Aldrin, and the other member of that distinguished trio, Colonel Collins, are not only All-American boys, but All-World boys, men who have contributed a great deal to all nations on this globe of ours.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. McCULLOCH who represents the Fourth Ohio Congressional District from which Mr. Armstrong comes and which neighbors the district I represent, I am sure would echo these sentiments had he been aware that this invitation to a joint session was going to be discussed at this time. For him and all Ohioans, all Americans, and all the people on earth, I congratulate these gallant men and look forward to greeting them in this Chamber.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) very much for yielding.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I concur completely in the remarks of the chairman in praise of our space program's splendid accomplishments. I was particularly interested in his introductory remarks, in which he paid tribute to the role of my most prominent "summertime constituent," our former President, the late John F. Kennedy.

In order to accomplish the remarkable achievement which culminated in today's successful splashdown by our astronauts, it was necessary to first direct the Nation's attention to the heavens—to raise our people's aspirations to the stars. This is what John Kennedy did. He gave our Nation the goal of conquering space, and the will to commit ourselves to achieving that goal. He gave us a dream—and today that dream came true. And America will never forget who first gave us the direction and the inspiration, that we might soar through the heavens and reach this final success.

Now we have succeeded, and once again are faced with an unknown future. We need to establish new goals, even more lofty and ambitious, to guide us as we continue to press forward. One such goal that I know John Kennedy would have approved of is to try to translate the dream of world cooperation that has been stirred so strongly by the events of the past week into reality. Mr. Kennedy's dream provided a strong first stage. Now it is time to think in even bolder terms, so that we may continue on the path we set out on 8 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that President Nixon will give the world another new dream—a dream of joint programs of space exploration, with all of the world's technical and scientific resources united in the future exploration of other planets that are still out there in the vastness of space.

A key phrase, Mr. Speaker, from President Kennedy's inaugural address is worth remembering at this time: "But let us begin." Thanks to his efforts, we have begun splendidly in space. I hope and expect that out of the culmination of his beginning will come new direction, and new inspiration, to begin a new era of international cooperation in exploring the mysteries of the universe that surrounds us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker,

I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, there will be no further legislative business this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are seven bills scheduled for consideration, as follows:

H.R. 9551, to enlarge Metropolitan Police Band;

H.R. 6947, to amend Chancery Act, grandfather clause as to chancery locations;

H.R. 9553, to amend District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act for hospital employees;

H.R. 8868, Interstate Compact on Juveniles;

H.R. 5967, to provide two auto tags per Member;

H.R. 12671, to permit employment of minors—14 to 16; and

H.R. 255, to deduct interest in advance on installment loans.

Also on Monday the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) has advised that he will seek to bring up under a unanimous-consent request two bills which have been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. Those bills are as follows:

H.R. 13079, to extend interest equalization tax for a temporary period; and

H.R. 13080, to extend for 15 days existing rates of income tax withholding.

Also on Monday we will consider H.R. 2, separate Federal Credit Union agency, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, the Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970;

H.R. 471, to hold in trust certain lands for the Pueblo de Taos Indians in New Mexico, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate;

House Joint Resolution 247, relating to the administration of the national park system, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 13018, military construction authorization for fiscal year 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, for the edification of the Members I desire now to advise the House that the House will meet next Friday. So we will be in session 5 days next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
JULY 28, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JULY 24, 1969.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct since it was first established. It is with sincere regret that I hereby submit my resignation as a member of it effective at the close of business today.

Sincerely,

LES ARENDS.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JULY 24, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been my privilege to serve on the District of Columbia Committee and it is with great regret that I tender my resignation to become effective at the close of business today, July 24.

Sincerely yours,

CATHERINE MAY.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF U.S. GROUP, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Assembly the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Devine, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, U.S.C., section 2251, the

Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from Washington, Mrs. MAY, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 492) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

Resolved, That Jack H. McDonald, of Michigan, be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION SHOULD BE FULLY FUNDED

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, today we acted on H.R. 12964, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill, fiscal year 1970 appropriations, House Report No. 91384.

This bill appropriates the huge sum of \$2.53 billion for fiscal year 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country will accept, though with grave misgivings, the \$480 million increase over the fiscal year 1969 total, as well as the \$58 million above the administration's amended budget request, but I can assure the Members of this body that there will be widespread condemnation when it becomes known that the request for \$15.9 million by the Equal Opportunity Commission has been cut to \$10 million.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House can never explain to the people of their separate districts why they supinely approved appropriations, among others, of \$36 million for education exchange programs, \$250 million for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, \$121 million for the judiciary, while displaying a wanton disregard to a reduction of \$5.9 million from the request of an agency created out of the turbulence, the inequities, and the blatant injustices of our society for the exclusive and often proclaimed purpose of stamping out discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex, and the enforcement of title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues dare not plead ignorance to the published facts that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was presented 11,172 charges of discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex during the year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues must be aware—some are acutely aware—of the disenchantment voiced by the past Chairman of the Commission with the seeming indifference of this administration to the vital work of job discrimina-

tion; and in this context, the Members of this body are not unaware that the present outstanding Chairman expressed the urgent need for greater cooperation with the hope and belief that such sympathetic support would be forthcoming. Both expressions were pertinent to this issue—the one a bitter conclusion—the latter a hope, perhaps a belief that help would come, but with judgment withheld.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility is ours. Will we face resolutely the obvious or evade in the hope that there will be a tomorrow without this problem?

My position is, and my demand is that we bodily meet today's problem now. So I urge this body to wake up, get out of the world of fantasy, face reality, and admit that we have problems in discrimination. Let us meet the problem by restoring the \$5.9 million and each Member may feel confident that he has given verity to the statement:

One small step for man—one giant leap for mankind.

Let us here and now restore the original figure \$15.9 million to this Commission.

AN UNUSUAL BEQUEST

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are called upon to perform a wide variety of duties, some pleasant, and some unpleasant. I see that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is on the floor, and I wish that the chairman would listen to this.

One of the most unusual chores to befall me during my tenure in the House of Representatives arrived by mail today. I have been requested to serve as the middleman in a transaction, the likes of which I have not heard about before, and the kind I do not expect to repeat too many times in the future.

Mrs. Mattie Meisner, a widow residing in Sabetha, Nemaha County, Kans., provided in her will that after several bequests to individuals and charitable foundations:

All the rest and residue of my estate, real and personal, and wherever located or situated, I give, devise and bequeath to the United States of America and to the State of Kansas, in equal shares, to be used respectively for the payment of the Federal debt and the debts of the State of Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Meisner's estate has now been settled and the distributions have been made under the terms of her will. I have in my possession a check in the amount of \$55,657.79, drawn on the Farmers State Bank of Sabetha, Kans. I am making arrangements to turn this check over to the Treasury Department so that this amount can be applied on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, the last report I had from the U.S. Treasury, listed our national debt in excess of \$358 billion, and it is increasing every day. Even though Mrs. Meisner's bequest will make only an infinitesimal payment on the liquidation of this obligation, I just want to observe that her gesture is typical of patriotic,

frugal Americans who live in the cities and farms of Kansas. They are grateful for the good life and the unlimited opportunities this country affords to those who are willing to apply themselves and get ahead by the sweat of their brow.

I would just like to observe that in making this gift to her Government, Mrs. Meisner has probably done more toward the retirement of the national debt than any of us can take credit for, even though we supposedly wrestle with the problem every day.

I include at this point the correspondence I received in regard to this matter:

SENECA, KANS.,
June 22, 1969.

Mr. CHESTER MIZE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MIZE: I am pleased to inform you that the estate of Mattie Meisner was closed today in the probate court of Nemaha County, Kansas. The will of deceased under item 13, gave one-half the residue to the United States of America, for the payment of debts.

Since I am unable to present the bequest to you personally, I enclose herewith check in the amount of \$55,657.79 payable to the United States of America for debts, and trust that you will see that proper persons are notified and the deceased be given proper recognition for her kindness to the United States of America.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS L. MEDILL, Jr.

LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT OF MATTIE MEISNER

Know all men by these presents, That I, Mattie Meisner, a widow, a resident of Sabetha, Nemaha County, Kansas, of sound mind and memory, do make and publish this as my last will and testament, hereby revoking any and all former wills made or purporting to be made by me:

Item 13: All the rest and residue of my estate, real and personal, and wherever located, or situated, I give, devise and bequeath to the United States of America and to the State of Kansas, in equal shares to be used by them respectively for the payment of the federal debt and the debts of the State of Kansas.

PROPOSED ASTRONAUT MEMORIAL AT KENNEDY SPACE CENTER

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, this country's greatness does not lie in its material assets, but rather in the spirit of its people. This spirit has never been more prominently on display than in the flight of Apollo 11. The success of this flight and the entire space effort is due to the teamwork of many dedicated men and women throughout our Nation. The three Apollo 11 astronauts—Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Mike Collins—are only representative of men whose belief in God, courage, and will to conquer the unknown has helped make this the greatest Nation on earth.

I have been joined today by all 31 of my colleagues on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, including the distinguished Chairman, GEORGE P. MILLER, and the distinguished ranking minority member, JAMES G. FULTON, in pro-

posing the establishment of an Astronauts Memorial Commission. This Commission would be responsible for erecting and maintaining, at no expense to the Government, a memorial at the Kennedy Space Center honoring all of our astronauts. It seems most appropriate to reintroduce the legislation at this time when all of America is united in its pride over the accomplishments of Apollo 11.

It seems fitting that this memorial should be near the point where each of the astronauts begin their journey into space. This memorial will serve as a tribute to all astronauts—past, present, and future—including the seven NASA astronauts—Chaffee, White, Grissom, See, Bassett, Freeman, and Williams—who have been killed in the performance of duty and their fellow astronaut, Edward Givens, who died in an automobile accident. It will serve as a constant reminder to all of us that the American spirit will remain strong as long as we have the courage to face and conquer the unknown. It will be a constant reminder to all of what can be done by teamwork and cooperation. It will remind us as a nation that there is no goal beyond us if we commit ourself to that task. In essence this memorial is for the astronauts but even more is for each and every one of us who has looked up into the heavens and dared to dream.

WASHINGTON CRIME OUT OF CONTROL

(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, June crime statistics confirm what many of us have been saying for a long time—crime is completely out of control in Washington and little is being done by responsible officials to bring it to a halt.

Crime is up 23.9 percent over June of last year. There was a crime committed in Washington at the rate of one every 8 minutes during June, and the rate for crimes against persons was one every 40 minutes. Murder was up 60 percent; rape, 80 percent; robberies, 17½ percent; burglaries, 40 percent; and larceny, 53 percent. Only auto thefts dropped, but there were still 951 cars stolen during the month.

The greatest crime increase was reported in the First Police Division, where many of the Federal office buildings are located. Overall crime in this area was up a staggering 84 percent.

No one expected miracles in the fight against crime this year, but neither can a 23.9-percent increase in crime in 1 month be tolerated. We need leadership from the White House and the Attorney General, the Mayor and District government now. It has taken them 5½ months to get their crime package up to Congress, and it will take many months more to get it enacted. But what is being done within existing law to launch a major anticrime crusade? Little or nothing that can be seen, or reflected in these appalling statistics.

Eight daytime robberies were reported

in this morning's newspaper. A woman was held at gunpoint in her own apartment and robbed Tuesday afternoon. Three men robbed a man at gunpoint in downtown Washington in midday Tuesday. A deliveryman was robbed during the noon hour by a group of 10. In one robbery of a laundromat in midafternoon, the police arrested four youths, aged between 14 and 17, armed with a sawed-off shotgun. How long must this city remain an armed camp of people living behind double-locked doors?

THE WHOLE WORLD WELCOMES MEN FROM THE MOON

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in public service, we of the Congress have become professional in the art of language. It is part of our job to be able to translate the meaning of events into the understanding of their significance. And yet today, with the successful splashdown of Apollo 11, we have exhausted the power of mere words to evoke the grandeur and triumph of that voyage.

The picture of the command module blazing through the friction of our atmosphere recalls the mythic voyages of the Greek God Apollo who was believed to drive his fiery chariot across the sky to give light to the world. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that analogy can serve as well today in paying tribute to the significance of Apollo 11, and its courageous crew.

Like the Greek god our astronauts have tamed the fiery chariot, but with a very important difference. Apollo of the age of Pericles was one in a succession of dream figures symbolizing man's desire to explain the unknown. Apollo 11 of 1969 is a realization that the unknown can be understood and conquered. The dream of a thousand years becomes a reality, and we will never again be able to slip into the easy answers of giant myths.

There are other dreams, Mr. Speaker. Dreams of understanding our lives here on the "good earth." Dreams of conquering myths of prejudice, hunger, and poverty. We owe an awesome debt to the men and women who by their efforts in the mastery of space have shown us the tinsel quality of myths.

I believe as we welcome home the brave and daring astronauts, it would be well to remember the words from President Kennedy's famous speech of May 25, 1961:

We go into space because whatever mankind must undertake, free men must truly share.

The triumph of Apollo 11 is one of mankind's monumental undertakings. In a fitting tribute to President Kennedy, it was truly shared by free men everywhere.

CONTROLLING INFLATION AND BALANCING THE BUDGET

(Mr. MESKILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to see that the President was reported yesterday in the Washington Post to have chided Congress for failing to accept a number of his money-saving proposals. The report indicated that the President had ordered a \$3.5 billion cut in spending by Government departments and agencies to offset increases in areas over which he had no control.

Mr. Speaker, being a strong supporter of the administration in its attempts to control inflation and to balance the budget, I find myself in a rather unique position of agreeing with President Nixon in principle, but questioning some of his priorities.

In looking at the President's budget requests for 1970, I was surprised to see that the President had included a request of \$807,000 for the controversial Dickey-Lincoln power project. If the President was looking for unnecessary projects to wield a scalpel on, this is certainly one that should have received his full attention. My colleagues, to be sure, are well aware of the shortcomings of Dickey-Lincoln. I need only remind the President that the House has rejected Dickey-Lincoln on five separate rollcalls. The House has forcefully and unmistakably said "no" to this project. Less than 4 years ago, its authorization was rejected by a rollcall vote. Three rollcall votes were cast in 1967 against appropriations for it. And last year, on a rollcall vote, the House voted to delete the requested appropriation of \$617,000. The will of the House could not be more obvious. And yet, here again in this year's budget requests from the White House appears a request for \$807,000.

I thought we had put this one to bed last year. Now it looks like we will have to do it again. If the President is to start wielding his scalpel, then this is where he should begin.

Now, if the President had chided Congress for covering up the cost overruns of the cultural-industrial complex by appropriating \$12.5 million more to bail out the sponsors of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, that would be one thing. But he could not do even that because he would have found that he had included the request for these funds in his budget as well.

The point I want to make is there are cuts that can be made and should be made. I regret that the President failed to perform the surgery needed on these two projects. They were within his control.

However, there are areas that are just too important to cut indiscriminately. One of these, I believe, is education.

There have been reports that the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will recommend funding above the Nixon requests for library programs and vocational education. Should the House vote more funds than the President has requested for these urgent educational needs, I hope Mr. Nixon will refrain from chiding us for extravagance. In my thinking, the education of our children must be given priority of

the funding of the Dickey-Lincoln boondoggle and the J. F. K. Center which was never intended to receive Federal funding.

SPACE EXPLORATION DAY

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, the landing of men on the moon on Sunday, July 20, 1969, and their safe return to the earth today is regarded by many as the most historic event in the history of mankind.

Certainly, the moon voyage of astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins—which included a successful landing on the moon, a brief exploration of the moon's surface, and a safe return to earth—is worthy of commemoration as a national holiday as truly as other great national events are celebrated by us today.

In immediate recognition of this event, President Nixon proclaimed Monday, July 21, as a "National Day of Participation." This was interpreted by many as a holiday for the purpose of following our astronauts' successful experiences on the moon's surface, their liftoff, and the start of their return trip to earth.

Commemorating this event on Monday is consistent with the action taken by the Congress at the last session in enacting uniform Monday holiday legislation—a measure which I and a number of my colleagues sponsored—designating four of our national holidays to be celebrated on specific Mondays. The uniform Monday holiday bill has received widespread approval, with the result that more than 35 States now have enacted legislation consistent with the Federal law, to the end that Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Columbus Day, and Veterans Day will be Monday holidays commencing in 1971. The successful mission of the three astronauts should logically be commemorated as a Monday holiday.

I am today introducing legislation designating "Space Exploration Day" a national holiday, to be celebrated on the third Monday in July of each year. While Public Law 90-63, the Uniform Monday Holiday Act, does not become effective until January 1, 1971, I am confident that the American people will want to celebrate "Space Exploration Day" in 1970, and thereafter to include it in the Monday holiday legislation when it becomes effective in 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we may have early action on this legislation in order that plans and preparations may be made by schools and business institutions, and by the Federal, State, and local governments, to celebrate "Space Exploration Day" on the third Monday of July in 1970 and in subsequent years.

SENATOR FRANK PORTER GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting today as we pay tribute to the three valiant Americans returning from the moon, to pay tribute also to Frank Porter Graham of North Carolina, teacher, university president, U.S. Senator, international civil servant, pioneer, mediator, inspiration to the young and disinherited, intrepid battler for justice and liberty, personification of kindness and courage; and above all, man of peace; he, too, came in peace for all mankind. If iron could be gentle it would be Frank Graham.

Frank Graham returns this year to his beloved Chapel Hill, in time to mark the 60th anniversary of his graduation from the university. We commemorate his retirement from active duty at the United Nations with gratitude for his great service to world peace, and with joy that he is able at last to return to his roots, to his gracious and generous sisters, to the village whose name he did so much to make synonymous with humaneness and honor and high quality; to the State he did so much to lift ahead of its region and out of its byways. The only sadness that intrudes into the sense of celebration that attends his homecoming is the fact that his wife, Marian, cannot return home with him.

No one who knew Marian Drane Graham will ever forget what it was like to be in the presence of such loveliness. She lived with a twinkle and carried a glow about her that lit any path she trod and warmed any life she touched.

Nor will anyone who knew Marian and Frank Graham together ever forget what harmony between husband and wife, between human beings, does to those enjoying it, or to those enjoying those who are enjoying it.

So this salute is no exercise of ritual tribute, no recital of titles held, no obeisance to power feared. It is, rather, a simple effort by people whose entire lives were forever blessed by Frank and Marian Graham to convey a fraction of the love and gratitude felt for them, by countless human beings of all stations in all places. It is hard to think what our lives would have been like without the Grahams, but it is clear that they would have been neither meaner, narrower, nor sadder.

A few things more should be said about the gallant and triumphant life of Frank Graham, who, while men all around him were seeking power and fame, forgot himself, in Martin King's phrase, "Into immortality for himself."

At the university he defied the odds to befriend workers and students, to defend the untrammelled mind and the unracial heart, and survived to rank—in longevity as well as effectiveness—among the fore-

most college presidents in the land. In the Senate, he voted his convictions, and set such standards of selflessness that he attained in less than 2 years an influence among his colleagues that is denied most men who remain on long enough to acquire chairmanships of committees. He lost an election—does anyone remember someone called "Willis Smith"?—to a sea of distortion and induced hate, without losing his patience or his faith or his will to carry on the good fight in the spirit of love that came of his commitment to God. He left us from that campaign a testament of democracy and to America that touches us now, after these decades of upheaval and challenge, as it did then:

THIS IS AMERICA

In spiritual faith and the American dream, America is being made safe for democracy without vulgarity, differences without hate, and excellence without arrogance; where men become brothers in the sight of God and in the human heart; where the opportunities of the children in homes and schools are the chief hope of a nobler society; where enduring progress in human relations is made through religion, education, and voluntary cooperation in the minds and hearts of the people; and where the struggle for the fulfillment of our historic Americanism is the best answer to fascism and communism in the present global struggle against totalitarian tyranny for freedom and peace in the world.

In this America of our struggles and our hopes, the least of these our brethren has the freedom to struggle for freedom; where the answer to error is not terror, the respect for the past is not reaction and the hope of the future is not revolution; where the integrity of simple people is beyond price and the daily toil of millions is above pomp and power; where the majority is without tyranny, and the minority without fear, and all people have hope. This is America, God bless America.

It is as great an honor as I expect I shall ever have to be able to participate in these statements of thanks to this astronaut of the human heart, always risking himself that others may follow with less danger, robust and uncompromising amidst the discomforts of difficult journeys, always so far ahead of his time and always so much a part of it; always transcending the ordinary limits of geography and custom to adventure on toward new horizons and new opportunities for all his fellow men.

How shall we measure how much we owe to such a man, how much our country owes, how much the tired and bruised world? Best simply to say that the least we owe is to try harder to do better for an America at last providing liberty and justice for all, and for a world at last resolving her differences with compassion and in peace.

I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, few citizens of my State have equaled the record of public service that Frank Porter Graham can claim. None has loved North Carolina or the United States more, and none has shown greater devotion to the cause of the unfortunate in State and Nation.

A conservative southern Senator once said of "Dr. Frank" that he is the living embodiment of the early American

patriot; it was not an idle comment. He believes in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. He has fought for them as a marine, a teacher, a college president, a U.S. Senator, and a U.N. mediator.

His contributions to this country as a labor mediator, as a Member of Congress and in innumerable public positions under every President from Franklin Roosevelt through Lyndon Johnson have earned him the respect of liberal and conservative, Democrat and Republican.

He has helped end one civil war and helped bring a partial peace in another.

Yet great as are his accomplishments as an American, I would think of him today primarily for what his life has meant to North Carolina.

When, in the depths of the Depression, our university seemed on the brink of closing, Frank Graham traveled the State raising money to make loans to students so they could stay in school; when children in our rural areas were deprived of the opportunity to gain greater horizons of hope and understanding, he worked to organize a public library program that crosses every road and corner of North Carolina; and, when in the twenties and thirties our State's people suffered from inadequate roads and hospitals, he helped give birth to the good roads and good health movements and was content to let other men gain the credit.

And while he is himself essentially a man of most conservative traits, he has been a fighter for progress who fought with all the vigor of the bantamweight wrestler he once was. When trustees complained because a great Negro singer was extended the courtesies of the university, he welcomed her; and when another trustee threatened the university if it provided a forum for the Republican candidate for Vice President of the United States, Frank Graham sat on the platform with him. The fact that both circumstances are of unquestioned acceptance by today's standards should not belie the courage he exhibited then.

There are literally hundreds of people in North Carolina today, many of them among our leaders, who are indebted to Dr. Graham for his generosity when they needed money or a voice to plead their case; there are millions who are indebted to him for what has been his contribution to the character of our State.

No Tar Heel has reaped more of her honors. Every major institution of learning in North Carolina has awarded him an honorary degree—some as often as three times; he is the only North Carolinian to hold such degrees from every campus of the consolidated university; our State legislature has made him a trustee of the university for life; and he has received the highest honor the State can officially bestow on a distinguished son—the North Carolina Award.

Yet all of these honors seem to pale in the splendid reflection of what he, as a man, has meant. In a time when some would preach progress through violence, his quiet faith in the eventual victory of any good cause advanced with respect for the common man under the law stands as a positive example for our youth. In a time when advocacy of com-

pulsion to bring about change is popular, his devotion to the power of honest persuasion to bring men together should remind us all of how much we have accomplished through good will.

A leader in our State once challenged because he, a conservative, could be such an advocate of Frank Graham, the progressive, replied:

His dimensions of goodness and greatness transcend philosophic differences.

And so they have.

Not long ago a lady in a sister State wrote the Governor of my State that she admired us because we celebrate our victories with a rose and not a whip. It is a source of that character of North Carolina that for so long she has had the splendid example of Frank Graham and in him the tremendous power of one good man.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point letters and articles concerning Dr. Graham:

RALEIGH, N.C.,
May 7, 1969.

FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.:

My love to you as a great southerner of your generation and one of the great humanitarians of all time.

JONATHAN DANIELS.

MAY 5, 1969.

MY VERY DEAR DR. GRAHAM: When on December 31, 1939 you, the President of the great University of North Carolina, came to the door of the recently opened Danziger Candy Kitchen in Chapel Hill and knocked on our door we, the Danziger Family and some of our friends, were very surprised and puzzled that a president, a professor, and a scholar would take time out on a cold winter evening to see us.

We all had come to this country not too long ago; we could hardly speak the language, had escaped our birthplace because of hatred, prejudice, dictatorship, persecution and threats of death. We were a bunch of unknown, unwanted men and women without any means, standing, money, friends, and without any importance whatsoever.

You came to wish us all a Happy New Year, a new and prosperous future, peace and happiness and a new life in this, our new country. We could not understand that a man in your outstanding position would take time out to even speak to us, the refugee, the outcast.

But we have learned in these 30 years that this "God's own Country" is so great and beautiful because of men like you. Men with a big heart, a feeling and an understanding for the underdog, the persecuted and the oppressed.

My dear Dr. Graham, this country and Chapel Hill have been wonderful to us, but we, the Danziger family, will never forget your kindness, your understanding, and your love for your fellow man.

In deep appreciation and thankfulness.

Respectfully,

EDWARD G. DANZIGER.

[From Solidarity, December 1966]

FRANK PORTER GRAHAM

(By Al Adams)

If the world ever gets around to picking its number one citizen, up close in the running should be Frank Porter Graham.

But not of his own choosing, for the mild-mannered, little educator-statesman from North Carolina would, in modesty, deny such an honor.

He goes almost unknown among the masses of his own countrymen who are

blandly unaware that he has influenced every American's life.

Now 80 years of age, Dr. Graham has lived a dedicated life as high school teacher, college professor, World War I marine, university president, governmental advisor, U.S. senator and United Nations mediator—a post he still fills.

Its no wonder that buried beneath deed after deed as a professional man lies forgotten his frequently extended helping hand to agricultural and migratory workers. Their rootless, homeless and almost defenseless plight moved him to describe them as "the most forgotten and neglected human beings in our land."

He could be the nation's original poverty-fighter. And he certainly spoke out loud and clear for the labor movement during those most hateful years when most southern towns and villages had an "open season" on union organizers.

Back in 1955, late in his career but still a full decade before the grape workers of Delano, Calif. dramatically focused national attention on the conditions he decried, this soft-spoken little man who never tilled a field again clearly saw an ominous sign overshadowing field hands.

Cautioning the nation that Federal laws under the Eisenhower Administration tended to help big farmers, Dr. Graham felt this would drive little farmers off the land.

"More and more migrants, with their miserable conditions, will be sought to work the factories-in-the-fields of the large farm corporations," he feared. "If this happens, it will be a sad day for America."

Such is his concern for all men.

"The dignity and worth of the human person is a way of life to him," said one of the many citations he has received.

Illinois Senator Paul Douglas, who once shared a corner of the Senate with Dr. Graham, called the methodic man "the nearest thing to Mahatma Gandhi that America has yet produced." And Oregon Senator Wayne Morse said: "He is the most Christ-like man I ever knew."

Talk your way into the office of Raleigh editor Jonathan Daniels, himself a giant in North Carolina affairs, mention an interest in Dr. Graham and everything seems to stand still. Undisturbed by the hum and clacking of a newspaper office, Daniels' mind races through the years, picking out the little figure of a man who spoke out for justice on street corners, along dusty roads and just off the football field of the university he came to head.

"He's a genuine man. . . ."

The spry, twinkling-eyed educator—his tiny five-foot five, 130-pound stature far outweighing his ego—speechlessly rubs his glowing gray hair when confronted by words of honor. In a lifetime of tributes he has yet to become accustomed to praise.

For with the praise often has come persecution—and once a burning cross—as his deeds earned for him a reputation as a consistent fighter for union security and wage stabilization and for the right of working men to organize.

In the days when the words "labor organizer" and "Bolshevik" were synonymous in the south, he fought for abolition of the 60-hour work week and 12-hour day; abolition of night work for children, and in favor of better working conditions for women. As early as the 1920s, he helped frame a model workmen's compensation law.

Scorning the advice of friends to temper his crusades lest he endanger his own future, the "tee-total" liberal forged ahead almost singlehandedly for what he considered right.

"Whether you stand as one person, one of a minority or one of a majority, the main thing is the principle, rather than popularity."

Such is the philosophy he lives by.

How is such a philosophy born and nurtured to maturity?

For Frank Porter Graham, some of it began when he was born in Fayetteville, N.C., on October 14, 1866. It has been nurtured by fate.

One of nine children of Alexander Graham, who helped found the state's grade school system, Frank grew up in the knowledge that education is one cornerstone of freedom.

He pursued his own education diligently, graduating Phi Beta Kappa from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1909. He enrolled in UNC's law school and was licensed by the Supreme Court to practice. But friends say that on his first and only legal case, a divorce action, he beat himself out of a fee when he concentrated on reconciling the unhappy couple.

Fate introduced him to a career more suited to his easy-going temperament when he was forced to interrupt graduate study and accept a teaching job to earn money.

He became so engrossed with teaching that it became the first of three major phases of his life. Only against his will did he leave the classroom to become president of UNC and, later, a national and international statesman.

He was pursuing his education in the 1920s—working on a Ph.D. at the University of Chicago after serving as a marine in World War I—when awarded a two-year travel-study fellowship. Graham set out for England where he studied economics and industrial history. He then went to the League of Nations in Geneva.

Although he never got back to completing his doctorate (he now holds more than a dozen honorary degrees), the work abroad proved more valuable.

"I became more acquainted with the coming of the industrial revolution and its social consequences," he said. "When I went back to North Carolina (as a professor) I thought it was my opportunity to tell the people we should begin making more humane adjustments. . . ."

He was "one of those few men up on the cutting edge of what was evolving as a new era," said William C. Friday, now president of the university so long piloted by Dr. Graham.

Later, as the seeds of "humane adjustments" which he planted had begun to bear the fruit of collective bargaining and union security for textile and factory workers, Frank Graham found it necessary to retrace his steps on behalf of farm workers whom the south's new economy left "on the frontier of the American labor movement."

North Carolina farm families and workers never forgot their champion, said Hubert Robinson, Graham's personal aide for 18 years. "People around here tell their children about Dr. Graham the way they would if they knew someone in the Bible."

Robinson, a former Chapel Hill councilman, lights up from the inside as he remembers: "We'd go into some of those communities and he'd be welcomed like the President. Folks reached out just to touch him. . . ."

If there were those in the south who welcomed the coming of the new industrial day Frank Graham heralded, there were others who resisted the inevitable with their very souls.

"These very simple proposals we were sponsoring, such as a workman's compensation act, shorter hours, organization of unions, equal rights in collective bargaining, decent wages and working conditions, were the cause of my first being branded a communist," Graham recalled.

But the brand did not burn. In 1930 the University of North Carolina board of trustees plucked him out of his history classroom and placed him at the helm of the state campus.

Thrust into the second phase of his career over his protest, Dr. Graham became president when few persons wanted to tackle the

problem of consolidating three state-supported schools and, more important, fight with a legislature which was cutting the school's budget each year of the depression.

Showing his political savvy, Graham bypassed the legislators, carried his fight for funds up and down the dusty back roads to the people of North Carolina. And he won!

Not everything Frank Graham dedicated his life to was so warmly received. His labor and civil rights stands were lauded by liberals but cursed by conservatives.

"He is both the best-loved and best-hated man in North Carolina," the Saturday Evening Post said almost two decades ago.

This divided reaction to the work of Dr. Graham was at no time more evident than in the North Carolina election of 1950.

In 1949, Gov. Scott Kerr appointed Dr. Graham to fill a U.S. Senate seat left vacant by the death of J. Melville Broughton. In a run-off election for a full term in 1950 against segregationist Willis Smith, Dr. Graham found himself caught between the Dixiecrat forces trying to hold back the tide of time and President Truman's Fair Deal.

The campaign became one of the bitterest ever waged in the state.

Smith won.

It was a sad day in the politics of a state destined to show the way for the new south.

"I just wasn't masterful enough to overcome all these forces—this forest fire which spread across the state fanned by racial fears, deep prejudice and even demagoguery," Dr. Graham said.

"He's not a strategic planner," said Chapel Hill clergyman and close associate Rev. Charles Jones. "But once he took a stand on something, he stayed stood!"

Commenting editorially on the election results, the New York Times said: "One hopes that this defeat does not mean the end of his public life."

Fortunately it did not.

Public service was in his blood, the only way of life he knew.

So varied and so frequent were the calls from government for his help while he was UNC president that a student editor once wrote good-naturedly: "President Graham is visiting us for a few days."

Early in the Roosevelt Administration, he had served as chairman of the President's Advisory Council on Social Security and helped draw up much of the New Deal Social Security legislation. He also was a member of Roosevelt's committee on education and was appointed by FDR to the War Labor Board, representing the public.

Dr. Graham won the CIO's Sidney Hillman Award for effort on behalf of labor while on the War Labor Board.

Under Truman, he served on the Commission on Civil Rights and supported racial equality measures which irked many of his fellow southerners but which opened the south's door to civilization and a trace of democracy.

He was appointed in 1947 as the U.S. representative on the United Nations' three-man Good Offices Committee to help resolve the Dutch-Indonesia dispute. He favored self-determination for Indonesians.

He was the first president of the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies.

Less than a year after the Senate election loss, Dr. Graham was again serving the public as defense manpower administrator in the Department of Labor. The appointment came at a crucial time, when labor was dissatisfied with the policies of mobilization director Charles E. Wilson.

Labor's tribute to his integrity is evident in the fact that in 1951, when the executive board of the CIO voted for a court-enforceable contract barring jurisdictional disputes and calling for final settlement by arbitration, only the name Frank Graham was proposed as arbitrator.

He was forced to decline the position because of international work with the United Nations.

No task, however, diminished his interest in young people nor detracted from the fondness with which UNC students regarded their "Dr. Frank," as he is called in North Carolina. And major world problems notwithstanding, it has been said that nothing ever gave "Dr. Frank" more pleasure than coming to the aid of a youngster passing through the gates of the university on the way to life.

On Sunday evenings, he turned on his porch light as a signal to students that he and Mrs. Graham were ready for the weekly "bull session" to begin in their living room.

Former Michigan Gov. John B. Swainson recalls Dr. Graham walking the halls of the campus infirmary, comforting the patients. "The sight of him was medicinal. . . ."

If ardent concern for such seemingly inconsequential affairs appears as time-consuming as were endeavors to settle international disputes, it shows both the depth and breadth of the man's concern for his fellow man.

Dr. Graham applied his energies with equal fervor to the interpersonal and the international. And he is equally at home at an international conference table and a country gathering.

Long chairman of the National Sharecroppers Fund, Dr. Graham was named co-chairman with AFL-CIO Vice President A. Philip Randolph, of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor. Founded with the aid of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the 21-member committee of civic and religious leaders seeks to educate the public on behalf of equal rights for agricultural workers in organization, minimum wages and fair labor standards.

The committee held public hearings which put the lie to big growers' propaganda depicting the migrant's life as "carefree, expense-paid travel with cash thrown in."

Migrant workers averaged \$892 income in 1958, the committee learned. It reported: "Although some good housing exists, many farm workers have makeshift housing shacks, tents, barracks, even trucks," and "most migrant children are retarded in school; the older the child, the greater the retardation."

Fighting what Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell called "the most powerful opposition I have ever seen (big growers)," the committee headed by Dr. Graham and Randolph called for "immediate action to improve substandard conditions of farm workers" and adopt measures needed toward "dragging the industry of agriculture, reluctantly, into the 20th century."

"One thing I learned from Dr. Graham, Mrs. Roosevelt and Norman Thomas," former UNC student Al Lowenstein said, "is that it's not a waste of time to fight for the things you believe in, even if the prospect of winning seems unlikely."

Reporting to the National Sharecroppers Fund, whose board includes UAW Region 9 Director Martin Gerber, Dr. Graham castigated the nation for a condition described by M. T. Van Hecke, head of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture.

"We depend on misfortune to build up our force of migratory workers," said Van Hecke, "and when the supply is low because there is not enough misfortune at home, we rely on misfortune abroad to replenish the supply."

In a world of organized power, said Dr. Graham, "the farm laborers and migratory workers need union organization." And he challenged American labor to help bring this about "for its own soul's sake."

Meanwhile, Dr. Graham was again projected into the international scene—and the third phase of his life—when the United Kingdom nominated him to mediate the bitter three-year-old dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

At the UN there exists the kind of community he urged last June's graduates of his university to strive for: "one world neighborhood of human brotherhood."

Those who have known him over the years say, almost reverently, that the staunch Presbyterian Scotsman "has sought to put into men's hearts, during the span of his own lifetime, principles of tolerance and brotherhood which the Christian church has been trying to put there for 2,000 years."

He pushes too hard, say some.

But all who have been touched by the man's influence can agree on one thing, said so well upon one of Frank Porter Graham's numerous public appointments:

"He won't represent North Carolina alone, nor the south, nor even this nation. He'll speak for all mankind. He is truly a citizen of the universe."

DR. FRANK: DURABLE HIGHLANDER

(By Mary Lee McMillan)

Dr. Frank P. Graham is celebrating his eighty-third birthday in Chapel Hill this year. Dr. Robert House, his friend and co-worker, says that "Frank Graham is our greatest poet. When he was president of the University of North Carolina he used to say, 'People come out all right if you trust them. You must trust them.' No one in Chapel Hill can touch our hearts as this man can."

Their friends who visited the home of Dr. Frank and his beloved wife, Marian, (who died several years ago), will never forget the beautiful arrangements of roses in every room in their house. Marian grew these roses. She and Dr. Frank enjoyed the wonderful new roses, including the All America Rose Selections, but the exquisitely fragrant old roses were their special favorites. Their garden of these old roses was their pride and many young gardeners were inspired to study and grow hundreds of them all over North Carolina. Dr. House says, "Frank Graham's life is a continuing prayer of gratitude for the eternal goodness which surrounds our lives."

DURABLE SCOT

I have asked Dr. Gerald Johnson of River-ton and Baltimore, Md., to share his birthday greeting to his friend and kinsman, Frank Graham, with our readers, many of whom are his friends and former pupils. Dr. Johnson says: "The Scotch Highlanders who poured into the Cape Fear River Valley after Culloden were for the most part made of very durable material but not many have been more resistant to the teeth of time than Frank Porter Graham. It is not simply a matter of years. At the age of 83, Frank could be considered getting along, but not until he has crossed 90 is a North Carolina Scot considered really old. This one's survival value is attested, not by his years, but by his scars, more numerous than those of a Zulu warrior who collects them for decoration."

Dr. Johnson continues, "For at least 50 years—and this is no heresy, but eye witness testimony—slaughtering Frank Graham has been one of the favorite sports of the Tar Heel nobility and gentry. Even as a young professor of history he was suspected of adhering rather to the heretic W. J. Cash than to the inspired writings of Tom Dixon. As president of the University of North Carolina he never passed a year without some effort to indict him in the court of public opinion, but the grand jury always refused to return a true bill. Only when he was a United States Senator did they finally get him and then by indirection."

"In that office, in the fateful year 1954, he was tried, convicted, sentenced and beheaded, not for any crime of his own, but for that of the Supreme Court of the United States in abolishing segregation in the schools. But the headman's axe had hardly fallen when Frank, like John Barleycorn, 'got up again and sure surprised them all' by reincarnation

as an official peacemaker of the United Nations, finally beyond the reach of the Tar Heel nobility and gentry.

"This resilience was the everlasting mystery of the man, and no philosopher can analyze it completely. The basis was, of course, transparent honesty, but it was compounded of many other elements. It is a tradition in North Carolina that he was not merely eloquent, but spoke with the tongue of men and of angels; yet a reader of his speeches finds in them, beyond an extraordinary command of lucid English, little effort at stylistic ornament and a careful avoidance of booming and empty rhetoric. He followed the scriptural injunction to let his communication be yea, yea, and nay, nay—but he never said yea, meaning nay or nay, meaning yea. In politics, that made him remarkable, but not beloved.

"What made him in his time the great tribune of the people and their idol is most succinctly expressed in language that his Presbyterian orthodoxy would deplore. Frank Graham didn't give a damn. Whatever he thought was right, he said, and if he risked getting lynched for saying it, what of that?"

"His heart's desire was not for long life, or riches, or honors, but merely to say what ought to be said and to do what ought to be done in the North Carolina of his time. Like the young Solomon, he desired above all else an understanding heart, to discern between good and bad. He was given it, and, again like Solomon, he was given what he had not asked, long life, and honors, and in lieu of riches the unfailing love of a great people.

"Surely, then, it is reasonable to suggest that even among the durable Highlanders this one has outlasted them all."

CITIZENS BANK & TRUST CO.,

Andrews, N.C., May 17, 1969.

DR. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I was delighted to see that you had been honored by two national organizations for the "Years of Dedication and Service in the cause of Justice and Equal Opportunity for all".

While it has been some time since I have seen you, I think of you often and the time that you were president of the University. I want to take this opportunity to wish for you success in all your undertakings and the best of health.

Sincerely,

PERCY B. FEREBEE.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.

May 8, 1969.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with the many others in expressing appreciation to you today.

It would sound trite if I were to recite all the good things you have done; so I'll not do that.

One characteristic of your life, though, stands out clearly; dwarfing in importance even the best of the good deeds. It is a rare thing, one often talked about and seldom realized. I refer to the simple, yet extraordinary, fact that in your life of humility, in acting as the humble servant of your fellow men, you are the greatest among them.

This doctrine is widely taught, and, even after 2,000 years, it is widely suspect.

And yet, you have lived it, and you continue to live it.

I am awed. And appreciative.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. WALLACE.

YALE UNIVERSITY,

New Haven, Conn., May 5, 1969.

DR. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: At this time of profound social change abroad and at home, the lesson you have taught us and the example you have set for us take on special significance

in our lives. Always you have championed justice, but with love for the just and the unjust alike and never with hate for the latter or pity for the former. Always you have added your strength to those seeking to enlarge the freedom of human beings to shape their own lives, but your strength is wisdom and your counsel is of reason, and never of the power of brutish force. Always you have directed our attention to that which is faulty in our society, so that we might change it, but with equal fervor you have distinguished and affirmed the good that is here also, so that we might be heartened by it, and thereby encouraged to go on living and serving. Always you have witnessed a vision of individual and social man which transforms present imperfections into waystations on man's journey to be tolerated impatiently but never to be rejected until the next waystation is in reach. Always you have served that vision, and by your devotion to it have sanctified it for us all, but never have you been willing to sacrifice for it your devotion to love, to reason, to equity, and to grace.

No life in our time has had a greater influence on me than yours. Never in my lifetime has your moral example been of greater importance to our nation than now, and by my life I shall try to bear witness to it.

With immense admiration, gratitude, and Love,

JOEL L. FLEISHMAN.

THOMASVILLE, N.C.,
May 5, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: I simply want to say "thank you" for everything you have stood for over the years. Your example has served, and will continue to serve, as an inspiration to people of good will. Your accomplishments will stand as a foundation for the building of a better world. I thank you in the name of all the poor, the outcast, and the mistreated human beings throughout the world who have benefited from your life.

Devotedly,

CHARLES F. LAMBETH, JR.

THE MIAMI HERALD,
Miami, Fla., May 5, 1969.

DEAR DR. FRANK: This day of further recognition for all you have done for your fellow man, not to speak of your old students, is full of meaning. I remember something Gerald Johnson wrote during the war years about the right to pay tribute. I am sure that is in our minds now as we think back over your career and the influence you have had on so many lives which, I believe, have been devoted to useful purposes.

Slowly we see the promise of the American dream. I remain eternally optimistic that it is going to be achieved as long as men of integrity and courage contend for it as you have contended.

In gratefulness for what you have done for me and others who cross your path, I remain,

Always faithfully,

DON SHOEMAKER,
Editor.

DUKE UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER,
Durham, N.C., May 6, 1969.

Dr. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. FRANK: One of the privileges of our lives is the good fortune to know you and to be inspired by you. We cherish your friendship and hold dear the great tradition of humanity and freedom you have instilled in all of us.

A few days ago a small group gathered in Winston-Salem and were discussing the problems of our time—campus difficulties in particular. Someone asked the question,

"How does the University in Chapel Hill manage to go through disruption and periods of dissent and great criticism and quickly return to general acceptance where alumni reassemble and conservatives and progressives alike fall in behind it with genuine love and strength." A man in the gathering spoke up with an instantaneous answer, "The reason is Frank Graham. His spirit of liberalism—his personal approach, his love of people, education and U.N.C. in particular."

We have been asked to speak several times lately on the subject of the arts in North Carolina and why this State has been among the top three in the nation in fostering the Arts. One of the main reasons we point out is your own emphasis in the arts and humanities.

Doctor Frank, these are only two of the many, many illustrations. We could write of the daily influence you have on all our lives. You have given us the courage to continue in controversial tasks like the Civil Liberties Union and to do things because they are right.

You are truly a Christian gentleman and we send you hearts filled with love. Thank you for your friendship. May God bless you always and do please remember that we stand ready to help you with any new project you may embark on.

Your devoted friends and admirers,

MARY SEMANS
Mary Duke Biddle Trent Semans.
JIM SEMANS
James Hustead Semans, M.D.

CHARLOTTE, N.C.,
April 8, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: This is by way of extending to you my appreciation and esteem.

You raised the State of North Carolina in prestige where it became known as a liberal State, and you raised the University of North Carolina to the highest point of academic life in America.

I remember very well the night you had Dorothy Maynor, the Negro contralto, at the University and you desegregated the audience. This was back there in 1943. And the troubles you had with the trustees, Clarke and others.

But you fought them through as you did with the depression when you asked boys to stay in college and give you a note for their tuition. There's many a lawyer in North Carolina who thanks you from the bottom of his heart for this today.

On top of all of this, I have to thank you for your friendship; that you should call me friend is a great honor to me. I remember Senator Morse telling me, "Dr. Graham was the most Christ-like man I've ever met."

You ain't what's wrong with America and I love you very much.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY GOLDEN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Chapel Hill, May 5, 1969.

Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said that "Since life is action and passion, one must share the action and passion of his time upon peril of being thought not to have lived".

No one can ever accuse Frank Porter Graham on not "having lived". He does share the action and passion of his time, to the benefit of his state, region, and country; and especially to those who have been inspired by knowing him.

DANIEL H. POLLITT.

SANFORD, CANNON, ADAMS &
McCULLOUGH,
Raleigh, N.C., April 25, 1969.

DEAR DR. FRANK: You have been the inspiration of the forward-looking leadership

of North Carolina, most of the South, and much of the Nation. I count my student days and later friendship with you as among my richest blessings, and I will always be grateful.

Sincerely,

TERRY SANFORD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Chapel Hill, N.C., April 25, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: I am delighted to have the privilege of joining with hundreds of your friends and admirers in this tribute to you from the National Sharecroppers Fund and the National Child Labor Committee.

Speaking for your University, you know how proud we are to see this justly deserved tribute paid you.

There are many men and women who have done wonderful things for those less able to care for themselves; but none, Dr. Frank, exceeds your contribution of time, energy, and spirit to those who need assistance.

We are indeed happy to see this national tribute paid you.

Cordially,

WILLIAM FRIDAY.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
May 9, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: Along with others, I am extremely proud of another award that will be given to you by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund.

Over the years you have earned many awards of distinction. Your dedication to public service and your very sincere interest in human beings has brought light and happiness to many individuals and to many groups.

All of us are very proud of you.

My very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE
CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., May 1, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: Much is said these days of the quality of life. It is a phrase most often used to describe the quality the environment in its broad sense contributes to the way people live.

But there is another way to look at those words: it is to understand them in the context of the qualities that a person brings to life, the qualities that enable a man to transcend or transform his environment.

During nearly thirty years you have exemplified for me (and much longer than that for others) the qualities that make life worthwhile, whatever the limitations imposed by environment and events. You have shown us, by exhibiting them in their fullness, that among those qualities are to be loving, to be friendly, to be brave, to be modest, to be patient, to be staunch, to be thoughtful, to have convictions and to work for them, to be caring, to be optimistic, and to try to be godly. All these words are old words, bred into the memory of the race by the deeds of its most vallant members through centuries of testing times. But I am convinced that all you have done to mold events and the environment for others stems from these root qualities in your own life.

In this time when all values are being tested and questioned as seldom before in history, you shine for all of us privileged to know you as one through whose triumphs and tribulations runs the radiant, unbroken

strand of humanity at its highest exemplified in a victorious life.

Mary Jane and I so much enjoyed the hour we spent with you in March. As always, it was a privilege. With very best wishes to you and to your sister.

Sincerely,

DOUGLASS HUNT.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND,
New York, N.Y., May 6, 1969.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: One of the special joys of my life has been my association with you as Chairman of the National Sharecroppers Fund over these many years. Unlike others who often serve as chairman in name only, you gave vigorous leadership to our organization and to the struggle for a better life for all deprived farm workers.

You were always available to me when I needed you. You never made me feel that I was taking too much of your time. You were always ready and eager to discuss our problems and offer your counsel. Rarely have you missed a meeting of the Board and your presence always brought a warmth and the kind of knowledge and understanding which made Board meetings rewarding occasions.

Over the years I have learned a great deal from you, not only from your rich knowledge of history, but from your experiences and your guidance in helping our work along when serious problems had to be faced. You knew how to be firm when firmness was required but always your gentleness and love shone through. Your association with the National Sharecroppers Fund has meant a great deal to me, to our staff, to our Board members, to our supporters, and to all of the agencies with which we have been associated.

My life has been enriched through our association and I write you now to express my appreciation and love for all that you are and have been to me.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

FAY BENNETT,
Executive Director.

HARTSVILLE, S.C.,
May 6, 1969.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: How does one describe a diamond when it sparkles as the light shines on all its facets?

How can one portray the throb of one's heart as he takes his six year old to school and looks down on his face so full of hope?

How can one paint with words the sunset which comes in ever-changing, glowing colors?

How does one know the pride, the confidence, and the dedication of a young boy of fifteen as he receives his Eagle Scout award?

How does one know the feeling of achievement when it comes to a young man who has dropped out of school only to return several years later to receive his high school diploma, a Phi Beta Kappa key from his college, and a Ph. D. from his university?

So one cannot describe Frank Graham's sparkle, his hope, his beauty of character, his poise, or his confidence that education and goodness will win some day. He has had such qualities that have inspired men and women of many ages to go forward with such education and purpose that they have become leaders in the professional fields, the educational fields, and in the most important one of all, the occupation of educating Christian men and women.

He has shared his life, his gifts with everyone with whom he has come in contact. He is courageous and determined, as well as completely selfless. He has been an inspiration to those around him in his work, and he

has helped thousands around the world to render more useful lives. He has made greater everyone he has touched.

With love and admiration, your devoted friend and admirer,

Mrs. DAVID R. COKES.

ATLANTA, GA.,

April 23, 1969.

DEAR DR. FRANK: To keep encountering you, Dr. Frank, physically and otherwise, through the years is almost a talisman against a life misspent—at least so it has seemed to me in the numerous years since I met you, a brash young outlander at the South's finest university.

I remember, as do many other participants, the high point of that first encounter, in the trying years surrounding the outbreak of World War II, a group of anti-war dissidents decided to hold a Peace Day on that vehemently pro-war campus. By nightfall, when the Peace Rally was scheduled, an ugly mood had seized the campus. The two dozen young people backstage heard with dismay, that eggs, sticks, and stones were bulging out of the shirts and sweaters of the students filing into the auditorium.

The program began, I believe, with my production of "Bury the Dead." Before the drama was well underway, a missile or two landed on the stage. Thereupon social scientist Stanley Diamond, then a gangling, gutsy undergraduate, stepped out of role to urge the audience to play fair, assuring them that they would have ample opportunity to state their case at the end of the program.

This reasonable request seemed only to exacerbate the militants—eggs flew, sticks appeared, and a baleful din rose from the hall. At that point, someone had the good sense to fetch the college president, Dr. Frank. He came in and stood at the edge of the stage, alone—a small, unimposing, white haired man. He stood perfectly still and waited. The great wave of noise rolled back; in a few minutes, the auditorium was absolutely quiet. Then Dr. Frank spoke, very briefly.

He expressed some sympathy with the emotions of the audience: he, too, disagreed with the viewpoint of the rally. He then reminded them how controversy was traditionally handled in the American democracy and departed. The meeting proceeded without further incident. I have often wondered whether the dogmatists in the audience learned as much from that three-minute lesson as the dogmatists on the stage.

After this introduction, it was no surprise to encounter Dr. Frank in the flesh at the Sharecroppers Fund and in the history of the Farm Security Administration, the War Labor Board and its enormous helpfulness to Southern labor, the Southern Conference on Human Welfare during its major phase, and many, many more.

For all these we remember, honor, and love you, Dr. Frank.

VERA RONY.

OAKTON, VA.

April 18, 1969.

DR. FRANK PORTER GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: It has been a pleasure and inspiration over the years to know of the work you have done—as student leader, teacher, statesman, and friend of the forgotten folk.

As my first teacher at the University of North Carolina, you made an indelible impression on me. Your "evolution of revolutions" was history at its best, with a solid dash of good sociology inherent in it. So I did my undergraduate work in history and my graduate work in sociology.

Also, in far off Indonesia, I was almost feted one evening on the fifth anniversary of the United Nations when the Indonesian leaders learned I had been a student of Dr.

Frank Graham, who was they said in truth the Father of their country as an independent nation.

We still remember with hurt the imposing battery of national opposition brought against your candidacy in North Carolina for the U.S. Senate. We regret, too, that the Kashmir question remains unresolved. One day, in faith we expect your recommendations there, too, to be acted upon.

We salute you as a historian who has been sensitively aware of current affairs, and not afraid to attempt difficult tasks.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR F. RAPEL.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

May 6, 1969.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: It was with much pleasure that I learned of the tribute which the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund was arranging for you and I considered it a privilege to be asked to have a part in it.

I share with them and with your host of other admirers a full awareness of the very real and significant contribution which you have made to the state we both love and indeed to your country and the world by your many years of dedicated service.

You have made an indelible mark as an educator, philosopher and statesman but even more importantly as a man of courage, integrity and dedication to the causes of justice and equality.

As you now receive the recognition which you so much deserve I want to add this assurance of my own high regard and my warm wishes for your renewed health and many more satisfying and fulfilling years with your friends and loved ones.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

B. EVERETT JORDAN,
U.S. Senate.

CBS NEWS,

Fairbanks, Alaska, May 28, 1969.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. FRANK: A letter from the National Sharecroppers Fund just caught up with me here in Alaska. They wanted me to write a letter to go in the book from your friends and disciples, and I am disappointed that I did not learn of this project in time.

But then, I reflected, surely you know the central part you have had, and have yet, in the lives of so many of us. So much of what I know, and believe, and hope for in our home state and in the nation and on this small planet springs from what you have said and the example you set with your life. There must be thousands of men in this world who would say the same. Through my father, and some of my teachers at Chapel Hill, and directly from you have come the directions of my life.

It is not necessary for my letter to be included in the collection of the National Sharecroppers Fund, but it does somehow seem necessary for me to say these things.

As ever,

CHARLES KURALT.

BOONE, N.C.,

May 12, 1969.

DEAR DR. FRANK: We have heard of the collection of personal letters which were to have been presented to you this past Friday night. It is not too late, we hope, for us to add ours, or at least send directly to you our expressions of deep appreciation.

As you know, both of us prized greatly the friendships you and Marian shared with us. Yours continues to be a source of pride and satisfaction to us.

Whatever successes we may have had as President and First Lady of Appalachian has been due in great measure to you and Marian. Oftentimes we have said, "This is what Dr. Frank would have done," or "This is the way Marian would have done it."

Sometimes I am accused of being too democratic. My usual reply is to the effect that I learned democracy from one of the greatest democrats of all, Dr. Frank Graham.

You have been an example and inspiration to untold millions at home and abroad. We are proud and feel fortunate to be among these and to be able to claim you as a close personal and professional friend.

As you know, my retirement as President of Appalachian becomes effective this summer. Before I leave office and we leave the President's home, we want to thank you again and a million times for all the help and inspiration you have been to us and to tell you that you will always have a favorite spot in our hearts.

We look forward to a visit with you on one of our next trips to Chapel Hill.

Both of us send our love and very best wishes to you.

Most sincerely,

THE PLEMMONSES.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join some of my colleagues today in extending greetings to Dr. Frank P. Graham as he returns to private life after a long career of public service.

My association and friendship with Dr. Frank, which was the term most of his friends always used in speaking to or of him, began many years ago when I was a student at Chapel Hill and he was professor of history. That friendship continued and ripened through the years—while he was president of the University of North Carolina, U.S. Senator from our State, and in his service in the cause of world peace with the United Nations.

Dr. Frank Graham is a remarkable person. While he had opponents, during his presidency of the university as well as after he entered the political arena, I do not believe he ever had an enemy. His sincerity was always so genuine that even those who opposed him through the years could not help but admire him for his dedication to any cause he espoused. He also held the admiration of all who knew him for always having the courage of his convictions.

Frank Graham's courage, sincerity and dedication often led him to embrace causes that were not popular but he always continued on his course if he believed it was the right course to follow and regardless of the consequences to himself.

As Dr. Frank returns to private life, perhaps to the Chapel Hill he loved so much, I should like to be numbered among his many friends who extend to him sincere good wishes for long life, good health and peace of mind in the years ahead.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) for taking this time to pay tribute to a most unusual and most remarkable American. He represents so many of the fine things in our tradition. His courage and his

vision and his great contributions, not only to his State and his region, but also to the country and to the world, will be long remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I commend those gentlemen for taking this time to pay this tribute to Dr. Graham today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I enter into the RECORD the following letters and telegrams collected through the devotion of Miss Faye Bennett, who has worked under the vigorous leadership of Dr. Graham as executive director of the National Sharecroppers Fund, and of Eli E. Cohen, who has given so much as executive secretary of the National Child Labor Committee:

UNITED FARM WORKERS
ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, AFL-CIO,
Delano, Calif., May 5, 1969.

FRANK GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR BROTHER GRAHAM: Those of us who have toiled under the sun and know the need for organization of farm workers appreciate your work on behalf of field laborers. You have been an inspiration to us all.

The National Sharecroppers Fund under your chairmanship has made great strides especially in the area of preventing bad legislation and presenting the plight of the farm worker to Congress and the public at large. This was especially true regarding the termination of the bracero program.

We congratulate you on the occasion of your receiving of the awards and wish you better health.

Viva la causa!

CESAR E. CHAVEZ.

ENCINO, CALIF.,
April 13, 1969.

Dr. FRANK GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I wish it were possible for me to be personally in attendance this evening to offer my compliments for your many years of dedicated public service.

As a quite minor player in the drama of the American farmworkers' fight for social justice, I am mindful of your own major contributions in this field.

Please accept my warmest congratulations and good wishes.

Cordially yours,

STEVE ALLEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.:

Warm congratulations on awards being presented to you today by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund. This recognition and tribute are certainly fully merited. I hope that your health is steadily improving. Best wishes.

U. THANT.

WASHINGTON RESEARCH PROJECT,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Executive Director, National Sharecroppers
Fund, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: As a black southerner I have long watched and admired your attempts to provide decent leadership in the south. Such an example has always been and remains rare. It remains a small source of hope that you, Ralph McGill and a few others did stand strong and attempted to point the way toward things in common rather than our differences. We are very grateful.

My best hopes for many more happy and fruitful years.

Sincerely yours,

MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 15, 1969.

HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: I was so glad to hear that, on May 9th, you are to be honored by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund. I wish I could be present to express to you in person my sentiments of admiration and affection. You were one of the men in the Senate to whom Herbert felt closest; and he so often spoke of you in the highest terms. He valued your friendship tremendously, and was always so interested in anything that affected you.

As for myself, I have enjoyed knowing you over the years and, more recently, it has always been a great pleasure for me to sit next to you at dinners which we both attended.

I do hope you are feeling better, and that you will let me know when you get to New York so that I can have the pleasure of seeing you again.

In the meanwhile, heartiest congratulations, and affectionate greetings.

Yours,

EDITH A. LEHMAN
Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 23, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: What a magnificent occasion. The National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund are honoring one of this country's most eloquent, courageous and dedicated battlers for human freedom and dignity.

In these difficult and tumultuous times, we need occasions like this to refresh our spirits and to rekindle our commitment to the goals for which we have all been striving over the past decades.

I will never forget your many kindnesses and your courage and counsel during those lonely years in the Senate when these issues were very much on the back burner for most people, but not for you.

You have given so much to your country and to the less fortunate people of our land, especially those in the South. It is a great honor to join in this tribute to you.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: It is my sincere pleasure to join your many friends in appreciation of the years you have dedicated to the cause of justice and equal opportunity for all.

I wish I could be there when the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund present awards to you. I am happy that it was my good fortune to serve in the Senate with you.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

APRIL 11, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: Personally and on behalf of the AFL-CIO I am delighted to join your many friends in this demonstration of affection and appreciation.

It seems to me that all your fellow citizens owe a deep debt of gratitude for your devoted service to the nation and its people. But no group has a greater obligation than

organized labor for you have been the friend of the worker in good times and bad, in crisis and in victory.

So in the name of the AFL-CIO and on behalf of its members all over the country, I am honored to extend to you our grateful thanks.

With sincere best wishes and warmest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL-CIO.

INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT
WORKERS' UNION,
New York, N.Y., April 11, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I was happy to learn that you are being honored by the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund with awards for many years of dedicated and selfless service. You surely deserve these as well as many other honors.

This offers me and many of your friends an opportunity to tell you how we feel about your many achievements and contributions to liberal causes. Yours is an outstanding record—your whole life has been devoted to public service in the broadest sense, not only to the exploited and the underprivileged but also as president of a great university, as United States Senator and United Nations mediator.

In the sphere of organized labor, your many efforts to advance social justice are highly esteemed. In serving with you on a number of committees over the years, I came to appreciate not only your sincerity and integrity but also the depth of your devotion to everything that concerns the welfare of humanity. Your record as a liberal is greatly admired and your accomplishments will be long remembered by those who benefitted from your interest and service.

With warmest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

DAVID DUBINSKY.

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE,
Tuskegee, Ala., April 29, 1969.

Dr. FRANK GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: I deem it a privilege to be able to join with your many friends throughout the country in congratulating you on receiving awards from the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund. You richly deserve these tributes.

My colleagues at Tuskegee Institute join me in this expression of appreciation for the splendid contributions you have made over the years in the area of equal opportunity for all citizens of America. We are especially grateful for your long-standing interest in Tuskegee Institute and your outstanding work in behalf of minority groups in this country.

You have our best wishes for a continuing happiness in the years ahead.

Kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

L. H. FOSTER,
President.

APRIL 28, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: I am delighted to learn that the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund are presenting awards to you on 9 May. These two organizations are to be congratulated on the wisdom in their selection for there is no one more deserving of the tributes being paid to you by them than yourself. I heartily join them in praising you for your years of dedi-

cated effort in behalf of social justice, of decency and morality in our society. You have been always in the vanguard. You have been a courageous and unflinching pioneer and crusader. Wherever you have been, wherever you have spoken, whether on domestic matters or in support of the United Nations, you have left a glow of goodness and of hope.

It is with great admiration and affection that I take this occasion to salute you,
Yours sincerely,

RALPH J. BUNCHE.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C. April 24, 1969.

HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR DR. GRAHAM: My best wishes to you and most congratulations on your richly deserved awards. Your friends are not only quite proud of you—they are quite grateful for you.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: It is a rare privilege indeed to have known you, and of your work over the years during your all-too-short period of service in the United States Senate, as well as your service with the United Nations, and in so many additional ways.

Citizens of your state, your nation and other countries owe you a great debt of gratitude for able and dedicated service in the cause of prosperity and peace for America and the world.

Let me join with your host of friends in expressing tribute to a great public servant.

With affection and respect,

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

ATLANTA, GA.,
May 1, 1969.

Dr. FRANK GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DOCTOR GRAHAM: Few men in my lifetime have served the cause of education as constructively and effectively as you have; and few men in my time have served in the cause of international and interracial good will as you have.

I am very glad that Morehouse College had the good judgment many years ago to confer upon you an honorary degree. In doing this, we honored ourselves.

May the years ahead be gracious and kind to you and bring you many good things.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN E. MAYS.

EDP TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman, National Board, National Sharecroppers Fund, New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: I am delighted to have the privilege of joining with your many many friends to express my feelings for you and your great service to this Nation at this time.

Very few men have over such an extended period of time in so many walks of life contributed to others in a measure even close to yours. In your home community, in your state, with your Federal Government and then in the international sphere, you have brought devotion, sensitiveness and gifted leadership to the many tasks you have undertaken.

In the progress, you have charted a trail of integrity, courage and humanitarian concern for your fellow human beings particularly those who are suffering discrimination, hardships and lack of opportunity which will not be forgotten. Liberals everywhere revere the name Frank P. Graham, and rightfully so.

I am delighted to join with so many others in this expression of appreciation, affection and high regard.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

INDEPENDENCE, MO., April 30, 1969.
Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: I am informed that the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund is presenting you with Awards for your many years of dedicated service to their needs.

I well know how you have performed in response to every call to help improve the lot of the less fortunate among us. I am happy, therefore, to extend to you on this occasion warm personal greetings and congratulations.

With every good wish to a long time friend.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chairman,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: Since I have been in public life, I have learned that many fine public servants are not given full credit for the good things they do.

There is one reward, however, which cannot be taken away and this is satisfaction. And on this thesis Frank Graham must be one of the richest men in the world. All your life, you have been concerned with the needs of others—and your life's aim has been to help them.

In doing so, you have made enemies that tried to discredit you. They have failed and today you not only have satisfaction in your own heart but the gratitude of a host of people at home and abroad.

And, finally, let me say that one of the richest rewards in my own life has been knowing you and working with you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

SATURDAY REVIEW,
New York, N.Y., April 23, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK GRAHAM: Warmest greetings to one of the finest, most courageous men I know. Courageous because you were wedding high purpose to practical action long before it was safe or fashionable to do so. I can remember—and you certainly can too—when words like action and commitment were on the whole foreign to the academician's vocabulary, and *engage* was a foreign term in every sense of the phrase. It took a stout heart and a keen mind to speak out strongly in those days about social justice. You not only spoke out—by your example you encouraged others to take heart and speak out too. The past four decades of this country's social history have been the richer for your presence, and the decade that looms ahead will need you even more than we've needed you in the past. In honoring you today, the National Sharecroppers Fund and the National Child Labor Committee are speaking for all concerned Americans. Please accept my warmest best wishes.

Felicitations,

NORMAN COUSINS.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico, April 1969.
HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM.

DEAR FRANK: They tell me that you are having a little party in May at your home to celebrate what other friends think of you, and I must join them at long distance.

I doubt if you need to know by new testi-

mony the love and admiration which so many bear for you, but it is always pleasant to hear. From me, your contemporary, I can say that these years of tumult and hope always seemed more tolerable when I knew you and I were on the same side, both undefeated, both struggling, both firm in a common faith in mankind.

You have cheered me on often when you did not know it, just by being you. I got your inspiration often—at the Harvard commencement when you spoke after getting a degree, at the UN on so many occasions, and in all good causes to chart a happier future for the under-dogs everywhere. If character is what counts in the influences of a man your faith and unflinching direction will count, as it has in these long years. I've never lost the sense of it.

Always with the affection and admiration of an old colleague.

ROGER N. BALDWIN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
April 18, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM.

DEAR FRANK: There are a few Americans I have met in my career who have given of themselves as unstintingly and in so many varied capacities as you have in your full and active life.

Your conscientious response to every call of duty has led you into many fields of endeavor that seem only tenuously related, if at all, to your first vocation of educator. Yet they all have one element in common: a desire to improve the human condition and particularly the condition of those millions in our country and throughout the world who are denied an equal opportunity to enjoy economic security, good health, and intellectual, cultural and spiritual growth.

Those of us who have had the privilege of working with you, as I have had over the years, have enjoyed an experience difficult to articulate but nonetheless real and rewarding. It is the experience of working with a person, warm and wise, of unimpeachable integrity and infinite compassion, an intrepid champion of all our democratic rights and freedoms, who is sustained by an unshakable faith in the ultimate triumph of human wisdom and the best impulses of the human spirit.

I am honored to join with your many other friends in expressing to you on this day our warm appreciation and our high esteem for your great accomplishments and your years of selfless dedication and service in the cause of humanity.

Affectionately,

WALTER REUTHER.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Chapel Hill, N.C.

DEAR FRANK: Midge and I wish we could be with you on May 9. However, I am committed to be in Hawaii on that date.

I shall be giving a series of lectures on the Bill of Rights including its guarantee of the right to dissent against arbitrary, capricious, discretionary and often unconstitutional exercise of power by mere men holding government positions. As you know I have opposed our involvement in the Vietnam War from the very beginning on the grounds that it is an unconstitutional involvement of the American people in a war which also is both immoral and unjustifiable. In my lectures I shall stress the importance of our returning to the checking powers given to the Congress by the Constitution over the President of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

Although the views I shall express in the continuation of my dissent against our war-making policies in Vietnam are my own responsibility, I want you to know that your

devotion and dedication to our constitutional system of self-government and your superb record as a scholar and teacher of American Constitutional History have been a source of great inspiration to me.

How well I remember the applications of the historic background and meanings of our constitutional system which you brought to your work on the War Labor Board. The discussions we had together, and the insight you transmitted to me in regard to the application of constitutional guarantees to the daily lives of all Americans if they are to remain free men, greatly enriched my knowledge of American Constitutional History. I shall always be grateful and indebted to you, as are hundreds of your students and friends not only in North Carolina but across the entire nation and throughout the world.

Midge and I are looking forward to stopping in Chapel Hill for a visit with you the next time we drive to South Carolina to visit our daughter, Nancy, and our son-in-law, Hugh Campbell, and their family. In the meantime, our congratulations for the richly deserved awards you will receive on May 9, and our affectionate best wishes.

Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N.Y., May 2, 1969.

Dr. FRANK GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK GRAHAM: In behalf of the NAACP, I am pleased to extend cordial greetings and heartiest congratulations. This tribute is an honor you richly deserve.

Yours has been a full and uncommonly rich life, whose reward has been the attainment of many of your ideals. Few crusaders for human rights have lived to see so many of the causes they espoused in their early years become realities during later years.

In North Carolina you carried the liberal banner through the rough seas of anti-Negro sentiment when few others would publicly discuss the issues. The soundness of the ideals which you advocated can be recognized today. Through your gentle, but persistent, pursuit of justice and equality for all, you have contributed immeasurably to our progress.

It is with pleasure that I send you our warm thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Director.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April, 1969.

To have known Dr. Frank is to have been enriched.

Dr. Frank is a man among men. His use of his life in the service of others is a pattern for others to follow.

He has lived his life in the noblest Southern tradition. No Fourth of July orator he, he expressed in service his belief that all men are created equal.

Gentle, but tough . . . he never raised his voice in loud speech, but no amount of opposition stilled it in his demand for justice and fair play.

Never blinded by personal considerations, he has seen clearly the conditions under which the oppressed live . . . in his community, in the world.

The battle to right wrongs hasn't embittered him. The battle hasn't discouraged him. The battle hasn't diluted the quality of his gentle, loving nature. The battle hasn't weakened his stubborn, tough belief that justice and fair play can and must be realized for all.

Dr. Frank is proof that The Struggle does not destroy; it enriches.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH INSTITUTE,
April 11, 1969.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
National Sharecroppers Fund,
New York, N.Y.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Just a word of remembrance and congratulations to you upon having been chosen to receive awards from the National Child Labor Committee and the National Sharecroppers Fund for your long years of dedicated service.

I wish it were possible for me to be present upon the presentation of the awards to you for I have had a pleasant, happy, and rewarding association with you throughout the years in working for the cause of justice and equal opportunity for all.

Sincerely yours,

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to Dr. Frank Porter Graham who has recently celebrated his retirement from many years of public service and the 60th anniversary of his graduation from the University of North Carolina.

Dr. Graham has lived a dedicated life as a high school teacher, college professor, World War I marine, university president, governmental adviser, and United Nations mediator.

One of the many citations he has received said:

The dignity and worth of the human person is a way of life to him,

All who have been touched by his influence can agree on one thing which has been said so well upon one of Frank Porter Graham's numerous public appointments:

He won't represent North Carolina alone, nor the South, nor even this nation. He'll speak for all mankind. He is truly a citizen of the universe.

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the University of North Carolina while Frank Porter Graham was its president. His door was always open and the counsel of this beloved man was most helpful. Just as I took pride then in his being the president of my college, I take pride today in participating in this tribute.

So thanks, Dr. Frank, for several jobs well done, all of which were in service to your fellowman.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to pay tribute today to a great American; a man who has worked as an educator, champion of civil rights, and peacemaker for nearly four decades. I speak of Dr. Frank Porter Graham.

Dr. Graham began his celebrated career as an educator. In this, as in all else, his actions have been motivated by high moral standards. As president of the University of North Carolina from 1930 to 1949, Frank Graham staunchly defended intellectual and academic freedom on all issues for all people. He fiercely struggled to maintain the university as an open forum for even the most unpopular speakers.

Frank Graham truly believed in the virtues of a good education. When asked what the responsibilities of a university president were, Dr. Graham replied:

First, to keep the university open and free for fair-balanced discussion of all vital issues and to support the students in their right to have open forums.

Second, to keep and enlist the strongest faculty possible.

Third, to help promote student self-government, not as a front for the administration, but as an organic part of the government of the university.

With the same force and conviction that he pursued an open forum at his own university and the consolidation of the campus, Frank Graham also worked fervently as a champion of civil rights.

I have already spoken of the pressure he exerted to maintain free speech at the University of North Carolina. In addition, Dr. Graham began working toward desegregation even before the Supreme Court decision of 1954. He spoke all over the State of North Carolina for obedience to the ruling as the "law of the land and as a matter of wisdom."

Dr. Graham was also strongly in favor of the nonviolent civil rights movements of Martin Luther King, Jr. and A. Phillip Randolph. His warm feelings for those Negroes sitting down to stand up for the American Bill of Rights was generated by a genuine belief in freedom and liberty for all of humanity on an equal basis. It has been said:

He was seeking to put into men's hearts principles of tolerance and brotherhood which the Christian Church has been trying to put there for 2,000 years.

His high character has led him to defend integration on the ground that no man's human rights should be violated.

Dr. Graham's undaunted zeal for political, economic, and educational equality is equalled only by his genius as a peacemaker. During the war, as a public member of the War Labor Board, Dr. Graham was amazingly successful in placating stubborn antagonists. When labor and management were fighting over the question of the open-shop versus the closed shop, Frank Graham was able to propose a solution suitable to both sides. Through soft persuasion, Dr. Graham was able to arrive at a compromise agreeable to the most truculent antagonists.

Dr. Graham was a representative of the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations which arranged for a truce in Indonesia. He also served as the United Nations representative to India and Pakistan during the Kashmir dispute.

Dr. Graham was appointed by the Governor of North Carolina to serve the remainder of the late Senator Broughton's term when he died in office in 1949. During the election of 1950, Dr. Graham was described by the Raleigh News and Observer as "a truly distinguished man" as opposed to simply a "man of distinction." Through his efforts to guarantee human rights to humanity and create a peaceful world, Frank Porter Graham has certainly proven himself to be a citizen of the world.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) in this tribute to an outstanding American—former Senator Frank P. Graham, of North Carolina, and president of the University of North Carolina for 19 years. The mutual esteem and bonds of affection which exist between ALLARD LOWENSTEIN and Frank Graham

make it appropriate that he take this time for this tribute, and I commend him for his devotion to the principles for which Frank Graham has always stood.

Frank Graham's career is long and distinguished. A humanitarian in the best sense of the word, he has throughout his life spoken out for the cause of those men everywhere who have been denied justice.

As a professor of history at Chapel Hill, and later president of that institution, he was instrumental in maintaining, and furthering, the reputation of the University of North Carolina for academic excellence combined with a spirit of dedicated liberalism. Before the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the schools, Dr. Graham had promoted at the University of North Carolina discussion of the "injustice" of segregation and after 1954 vigorously supported the Supreme Court decision as both morally and legally binding. He later championed the cause of Negro demonstrators who sat in at a lunch counter in his home State, saying:

The Negroes sitting down were standing up for the American Bill of Rights. In their hearts they were not breaking the law but testing it in order to fulfill the higher law of the Bill of Rights.

Following his interim appointment to the U.S. Senate in 1949-50, he accepted an appointment to the United Nations, where he consistently worked in behalf of a settlement of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. During the speaker ban controversy at the University of North Carolina several years ago, he was asked how, as an international official, he justified his intervention in a local, North Carolina controversy. Dr. Graham replied that by his association with the United Nations, he spoke under authority of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights—of which the speaker ban was obviously in violation.

Prior to his concern with the Kashmir issue, Dr. Graham had previously arbitrated the controversy between the Netherlands and Indonesia in 1947-48, as U.S. representative on the Good Offices Committee of the United Nations Security Council. Prior to that, he had accepted, throughout and after World War II, numerous arduous assignments from the U.S. Government, including positions on the National War Labor Board, the President's Commission on Civil Rights, and with the U.S. Department of Labor. He was, furthermore, first president of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, thus continuing his efforts in the search for peaceful solutions to national and international problems.

It is not surprising that Dr. Graham's humane concerns, in addition to civil rights and international peace, are reflected in his defense of the rights of labor, his denunciations of child labor, his calls for the right of labor to organize, his demand for workmen's compensation, which were virtually his hallmark during the 1920's and early 1930's.

Dr. Graham is a man of unusual kindness and humanity, while possessing a virtue which few can boast—absolute consistency in defense of his principles.

Indeed, his fierce devotion to conviction belies the mildness of his aspect, as the Saturday Evening Post once took note:

For all his chuckling bonhomie, he has started more fights than any other man in the state and has fought them more joyously, loving his enemies tenderly while dealing them mighty blows. His smile is, indeed, warm and friendly, and his handclasp is so fervent that it most often ends up in an affectionate hug. But, his fellow citizens hasten to point out admiringly, his jaw juts out like a chunk of rock, and when he plants one foot firmly on the Sermon on the Mount and the other on the Bill of Rights, there is no moving him. His attitude of meekness and humility, they add, clothes a stern Presbyterian conscience which compels him to belabor sin, selfishness, ignorance, injustice and intolerance wherever he finds them.

Indeed, no area of human endeavor, if it serves the cause of human freedom, has escaped some measure of Dr. Graham's attention. He has borne out the prophecy of one of his admirers, made many years ago:

He'll speak for all mankind. He is a citizen of the universe.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to Dr. Frank Graham, former Senator from North Carolina and president of the University of North Carolina, on his retirement from many years of service to his country.

Dr. Graham's full professional life includes careers as a U.S. Senator, university president, United Nations mediator, World War I marine, governmental advisor, college professor, and high school teacher.

For most, adequate discharge of any of these professions requires full time and energy. Yet, it is an understatement to say that Dr. Graham's capabilities exceed those of most men. Indeed, former Senator Wayne Morse once characterized Dr. Graham as "the most Christ-like man I ever knew."

His efforts on behalf of migratory workers, his fight for the labor movement in the South, and his strong stand on racial equality as a member of the Truman Commission on Civil Rights will always be remembered.

It has been said that, to Dr. Frank Graham, "the dignity and worth of the human spirit is a way of life." Perhaps better than any others, those words capture the essence of the man.

FEDERAL ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT REPAYMENT ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the present condition of Federal water resource project development—from evaluation analysis through congressional authorization to construction and repayment—is in chaos.

The criteria for project evaluation analyses are outdated and inadequate. Data supplied to Congress upon which project authorization is considered are, at very best, inaccurate and misleading. Actual construction costs are skyrocketing to the point where they have rela-

tively little relevance to authorized project costs. And project repayment is confused and inadequate. The time has long since past when we, as a nation, with such huge and demanding priority drains on our Federal Treasury, can allow such conditions to continue.

The Federal Water Resources Council has been studying the problems of water project evaluation criteria and has made a small contribution toward making these criteria more timely and meaningful by their increasing the interest rates to be used in project evaluation. Today, legislation is being introduced which, when enacted, will make a major contribution toward clearing up another part of this chaos by establishing a uniform Federal policy on repayment of the reimbursable Federal costs of power features of water resource projects. Several of our distinguished colleagues—Representatives CLARK, DORN, JONAS, HALEY, HOSMER, MICHEL, MILLER of Ohio, SLACK, UTT, and WOLD—are joining me in this endeavor.

PROJECT EVALUATION

The executive agencies have been given specific policies, standards, and procedures by the President to be used uniformly in formulating, evaluating, and reviewing plans for use and development of water and related land resources. A statement of these policies, standards, and procedures is contained in Senate Document 97, 87th Congress, second session, May 29, 1962. Occasionally these policies are amended to reflect changing times and conditions. A significant change in the interest rate standard used for discounting future benefits and computing costs was made by the Water Resources Council late last year and published in the Federal Register on December 24, 1968—33 F.R. 19170.

The old standard, as contained in Senate Document 97, provided:

The interest rate shall be based upon the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the end of the fiscal year preceding such computation which, upon original issue, had terms to maturity of 15 years or more.

The Water Resources Council amended this section to read:

The interest rate . . . shall be based upon the average yield during the preceding fiscal year on interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States which, at the time the computation is made, have terms of 15 years or more remaining to maturity. . . .

This section shall apply to all Federal and federally assisted water and related land resources project evaluation reports submitted to the Congress, or approved administratively, after the close of the second session of the 90th Congress.

Therefore, the new interest rate to be used for all Federal and federally-assisted water resource project evaluation reports submitted to the Congress after the close of the 90th Congress shall be based "upon the average yield during the preceding fiscal year" rather than "the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury." The change from average rate payable to average yield has resulted in a substantial increase in the applicable interest rate over the 3¼ percent that prevailed in 1968. The increase,

however, was limited by the Council to 4½ percent until July 1, 1969. Since July 1, it is increased to 4¾ percent. The Council also provided that the rate shall not be raised or lowered more than one-quarter of 1 percent for any year. This certainly is a more realistic rate in light of today's economic conditions, but still falls far short of the current average yield of something like 6¼ percent.

The Water Resources Council notice was clear in its intention that the new interest rate would not apply to Federal projects for which evaluation reports were submitted to the Congress before the close of the second session of the 90th Congress. Seven proposed Bureau of Reclamation projects presently pending before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee fall into this category and still apply the old interest rate calculation in their evaluation reports. They are: First, Kennewick extension, Yakima project, Washington; second, Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Washington; third, Merlin division, Rogue River project, Oregon; fourth, North Loup division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska; fifth, O'Neill unit, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska; sixth, Narrows units, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado; and seventh, Columbus Bend project, Texas.

There are probably Corps of Engineers projects in this category pending before the Public Works Committee. Evaluation reports on any proposed project other than those pending in the Interior and Insular Affairs or Public Works Committees must be prepared using the new, higher interest rates.

The Water Resources Council amendment represents a substantial step in the direction of correcting some of the inequities previously used in water resource project benefit/cost analysis. However, this benefit/cost analysis applies only to the preauthorization evaluation reports submitted to the Congress prior to consideration of a specific project.

But, Mr. Speaker, the tragic truth is that the interest rate used in the benefit/cost statements given to the Congress in these reports has absolutely no relationship whatsoever to the interest rate actually used by Government agencies in establishing the amortization schedule for repaying project costs after it has been constructed. Necessary policies, standards, and procedures for project cost allocation, reimbursement, and cost-sharing are not covered in Senate Document 97.

The 1962 statement of purpose and scope of Senate Document 97 asserts that—

Problems of cost allocation and of reimbursement or cost-sharing between the Federal Government and non-federal bodies will be covered subsequently.

In the intervening 7 years, the requisite standards have neither been "covered" nor established. The time is now upon us when we, the Congress, must take prompt, affirmative action to stop the establishment of repayment schedules for power facilities in Federal projects using interest rates which are totally unrelated

to the interest rates used in evaluating costs and benefits for project authorization; and, more seriously, which are completely out-of-touch with the realities of sound, sensible fiscal management.

The Congress was warned of this monetary manipulation, since section VI (c) of Senate Document 97 contains the caveat:

The period of analysis and discount rate established herein for purposes of formulation and evaluation of comprehensive plans and project plans (Sec. V-G-1 and 2) shall not be construed as establishing the payout period or rate of interest to be used in reimbursement and cost-sharing arrangements.

Because the Congress has not put a stop to this strange arrangement, several bills to authorize construction of individual projects already have been introduced in the 91st Congress providing for a specific interest rate to be used in calculating repayment which substantially differs from the new rate required for project evaluation. It is true that before these bills are considered by the Congress, the preauthorization project evaluation reports—using the new interest rate—will be submitted. It is also true that the new rate will effect benefit/cost ratios and, thus, will affect authorizations; but—I repeat for emphasis—the new interest rate will in no way affect interest rates for repayment of the reimbursable costs of Federal projects to the taxpayers.

PROJECT REPAYMENT

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are introducing today is one which would correct this monetary manipulation by establishing "a uniform Federal policy for repayment of costs of Federal electric projects" which will assure to the tax paying citizens of this Nation that the funds they have advanced for construction of these projects will be repaid on the same basis as advanced. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill, when enacted, will establish the uniform policy of the United States requiring each and every Federal electric power project to be self-liquidating through amortization, with interest, of its total costs within 50 years after the project is first used for power production. When there is more than one unit in a project, the 50-year payout period will apply to each unit rather than the whole project, for power ratemaking purposes, however, the composite costs of the project's units shall be considered. It should be understood that use of the term "project" in this context may mean either one single water resource development unit or a series of several units. For example, the Colorado River storage project was authorized to include four storage units. These units are Glen Canyon in Arizona, Flaming Gorge in Utah, Navajo in New Mexico, and Curecanti in Colorado. Also there are 16 participating units. Thus, all 20 of these units should be considered as one project for ratemaking purposes. In the case of the Boulder Canyon project there is only one unit, the Hoover Dam.

The amount to be repaid, with interest, would include all construction costs

allocated to electric power, plus interest during construction. The interest rate to be used for computing interest during construction and on the unpaid balance of the Federal costs would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of computed average yields of outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a redemption date of 15 years or more from the date of issue. This would make the interest rate formula to be used in calculating repayment the same as was used in figuring costs and benefits for authorization.

The power rates charged for the power produced in Federal projects would be established at levels sufficient to meet the required repayment at least. They would still, however, be "low" by any standard for comparison with the power rates charged by non-government electric power suppliers.

While these so-called low Federal power rates are generally unfair, there is no attempt in this legislation to correct all the inequities contained in the Federal power rate structure. For example, the principal reason for these "low" Federal power rates is the fact that present Federal power pricing relieves users of Federal power of the burden of making any payment whatsoever, in the price they pay for that power, toward the costs of carrying on the necessary activities of the Federal Government. Last year between 75 and 80 percent of the Nation's electric customers paid an average of 22 cents on every dollar they spent for that electricity in the form of Federal, State, or local taxes to help pay for the operation of these governments. These 75 to 80 percent were customers of investor-owned electric companies.

The 20 to 25 percent of electric consumers who get their electricity from other sources paid no comparable Federal taxes and almost no State or local taxes.

This is not a new or unknown phenomenon. Over 14 years ago the Task Force on Water and Power of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government called attention to this grossly unfair situation by saying:

There is no economic nor social reason why the customers of Federal power should not pay their proportionate share of the costs of Federal Government as do the users of non-federal power. . . .

There is no economic nor social reason nor reason in equity why all customers of Federal power should not pay in their rates their fair share of the costs of State and local governments.

Still nothing has been done to correct this inequity. While fairness and equity to the vast majority of electric consumers would require inclusion of a factor for taxes foregone in the rates to be charged to the users of Federal power, this legislation we are introducing today does not go that far. However, the issue would be appropriate for consideration by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during hearings on our bill.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, there has been a pressing need for enactment of this kind of legislation for a long time, since there is no

overall requirement in Federal law at the present time that costs allocated to Federal hydroelectric power development be repaid in any uniform manner. The result is confusion and inequity in the application of repayment criteria. Section 3 of our bill points this out by stating in part:

Existing laws contain a variety of formulas and requirements for repayment of the Federal costs of electric power projects and related facilities. Some laws contain no specific repayment provisions. Electric power from some Federal projects is being sold at rates which do not cover the financial costs of such projects to the government.

Provisions for repayment in a specific number of years have been written into the authorizing statutes of a few different power projects or systems, but no one law applies uniformly to all such projects. Consequently, project repayment is in shambles with the result that unknown millions of dollars of Federal revenue are being lost each year.

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEM

Mr. Speaker, let us discuss this problem for a few moments for the benefit of our thoughtful colleagues. There are two significant, salable products of Federal water resource developments—water and electric power. Revenues from the sale of these products are used to meet the theoretical requirement for repayment of the Federal costs which is clearly set forth in basic law.

The water is sold for irrigation or for industrial or municipal supply. The Reclamation Project Act of 1939—53 Stat. 1187—provides the basic standard that construction costs allocated to irrigation shall be repaid to the Federal Government by an approved water organization. The repayment obligation shall be spread over annual installments for a period not to exceed 40 years plus an approved development period not to exceed 10 years. Actually, however, a large portion of the reclamation projects cannot and do not meet this repayment requirement. Such projects have been individually authorized by specific statutes which set forth definite—but exceedingly more liberal—repayment requirements. This is the same situation I described a few moments ago relative to some of the authorization bills presently pending in the Congress. The water Supply Act of 1958—72 Stat. 297—provides the basic standard for repayment of costs of Federal projects allocated to municipal and industrial water supplies. That act requires the entire amount of construction costs allocated to water supply, including interest during construction, shall be repaid within the life of the project, but in no event shall this repayment period exceed 50 years.

As far as the other salable product—hydroelectric power—is concerned, however, there are several unresolved problems:

First. Diverse statutory provisions cover the rates to be charged for power from federal projects. They fail to provide for uniform standards concerning the period of repayment for such facilities and the rate of interest to be charged on the unamortized balance.

Second. Congressional direction for

the review of power rates are either non-existent or sorely inadequate.

Third. After the financial cost of power facilities in some projects has been repaid, power revenues are being used to repay power facilities in other projects without any specific congressional authority.

Fourth. In all too many instances, power rates are inadequate to repay power investment even according to the announced standards for those individual projects.

Mr. Speaker, these problems are of such important magnitude that they must not be passed over lightly; but, rather, they should be given serious consideration by the Congress.

First, lack of uniform standards: Almost all laws relative to Federal power projects do not contain specific requirements that the power investment be repaid in a definite period, with interest, at a determinable rate. In some instances, they do not even provide that the rates must be adequate to repay the power investment with interest. In others, repayment is required, but the time period is not specified; and there is not always a clear statutory mandate that interest be paid on the unamortized balance.

There are a few exceptions to this general statement, however. In the case of Hoover Dam, the statutory repayment requirements are clearly laid down in the authorizing legislation, the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928—45 Stat. 1057. The law provides, in effect, that before any appropriation could be made for the construction of Hoover Dam, the Secretary of the Interior shall have made contracts for the sale of power to be produced at rates sufficient to cover all costs of producing power and the repayment of the power investment in 50 years with interest at 4 percent.

The authorization legislation for the Colorado River storage project—70 Stat. 105—is also specific by providing that power produced at this project should be sold at rates sufficient to provide for the repayment of the power facilities in 50 years with interest. Concerning the rate of interest to be paid on the unamortized balance, the law, as originally passed by the Congress, stated it was to be based on the "average yield to maturity on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 years or more." This provision is significant because it was the first statutory requirement to use an interest rate based on yield rather than rate payable in calculating project repayment.

Four years later, however, in June of 1960, an unrelated section was added to an otherwise acceptable bill authorizing construction of the Norman project in Oklahoma which had the effect of changing this interest rate formula for three dams in the Colorado River storage project. During the discussion in this chamber concerning the Norman project, the late Representative Clarence Brown, Sr. of Ohio said:

This particular section of the bill, section 9, was put on the measure in the other body as a rider without any committee hearing whatsoever being held on the rider or on the

measure at all, as I am informed, and was approved and slipped right through that body.

During that some discussion, I attempted to clarify the situation by making the following statement:

Just to make sure that the legislative history of this bill will be correct, it is not the intention of the chairman or the members of the [Interior and Insular Affairs] committee to have this provision applied to any project except the three which have been specified by the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of our committee.

Those three projects for which the interest rate formula was changed were Curecanti, Central Valley of Utah, and San Juan-Chama in New Mexico. The original formula based on yield was to continue to apply to all other projects in the Colorado River storage system.

The statutory repayment requirements applicable to the Boulder Canyon Act and the Colorado River Storage Act are exceptional and just a little research reveals that the law applicable to most other projects is not nearly so precise.

Different statutory requirements have been set for interest rates for power generated at various reclamation projects. For example, the Congress, in section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, provided:

Any sale of electric power or lease of power privileges, made by the Secretary in connection with the operation of any project or division of a project, shall be for such periods, not to exceed 40 years, and at such rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, interest on an appropriate share of the construction investment at not less than 3 percentum per annum, and such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper.

Several things should be carefully noted about this quoted language. The 40 years mentioned relates only to the maximum duration of any allowable sales contract and not to project repayment. There is no specific reference made to amortization as an element of cost. The language states that power revenues shall be "at least sufficient to cover" a share of the annual operating and maintenance costs and interest. The implication from this is that such revenues might be larger than would be required merely to cover such minimum costs. The interest at not less than 3 percent on an appropriate share of the construction investment could go on and on without limit, since there is nothing in the law providing that it would be applicable only to the unrepaid investment. Thus, for power facilities built under the Reclamation Act, there is no statutory requirement for their repayment. However, the Bureau of Reclamation states that the average rate for firm commercial energy is determined "as that which is necessary to provide sufficient revenue to repay all costs to be borne by power." The Bureau goes on to state:

Construction costs to be borne by power are divided into two parts for most studies. The first part covers those costs attributable to production and marketing of commercial power. This power investment is to be repaid with interest at 3 percent or such other rate as may have been specifically authorized for

the particular project. Interest during construction is included where shown on the individual studies. The second part covers those remaining project costs which are assigned to power, and are to be repaid from power revenues. These costs are, for the most part, irrigation costs which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay and are repaid without interest, in accordance with the Reclamation Project Act.

All construction costs borne by power are reimbursable, and the rates for firm commercial energy are set to accomplish the repayment of these costs within a specific period after the costs are incurred. Since construction investment generally is not made in a single year, but may be made over a period of years as irrigation and power needs develop, the total period from initial operation of the project to final repayment of all costs may be more than 50 years. However, the repayment period for the commercial electric plant investment for a particular year does not extend beyond 50 years. (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, "Power Systems, Average Rate and Repayment Studies, FY 1968," pages 2-3.)

The bill we are introducing allows for the fact that construction costs are spread out by providing that the 50-year repayment period begins when project is first used for production of power. In the case of multi-unit projects, the repayment on each unit shall begin with the use of that unit for power purposes.

The Bonneville Project Act of 1937—50 Stat. 731—establishing the Bonneville Power Administration originally to market power from the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River, was not explicit as to repayment and interest on its power facilities. This act provides that rate schedules for the sale of power should be drawn by the Administrator "having regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital over a reasonable period of years." It also said such rate schedules shall "become effective upon confirmation and approval thereof by the Federal Power Commission." This law does not prescribe the maximum period of repayment for the power facilities or require that interest be charged on the unrepaid balance. In practice, rates have been drawn supposedly to provide for the repayment of power facilities in not more than 50 years. The Senate Committee on Appropriations stated on March 23, 1965, that—

The Committee notes, however, that at present Bonneville power rates, the costs allocated to power cannot be returned within a period of 50 years . . . since projects in this area were individually approved and authorized by the Congress on the basis that the costs allocated to power would be repaid with interest over a period of 50 years, the Committee expects them to be repaid on that basis. (89th Congress, S. Doc. 167, page 28).

Although the Bonneville Act did not expressly require the power rates be sufficiently high to cover interest on the unrepaid investment, such interest charges have been considered as a cost in setting power rates. For many years, interest was computed at 2.5 percent, but on some of the more recent facilities, a different rate has been used. For new works, the interest rate is based on the average rate payable on interest-bearing marketable Government obligations with a maturity of 15 or more years.

The Congress, in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944—58 Stat. 887—made the Secretary of the Interior the marketing agent for practically all multiple-purpose power projects of the Corps of Engineers. Like the Bonneville Act, this act provided that rate schedules for power from such projects should be drawn by the Secretary having regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting the power, including the repayment of the power investment "over a reasonable period of years." Such schedules are to become operative and effective upon approval by the Federal Power Commission. Here again, although the law is not specific, power rates are set supposedly to recover the power investment in not more than 50 years with interest at 2.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent to all of us, therefore, that there is a total lack of uniformity in the statutory requirements for repayment of Federal power projects. This lack of uniformity is one of the factors contributing to the present chaotic condition of the Federal water resource development picture.

So far as this unresolved problem of the "lack of uniform standards" is concerned, our bill will resolve it.

Second, inadequate rate review: Power rates for most Federal hydroelectric projects are set by the Secretary of the Interior without outside review by an agency such as the Federal Power Commission. The FPC has the responsibility under the Flood Control Act of 1944, the River and Harbor Act of 1945—59 Stat. 22, the Fort Peck Act—52 Stat. 403, the Bonneville Act, the Falcon Dam Act—68 Stat. 255, and the Klutna Act—64 Stat. 382—to approve rate schedules applicable to the sale of electric power and energy generated at certain Federal electric power projects. During fiscal year 1968, for example, the FPC had the responsibility for approving power rate schedules at 59 Federal hydroelectric projects. However, as of January 1, 1968, there were 137 federally owned projects in operation. Therefore, there were 78 federally owned projects—or almost 60 percent of the total—for which the FPC had absolutely no authority to approve power rates.

Even where the law provides for FPC approval of power rates schedules, there are numerous shortcomings in this regard which have not been corrected by the statutes.

First, there is no one law which provides a method of compelling the Secretary of the Interior to file power rates for a project with the FPC in the first instance, if he does not wish to do so. For example, the Secretary consistently refused to file the power rates for the Missouri River Basin project. Our bill will correct this shortcoming.

Second, should the FPC disapprove a proposed power rate schedule, there is no way to compel the Secretary to submit a new rate schedule that might prove to be more satisfactory to the FPC. For example, in 1958, the FPC disapproved power rates for projects on the Cumberland River. The FPC did not approve of the Secretary's use of the incremental method of allocating joint costs and op-

posed his use of 2 percent as the rate of interest—19 FPC 744. Although the Comptroller General complained to the Congress about the Secretary's failure to file a new rate schedule, the Secretary did not do so until December 1963—over 5 years later. The FPC approved this new schedule, although it met only partly the objections raised in 1958—32 FPC 1523. In 1964, the Comptroller General recommended to the Congress that the 1944 Flood Control Act be amended to prescribe the course of action to be taken if the FPC disapproved a power rate schedule. The 1964 report of the Comptroller General on "Sale of Hydroelectric Power at Rates Not Approved by the Federal Power Commission" was the most recent report on this subject. Our bill will correct this shortcoming.

Third, except in a few instances, the laws imposing the responsibility on the FPC for approving power rates do not specify who is to determine what portion of the joint costs of the projects should be allocated to power. Such allocation might possibly be made by the constructing agency—the corps—the power marketing agency—Interior—or by the FPC. On several occasions, the FPC and the Corps have differed as to how such costs were to be allocated to power. Our bill will correct this shortcoming.

Fourth, the FPC has taken a restricted view of its role in reviewing power rate schedules submitted by the Department of the Interior. Thus, the FPC in approving a power rate increase for the Bonneville Power Administration in December 1965, said:

Congress obviously did not mean that we were to supplant the Secretary's responsibility for initiating appropriate rates, nor were we to make a *de novo* determination. The statutory standard leaves the Secretary a measure of discretion. It follows, therefore, that we need not necessarily reach the same conclusion as the Secretary. Our role is to review the Secretary's proposal and confirm and approve it if we conclude, on the basis of our independent judgment, that it comports with the dual statutory standard of providing consumers with the benefits of power at the lowest possible price consistent with good business practices as well as protecting the interests of the United States in amortizing its investment in the projects within a reasonable period.

Our bill will correct this shortcoming by giving FPC final authority in the rate making.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of the legislation we have introduced today will represent a giant step in the direction of resolving the problem of inadequate review of Federal power rates because the Federal Power Commission will have the authority to approve power rates at all Federal projects and will report to the Congress annually on each project's compliance with the new uniform requirements.

Third, use of power revenues after repayment: Although it is assumed generally in setting power rates that power facilities will be repaid in not more than 50 years, this does not mean necessarily that the facilities will be repaid in such a period solely from the revenues resulting from their own power production. A number of power marketing agencies have followed the practice of using reve-

nues from a fully repaid installation to repay other more costly facilities, even though Congress has not authorized this practice except for the Federal Columbia River power system. In 1966, the act authorizing construction of the third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam allowed this scheme of "rolling amortization" as it is called. The power marketing agencies which are using this scheme, contend that all facilities are to be repaid in 50 years, but, in effect, this is accomplished only by using power revenues from some projects for much more than 50 years. The BPA explained this manipulation in its 1963 annual report as follows:

Thus, when Bonneville Dam, the first in our system, is paid out in 1994, its revenues beyond that date will be used to help pay out the newer dams in the system. Fifty years after the last dam on the system is completed, it will be paid out from its own revenues and those of the older dams which were paid out earlier. In this manner, the power investment in each dam still will be repaid within 50 years after its completion.

The Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration also use rolling amortization, even though the Congress has not authorized its use in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I think the following point should be noted by our colleagues and should be brought strongly to the attention of the various Federal power marketing agencies. Since the Congress took the position that this rather unique financial arrangement had to be specifically authorized for the Federal Columbia River power system, the strong inference has been created that where it has not been so authorized, it cannot and must not be used.

Fourth, power rates are inadequate: The power rates charged for power produced at a number of Federal projects have not been sufficient in recent years to meet all of the costs of its production, including interest and repayment. An excellent case in point is the Southwestern Power Administration which markets 1,425,000 kilowatts of power generated at Corps of Engineers dams in all of Arkansas and Louisiana, and parts of Missouri, Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma. In August 1968, the Federal Power Commission found—

Our examination of SWPA's rate/revenue relationship shows that SWPA will not be able to meet its financial payout obligations under present marketing practices and existing contractual arrangements. . . .

SWPA is in its 26th year of operation and, to date has not met its scheduled repayment obligations. As shown in its 1967 study, at the end of fiscal year 1966, the accumulated initial power investment for hydroelectric projects and associated transmission facilities was \$410,328,728. Accumulated revenues have been sufficient to pay off operating costs but have fallen \$41,474,048 short of paying interest charges in the investment and generation and transmission facilities. (FPC order on Docket No. E-7172, August 15, 1968, pages 1 and 6)

Another example of a project failing to meet payout schedules is the Falcon Dam of the Bureau of Reclamation on the Rio Grande River in Texas. This 31,500-kilowatt project has very little dependable power. Since it was com-

pleted in 1955, it has never earned the \$444,000 required annually to cover all of its costs, including interest and repayment during a period of 50 years, because no one would buy the power at rates designed to yield such revenue. As a result, on January 17, 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation sought approval from the FPC for a period of 5 years of a rate schedule that would yield annually only \$320,000 of revenue. The FPC in approving this proposal, stated:

The sale of this amount of energy under the currently proposed rates would produce an annual revenue of \$320,000. Annual power costs, exclusive of amortization charges, are estimated to average about \$345,000. Of this estimated annual cost approximately \$180,500 is attributable to interest on the investment. It would, therefore, appear that although the power revenue to be provided by the project falls short of its total costs, it does exceed the out-of-pocket costs and provides for a substantial portion for the interest on the investment. (29 F.P.C. 457, 459)

According to the Bureau of Reclamation, this project from 1955 through fiscal 1968 had total revenues of \$3,850,489. However, total revenue deductions were \$1,897,029 for operation and maintenance, \$2,540,968 for interest, and \$1,783,545 for depreciation. Therefore, the Falcon project lost a total of \$2,493,968 during this period and has fallen almost \$716,811 short of meeting its repayment requirements. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that the project will have funds available by 1978 to restart paying the Federal Government, and when the project is 59 years old—in the year 2013—still about 68 percent of the project power costs will be unrepaid.

The Rio Grande project has 24,300 kilowatts of installed generating capacity in Elephant Butte Dam. The power installation was completed in 1940. Between 1940 and 1968, the project has lost \$2,663,221, after the payment of interest. Although every year after 1950 the project failed to earn enough to cover all charges, including interest but excluding repayment, the Department of the Interior expects that in 1972 it may begin to earn some repayment and in the last year contained in the repayment study for this project—2020, 80 years after project completion—approximately 50 percent of the costs will still remain to be repaid.

The giant Missouri River Basin project with its numerous generating units—which by the way has cost the taxpayers over \$1.1 billion to date for the power facilities alone—lost money every year between 1954 and 1965 for a total of \$57,649,187. In 1965, the law was changed to help bail this project out of its financial difficulties. The sale of power from the Missouri River Basin project is governed by the Reclamation Act of 1939 and the Flood Control Act of 1944. These acts require that the Secretary of the Interior sell the power at such rates as, in his judgment, will produce sufficient revenues to recover operating costs and the Government's expenditure for power facilities, with interest. Successive repayment studies made by MRBP subsequent to 1950 indicated a worsening

financial position for the project and the 1962 study clearly showed that the expenditures for commercial power facilities would not be repaid within 50 years from the date they had been incurred.

A few years ago the financial condition of MRBP became so obviously bad that our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs felt compelled to request a study be made by the Department of the Interior on ways and means of placing the project in a sound financial position. To comply with this request, the Bureau of Reclamation undertook a new study using revised criteria and principles for interest rates, expenditures, time periods, and revenues which were deemed necessary. The report was submitted to the committee on December 17, 1963.

The MRBP average rate and repayment studies prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal years 1966 through 1968 did not include projections as to when the commercial power costs will be repaid but instead indicated that economic analyses were under way. On March 18, 1968, the Comptroller General reported to the Congress on the "Need for Change in Method of Computing the Cost of Power Sold for Commercial Purposes, Missouri River Basin Project." In that report, the Comptroller General recommended a comprehensive study be made of power rates for the eastern division of the Missouri River Basin, to determine the extent to which MRBP rates would be raised and still remain in line with other power rates in the area. Our bill will resolve this problem of inadequate power rates or the Congress will be kept currently informed of the reasons for the rates being inadequate.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has made substantial progress in recent years in establishing uniform policies applicable to water resource development standards as they apply to irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply and recreation facilities. But, there still remains the need to write uniformity into the law relative to repayment of power costs. The time is long past for the Congress to procrastinate in correcting this problem. The enactment of the legislation we introduce today will accomplish this desirable goal by establishing a uniform policy relating to project repayment through amortization within 50 years using interest rates based on average yields of outstanding marketable public debt obligations. Enactment of this legislation will be a memorable milestone in correcting chaos which exists in Federal water resource project development. Therefore, we, the sponsors, respectfully urge its speedy enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill for the information and use of our colleagues:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1: This section of the bill is the enacting clause and short title—"Federal Electric Power Project Cost Repayment Act of 1969."

Section 2 states the declared policy of the United States to be that federal electric power projects should be self-liquidating through repayment with interest in not to

exceed 50 years from when the project or unit is first used for power production.

Section 3: (a) States the Congressional finding concerning lack of uniformity in federal power project repayment.

(b) The purpose of the legislation is to establish: (1) power rates set to produce sufficient revenues to repay at least the capital cost of power facilities as well as maintenance, operation, and replacement costs; (2) standards to insure annual payments sufficient to liquidate, with interest, the project costs allocated to power; (3) authority for the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the stated policy; (4) a time schedule for complete effectuation of this policy; and (5) requirement that the Federal Water Resources Council develop cost allocation and cost sharing standards.

Section 4 contains definitions of certain terms as used in this legislation.

Section 5 requires the Federal Water Resources Council to set up procedures and standards for project cost allocation and cost sharing within 180 days.

Section 6: (a) Requires repayment of federal costs in not over 50 years.

(b) Requires annual repayment payments.

(c) Requires rate of interest applicable to federal power projects to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the computed average yield on outstanding public debt obligations with a maturity of 15 years or more as of the beginning of the year in which construction of the "power facilities" was initiated.

Section 7 gives the Federal Power Commission authority to fix power rate schedules to assure project compliance.

Section 8 gives Secretary of the Interior responsibility for having marketing agencies carry out this act and for setting rate schedules under this act. If power in a project cannot be sold in three years at a price that conforms to this act, then it is to be sold at the highest marketable price and the Secretary is to report to the Congress on the reasons why an exception to the policy is necessary.

Section 9:

(a) Provides that power revenues may not be earmarked or encumbered after the 50-year repayment period "without specific authorization by the Congress."

(b) After project repayment, revenues go into General Fund of Treasury.

(c) Contains instructions for setting power rates after project repayment.

Section 10 makes legislation applicable to all federal power projects except those of TVA "and any research and development project" of the AEC.

Section 11 requires the Federal Power Commission to maintain a continuous review of the repayment status of all federal power projects and report annually to the Congress regarding compliance with the law.

Section 12: "All earlier provisions of law in conflict therewith" shall be superseded.

Section 13: This is the usual separability provision.

Section 14: The legislation takes effect when enacted.

RISE IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the long-suffering consumers of this country were given another shock this morning when they learned that the Consumer Price Index has taken another sharp jump, this time to an annual rate of 7.2 percent. This is shocking testimony to the failure of the Federal Government to get its house in order.

Last fall during the presidential campaign the voters of the country were led to expect something different. In his acceptance speech at Miami, Mr. Nixon said:

I see a day when our senior citizens and millions of others can plan for the future with the assurance that their government is not going to rob them of their savings by destroying the value of their dollar.

Well, those were encouraging words, but the record of this administration to date is a very different story. It is a record of indecision, delay, miscalculation, and a total failure of leadership which has left the business of labor communities adrift, unaware of any constraints, guidelines, or national policies relating to wages, prices, and the cost of living.

It seems that the administration is clearly against sin, but unwilling to define it.

Mr. Speaker, I have withheld any criticism of the new administration, on this or any other issue, until it had time to work out its policies and put them into effect. Even now I am willing to support President Nixon on an effective program to check inflation. And he knows that I supported him on extension of the 10-percent surtax in spite of my strong feeling that tax reform deserves equal priority.

However, the price of my continued support of the surtax—and it will undoubtedly meet another test in the form of a conference report—is some demonstration that the administration is actually serious about inflation and willing to face some of the hard realities related to it.

The dialog between the President and Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy has not been an inspiring one. In fact, it brings back memories of that weird dialog of 1957 between President Eisenhower and his Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, when Mr. Humphrey announced that Mr. Eisenhower's budget had "a lot of fat in it," and Mr. Eisenhower alternately agreed and disagreed with this view.

In this case Secretary Kennedy has clearly shown that he knows how serious is our inflation situation. With complete realism he has warned on several occasions that, unless the threat is met in other ways, inflation will have to bring on wage and price controls. In each instance, often before nightfall of the same day, President Nixon has put out statements contradicting his Secretary, at the same time declaring that he stands behind Mr. Kennedy in his fight against inflation.

I think Mr. Nixon is suffering from a crisis of identity. He knows what he does not want to be, but he does not know what he wants to be.

What he doesn't want to be is Lyndon Johnson, the man so long denounced by Mr. Nixon and his associates as an arm-twister and jawbone persuader.

Yet what role does Mr. Nixon plan to play as the value of the American dollar skids and skids and skids? Just since he became President the value of every bank account and insurance policy in the country has declined more than 5 percent. And yet he apparently is unwilling

to exercise the slightest bit of leadership to halt this tragic decline.

What affirmative action we have seen since January 20 has come from the Federal Reserve, which has applied increasing pressure to reduce the money supply. The effect of this has been a steady rise in interest rates, which is starting to create serious problems in housing and elsewhere. But without some leadership from the President the job is not going to be done, either by a money squeeze or surtax extension, or a combination of them.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the President believes that, if Congress will only complete action on the surtax bill, the whole problem will go away. I think he is badly mistaken.

The fact is that the President, and only the President, has the means to exercise moral leadership in this area. And Mr. Nixon thus far has refused to do so.

What a different story it would be right now if President Nixon had started his term with a strong statement of policy on wages and prices, a clear signal to the leaders of business and labor that restraint would be the order of the day. Instead, Mr. Nixon chose to tell the country, at his first press conference, that labor and business leaders "have to be guided by the interests of the organizations that they represent."

What leadership. What a blank check.

Apparently, Mr. Nixon cannot make the transition from candidate to President. It was fun castigating Lyndon Johnson for interfering with the freedom of the marketplace through his guidepost system. But by chopping down those guideposts he has left the economic forces of this country to do what comes naturally; namely, to raise prices and wages to the maximum.

No one should believe that Mr. Nixon could have stabilized the dollar overnight. But as a newly inaugurated President he had a rare opportunity to set a new course for our economy. Because of his personal identity crisis he did not, and we are now paying the price, not just with a continuation of the inflation of the last 3 years, but with an accelerated rate of inflation.

Where will it end? And when will it end? These are questions that can have no answers until President Nixon faces up to his responsibilities and exercises the moral leadership expected of him as our Nation's Chief Executive.

What would it take? Let me be specific. I believe the President should go before the people of this country and say something like this. "Inflation is a reflection of public attitudes. It is as much psychology as economics. People buy today because they think prices will be higher tomorrow, and their buying insures that prices will go up. People demand higher wages today because they think prices are going up, and their wage increases guarantee that prices will go up. You and I talk ourselves into each successive round of inflation. Acting together with determination we have the means of stopping it in its tracks.

"What this country must do," the President should say, "is exercise re-

straint. Working together, we can accomplish what we can never do working separately. I say to you people in business, trim your profits for a while, do everything possible to hold down price increases. I say to you people who work for wages, you people in the labor movement, demand no more than the productivity of our economy entitles you. I say to all of you, who in addition to everything else are consumers too, hold on to your money for a while, defer your purchases where possible, give our economy a chance to stabilize.

"And finally," the President should say, "I want you to know that as President I am establishing a price stability board composed of leading representatives of business, labor, and Government. And I am going to charge that board with the responsibility of reviewing all price and wage proposals in the key industries and sectors of our economy. That board will have no power to control prices or wages, but it will carry the authority of my office in exercising moral leadership in this vital area. Its job will be to use the maximum pressure of public opinion against any industry or any labor group exceeding reasonable limits in wages or prices. Working with this board and with your help, I intend as your President to see that inflation is brought under control, and that this is done starting today."

If the President were to take such steps, I firmly believe we would see immediate results. The syndrome of inflation would be broken up, the psychology of inflation undermined, and we would begin to see some restraint and some moderation in our economy. Then, passage of the surtax and income tax reform could be given a chance to work. Fiscal and monetary policy, and Presidential leadership, would all be working for the same end—a restoration of confidence in the American dollar.

Let me say that if the President does not exercise this kind of leadership, there is still something that the ordinary citizen can do, and I urge that he do it. The burden of inflation is intolerable, particularly to persons on fixed incomes, and it is a burden which gives all of us a feeling of helplessness. Yet we are not totally helpless. If the President will not say it, then each of us should say it together. This is a time to hold back on purchases, to seek out and favor those businesses which have shown restraint, to use our collective purchasing power to lessen some of the pressures on our economy. The act of one consumer multiplied by millions of others can produce a force more powerful than the inflation psychology which is wreaking such damage to all of us today.

Mr. Speaker, just last month I published a report for my constituents on the problem of inflation. It should be noted that I withheld any criticism of President Nixon in that report. But I think the time has now arrived when he must be held responsible for what is happening, and he must be persuaded to take prompt, affirmative action. Without objection, I insert the text of my report and an article from today's Wall

Street Journal at this point in the RECORD:

[From Congressman MORRIS K. UDALL's report, June 13, 1969, vol. VIII, No. 5]

PREPARING FOR PEACE—IV: THE CASE OF THE VANISHING DOLLAR

Three years ago in one of these newsletters I made the preposterous suggestion that we should increase taxes in an election year. A member of my staff thought that report ought to be titled: "Election Year Memo from a Political Lunatic." And, as a matter of fact, many of my constituents viewed my proposal in just that light. One angry former friend wrote: "Udall, are you out of your cotton-picking mind?"

Well, thirty-nine months have passed since then. History will record that former President Johnson didn't take my advice. He may have recognized the need for a temporary tax increase, or surtax, to take the steam out of the economy, but it was an election year, and he may have calculated that Congress wouldn't do it—so why take a defeat? Also, a debate over taxes, made necessary by the Vietnam War, might have forced a war-policy debate he was not anxious to have. At any rate, we didn't enact the 5% surtax I proposed and which most of the country's leading economists were advocating. We simply closed our eyes and plunged headlong into ever-heavier war expenditures which would upset our economy and trigger the worst inflation since the late 1940s.

By the time we got around to passing a surtax last summer, inflation fever was so high that the medicine wasn't very effective—at least not immediately. And, as every taxpayer knows, the tax we finally had to apply was twice as big as the one we were talking about back in 1966.

WE HAD A GOOD THING GOING

When you have a good thing going, you often don't fully appreciate it at the time. Looking back at the five years of 1960-65 we can now see that we had achieved something quite spectacular, precious and elusive:

Between 1960 and 1965 the average rate of inflation in the United States was 1.3%, the best record of any industrially-developed nation in the world.

Even better, we were able to achieve this price stability alongside steady economic growth and declining unemployment.

Because of our price stability U.S. products were unusually competitive in world trade, and we were enjoying a \$5 billion trade surplus.

What happened to change this? There is no doubt that the real cause was our decision to escalate the Vietnam War, which in 1965 started its spiral toward an annual cost of \$30 billion. How ironic it is to recall that the Federal budget submitted in January, 1966, made the assumption that the war would be over by June 30, 1967, and that the war cost for that fiscal year was underestimated by \$10 billion!

As I wrote that newsletter in March, 1966, I saw disturbing signs on the horizon. The Consumer Price Index had crept up to an annual rise of 1.7%. The Wholesale Price Index, almost static since 1959, had started moving up at a rate of 1/2% a month. Our utilization of industrial capacity had climbed to 91%, close to the point at which efficiency drops off. And an inflation psychology appeared to be developing; manufacturing firms were building up inventories of supplies, anticipating an increase in the price of raw materials. It was clearly a time, it seemed to me, when the country needed a dose of fiscal medicine—a small, temporary increase in taxes to slow down the economy, just as we had cut taxes to speed it up.

WHAT THE "UDALL SURTAX" WOULD HAVE COST

Let's see what a 5% surtax in 1966 would have cost the taxpayers of this country. And,

recognizing that it might have been extended up to the present moment, let's see what it would have cost for the three-year period. Here is a breakdown for three levels of income (assuming in each case a married couple with two children taking the standard 10% deduction):

	Annual income	Regular tax	5-percent surtax	Total cost to date
(A).....	\$5,000	\$290	\$14.50	\$43.50
(B).....	10,000	1,114	55.70	167.10
(C).....	25,000	4,412	216.60	649.80

In other words, the "fiscal medicine" proposed for the threat of inflation in 1966 ranged from \$14.50 for a couple making \$5,000 to \$216.60 for a couple making \$25,000. If left in force to the present, this 5% surtax would have cost those same couples \$43.50 and \$649.80 respectively as their share of the fight against inflation.

WHAT WE ACTUALLY HAD TO PAY

Now let's see what our country's failure to face up to the threat of inflation actually cost those same taxpayers. Instead of an average rise of 1.3% during the years 1960-65, the Consumer Price Index has risen an average of 4% for the past three years. This has meant that the real incomes of all Americans have been cut more than 12% since the spring of 1966. Every pension, every insurance policy and every bond is that much less valuable today as a result.

Let's look specifically at the extra 2.7% of annual inflation that was added after 1966 and the 10% surtax which went into effect last year. Here is what our three taxpayers have actually had to pay for this round of inflation:

	Annual income	2.7 percent added inflation for 3 years	10 percent surtax, 1968-69	Total cost to date
(A).....	\$5,000	\$405	\$50.70	\$455.75
(B).....	10,000	810	194.95	1,004.95
(C).....	25,000	2,025	771.10	2,796.10

As you can see, the couple making \$5,000 actually lost \$455.75 instead of \$43.50, and the couple making \$25,000 actually lost \$2,796.10 instead of \$649.80. And, of course, they're likely to pay another year of surtax, while the loss from the increment of inflation will go on forever—reducing the value of all their future income by that percentage.

We might also note that, as a result of three years of 4% inflation, the real income (in 1966 dollars) of Taxpayer A has been cut to \$4,400, Taxpayer B to \$8,800, and Taxpayer C to \$22,000.

Obviously, no one can absolutely prove that the 5% surtax of 1966 would have prevented any increase in this country's rate of inflation. But I don't think it takes any great sophistication in economics to recognize that fiscal measures taken early, before the onset of real trouble, need not be as severe as those required at the height of an inflationary spiral. And their chances of success must obviously be much greater.

EFFECTS OF INFLATION

The tragedy of inflation is that it hits hardest those who are in the most meager circumstances—old people who are retired on fixed incomes, and unorganized, low-wage workers who lack the bargaining strength to demand higher pay. Such people find the cost of rent and of groceries going up while their incomes remain the same.

But even people in the work force whose incomes ultimately adjust at a higher level will find inflation exacting a high price. Take, for example, the cost of housing. Inflation has forced successive increases in interest rates, with devastating results.

Suppose you set out in December, 1965 to finance a \$20,000 home. Let's say you paid 10% down and signed a 25-year FHA-insured mortgage for the remaining \$18,000. You could have obtained such a mortgage then at 5½% interest. Your payments in principal and interest would have been \$110.54 a month, or a total \$33,162 over the life of the mortgage.

Now it's April, 1969, and the purchasing value of the dollar has declined 12.8%. You're setting out to buy an identical house. You find it doesn't cost \$20,000 anymore; the price has gone up to \$22,560. And the interest rate has jumped from 5½% to 8%. After a down payment of \$2,250 you end up making monthly payments of \$156.68, or a total of \$47,004 over the life of the mortgage.

In just a little over three years the cost of financing that house will have jumped over \$550 a year or \$13,842 over the life of the mortgage.

There are other ways that inflation hurts. Recently the Southern California Edison Co. announced it was withdrawing from the combine of power agencies planning a plant at Page, Arizona, to produce pumping power for the Central Arizona Project. The reason they gave: rising interest rates. Bonds that used to sell for 3.9% interest are going now for 7.25%; this cost of doing business hurts all businessmen, large and small.

Or look at the Federal budget. In one sense, the income tax is self-adjusting; when money declines in value, more taxes are collected. But this doesn't mean there are no problems. Between 1965 and 1970 the Federal debt will have grown by 14%, but because of rising interest rates the cost of servicing that debt will have jumped at least 40%. This has the effect of robbing programs that provide some service to the people.

And if that's a problem, think about all the state and local governments that depend on real estate taxes for an important part of their income. When the value of the dollar declines, tax rates or tax valuations have to go up. Adjustments of this kind aren't easy, and they don't win friends or votes. This is why it's becoming increasingly difficult to pass local bond issues for anything, as the people of Tucson, Yuma and Green Valley learned recently.

WHO STARTS THE SPIRAL?

An age-old argument is: who starts the inflationary spiral? Is it labor demanding higher wages, business demanding higher profits, or both?

Some months ago the *Wall Street Journal* devoted a column to this question and came down on the side of profits. Looking at the record of inflation since World War II, the *Journal* quoted Peter L. Bernstein, president of a New York investment counseling service: "The pattern is clear enough. Instead of labor costs pushing prices up, what we see instead is a sort of profit-push. Profits are already well on their way up before prices begin to rise, and prices are well on their way up before wages begin to rise faster than output."

In truth, inflation is something like the Hongkong flu. It's hard to trace and hard to stop. Government, ignoring the state of the economy, orders more planes and tanks and ships than the country can produce without running up excessive demand for labor and raw materials. Manufacturers, faced with the opportunity for higher profits, up their prices. Labor, faced with rising prices, demands higher wages. Using another metaphor, we might say that inflation is like a tailspin in an airplane; the longer it goes on, the tighter the spin becomes. Wages drive up prices; prices drive up wages. People speed up their buying to beat higher prices later; their buying decisions help to assure that prices will go higher. Meanwhile, the United States finds its products less and less competitive in world trade, and our bal-

ance of payments problem, a perennial headache, gets worse.

There are obviously many forces contributing to inflation. That's why, once it's started, inflation is so hard to stop. But I think it's important to realize that the decisions of government play a unique role requiring the greatest of attention. In an economy approaching \$900 billion the Federal budget of \$190 billion obviously plays a crucial part. As a customer of this country's goods and services the Federal government, clearly, can be very helpful, or very damaging, in the spending decisions it makes. I think, in the last three years, it hasn't helped very much.

DID THE "NEW ECONOMICS" FAIL?

In the summer of 1965 I wrote a series of newsletters entitled, "The Silent Revolution in Economics." It was a review of the lessons this country had learned through 30 years of depression, war, inflation, recession and stagnation—interspersed, of course, with occasional prosperity, relative price stability and growth. Comparing money to water in a river—water which can be used and re-used as it flows downstream—I tried to show how the "new economics" works. The point was that the Federal government, through its decisions to spend more or less than it takes in during a given year, can stimulate or retard the economy as needed.

Did the "new economics" fail? Some people seem to think so. But significantly, this is not the view of President Nixon or his economic advisers. In fact, this is worth noting: the "new economics" has survived the transition in administrations. Like Medicare and federal bank deposit insurance, I think it's here to stay. Different approaches will surely be taken; more or less emphasis will be placed on fiscal policy (taxes and spending) as opposed to monetary policy (regulation of credit and interest rates). But the critical role of government fiscal decisions in influencing the economy—for good or for ill—is now an accepted fact. No longer will monetary policy be expected to carry the load alone.

A corollary is also worth nothing: balance or imbalance of the budget must still be watched, but no one is talking any more about balancing the budget every year as a first priority. There is great concern about the current situation, and we certainly must balance the budget this year. But you won't find any Nixon Administration economists arguing that all budgets must be balanced as a matter of principle. Like their predecessors, they recognize that what they do with the budget—for example, running a surplus in a period of impending recession—can have dire consequences for the nation's economy.

I think most economists, of various persuasions, agree that it wasn't the "new economics" that failed it; it was the tardiness with which it was administered. Where they will disagree is in the possibility of its ever becoming a tool available for timely use.

CAN WE AVOID ALL INFLATION?

Perhaps we ought to put this discussion in some perspective. Inflation is bad and must be held in check to the greatest extent possible. But we should not be deluded: this country has always had some inflation. A dollar in Abraham Lincoln's pocket bought less than one in George Washington's. Inflation is a by-product of industrial development—not just in this country but everywhere. The day will probably never come when the value of the dollar will remain constant year after year.

How many times have you heard it said that New Deal spending started the erosion of the dollar? There is probably no more firmly-held opinion in the American body politic. Yet it's not true. The 1890 dollar had shriveled to 61 cents by 1929; at the end of the New Deal period and the start of World War II it was actually worth 65 cents!

With the war and postwar period we resumed our old-established pattern of steady, occasionally rapid, inflation.

Similarly, I think it's important that we recognize that along with inflation we have had tremendous growth in personal income, the product of improving technology and increasing productivity. Thus, while it would be better if we had had no inflation, we should not lose sight of the gains we have made *in spite of inflation*. A Cleveland machine tool company ran an ad recently pointing to some of these gains. Here are a few:

In 1914 an average American worker had to work 6 hours and 44 minutes to earn enough to buy a shirt. Today he earns a better shirt in 1 hour and 39 minutes.

In 1914 he worked 1 hour 37 minutes for a pound of butter; today, 19 minutes.

In 1914 he had to work 1 hour 14 minutes for a pound of bacon; today it's 22 minutes.

For better or worse, we have learned to live with *some* inflation. I don't think we can ever expect perfect price stability. But I do believe that the kind of inflation we have endured the last three years can be prevented if we are willing to keep abreast of our economy, to analyze the economic facts available to us, and to make the tough decisions necessary to deal with them.

AN OLD PROPOSAL REVIVED

Anyone can tell after serious inflation has developed. All you have to do is open a newspaper and look at the grocery ads. The trick is to detect the early signs of inflation before it becomes evident in the price of sugar and lard. And this is what the President's Council of Economic Advisers is for. Studying monthly reports on business activity, building contracts, housing starts, inventory accumulation, prices and all the rest, these men have the job of assessing what is happening and advising the President what steps ought to be taken to avoid recession, reduce unemployment, prevent further inflation or prolong growth and prosperity. The trouble is that *prompt* action may be required, and Federal fiscal decisions are *never* prompt.

You may recall that President Johnson finally asked Congress to enact a Vietnam surtax in August, 1967. However, it wasn't passed by Congress until late June, 1968, by which time the value of the dollar had dropped another 4%.

I am reminded of Great Britain's initial experience with the nationalization of industry in the early days after World War II, when the Labor government attempted to make policy decisions concerning coal production, electricity and even airline operation in the halls of Parliament. It didn't work, of course, and ultimately these "socialized" industries were accorded autonomy similar to that enjoyed by the managers of private industry. The lesson here is that legislative bodies are ill-suited to play management roles; when they try, they're likely to fail. (The Post Office Department is another example.)

The parallel isn't perfect, but I think this same kind of problem faces us in attempting to apply fiscal policy through the slow and tedious decision-making procedures of the Congress. In 1964, when we made a big cut in Federal income taxes, we got results: it was a successful move. But I wonder how timely, or effective, would have been a move to *increase* taxes a like amount. In reducing taxes we have politics on our side; in raising them we don't. Thus the lag from early 1966 to mid-1968 before enactment of some kind of surtax to check inflation.

What's the answer? Back in 1962 President Kennedy proposed legislation giving the President standby authority to raise or lower taxes within a limited range—say 5% to 10%—subject to congressional veto. Thus when the economy appeared to be heading for trouble, he could act quickly to prevent a

recession or check the onset of inflation. The proposal got nowhere, mainly because Congress is very reluctant to give up any of its taxing authority, even if it be subject to limitations of time, size and veto.

However, I think this kind of idea needs another look in the light of our experience of 1966-69. We now face these hard realities:

1. Congress is a deliberative body, not an operational agency. Given a sound reason for doing so, every congressman will vote to *lower* taxes with enthusiasm and dispatch. But he will tend to drag his feet on *raising* them, since inaction will rarely hurt him *politically*.

2. When inflationary pressures build, *prompt* action is absolutely essential.

3. Congress is unlikely to give up any of its power to *cut* taxes.

4. Inaction by a President on the threat of inflation can hurt *him* politically, yet he is powerless to adjust taxes, potentially his most powerful anti-inflation weapon.

Recognizing these realities, it seems to me we ought to have the talent and the brains to devise machinery which would accept these realities and yet put some flexibility into our system, machinery which would let us use the effective tools we have learned about in recent years. I think there is one possible answer which would work like this:

Congress would keep its full and unfettered right to *lower* taxes.

But to prepare for the future possible threat of inflation Congress would pass legislation encompassing a series of prospective tax increases to deal with various possible emergencies. In other words, Congress would pre-package to its specifications and put *on the shelf* for the President's use as needed a series of prescriptions for economic over-indulgence. One might be a 5% surtax expiring at the end of one year. Another might be a 10% surtax expiring after six months.

With this standby authority the President would be given the power to deal *promptly* with the threat of inflation. Perhaps it might be written to take effect 30 days after an executive order signed by the President, subject to veto by either branch of Congress within that period.

Another device with much the same effect would be a change in congressional rules permitting the President to send up a proposed income tax adjustment (either raising or cutting tax rates) with a declaration that it be given priority consideration. When such a message was received, the rules of the House and Senate would require a floor vote—up or down—within, say, 60 days.

If President Nixon had either of these approaches available to him today, I think we could anticipate an extension of the 10% surtax for another six months or a year—long enough, in any case, to slow down our inflation. But, since he doesn't have that authority, we can't be sure what's going to happen.

OTHER POSSIBLE WEAPONS

Taxes and interest rates are two very powerful weapons which can be used to fight inflation. There are others which could be used along with them; unfortunately, they are much less acceptable to one element or another in our economy. I'm speaking of the various devices, either tried or proposed, to restrain the excessive rise of wages and profits in our industrial system.

On the one hand, it is proposed that all major, nationwide *labor disputes* be subjected to compulsory arbitration—both sides being required to abide by the decisions of the arbitrators. I find few labor leaders or corporation executives who favor this approach.

On the other hand, there are those who favor outright *wage and price controls*. The last time this approach was tried was during World War II. However, there are so many problems with this—enforcement, equity, the encouragement of needed investment, to

name a few—that I doubt we will ever choose this route again short of an all-out war.

Finally, there is the approach which was actually used by the last two administrations—an attempt to restrain these contending forces through mere power of persuasion. The key word for this approach was "guideposts." Through this device management and labor were given a rather precise indication of what price and wage increases would be consistent with the rise in productivity in the entire economy; anything beyond that was considered inflationary. Though lacking the force of law, these "guideposts" succeeded to a considerable degree until economic pressures became too great to restrain any longer. The Nixon Administration has now abandoned them.

This persuasion approach, or what some critics have labeled the "jawbone technique," probably isn't a very good idea on a permanent basis. For one thing, labor leaders tend to search for a White House scolding to show their members how much they're getting away with. For another, it isn't really fair to single out one steel producer or electrical manufacturer for allegedly unjustified price increases when other companies or other industries remain untouched by official criticism.

The British have tried an idea which has had some success. Prices aren't controlled, and wages aren't controlled, but excessive increases are restrained nonetheless through a requirement that they be reviewed by an impartial high-level public panel. The moral force exerted has made a considerable contribution to price stability.

Last year in the United States lumber prices were increased as much as 100%. Ordinary home-buyers and other citizens didn't know this was going on until a whole new pattern of really unjustified lumber prices had been established. Rolling them back at that point was almost impossible.

It occurs to me that something like the British system might work here. If we had a Price Stability Board composed of leading economists and top labor and business executives, it might be able to restrain through *moral force* the kind of excessive increases in key industries which trigger whole rounds of inflation. This would be especially true, I think, in the case of the large oligopolies which have acquired very considerable control over their own price structures.

There may be other approaches which would be better. But at least this formal, structured system of price and wage review would get away from the suspicion of personal vendetta which was always a possibility in the days of White House arm-twisting. And it just might work.

WILL WE KEEP THE SURTAX?

No one in his right mind would try to put out a fire by pouring gasoline on it, and yet something of this kind could happen if Congress fails to extend the 10% surtax before June 30. The President has made an urgent appeal. The Budget Bureau says it's absolutely essential. The Council of Economic Advisers agrees. But there are a lot of reasons why that might not happen.

For one thing, many Members of Congress feel tax reform must take precedence over surtax extension. Others see the surtax as financing the Vietnam War, and they're against the war; cutting off the surtax, they reason, might force the Administration to end the war. Still others are simply opposed to the surtax, and they don't want to have to answer to their constituents for continuing it. And, of course, time is running out.

In the end, I expect we will extend it. It's strong medicine, and it was administered late, but giving it up now could make matters even worse. As before, if the choice is between 4-6% annual inflation or a 5-10% surtax (applied, not to your whole income but only to your regular tax), there can't be any doubt which is better.

In preparing for the period of peace we all hope lies ahead, I think we ought to give real attention to this problem of inflation. It need not be a by-product of war; surely we know now we can't have both "guns and butter." And it need not be a by-product of peace. It is my hope that out of this costly experience will come a determination to improve our fiscal and other machinery to deal with the problem of inflation. If we will do that, we may never again go through such an unstable period or see so many of our hard-earned dollars disappear.

I had intended this report to deal with one of the great debates taking shape in Congress—the need for tax reform. Because of developments in the Ways and Means Committee, where our tax laws are written, I decided to reverse my original order. Tax reform will be next.

As always, I'll appreciate your comments.
MORRIS K. UDALL.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX RISE IN JUNE DOUBLED FROM MAY RATE; HALF OF GAIN TIED TO FOOD

(By a Wall Street Journal staff reporter)

WASHINGTON.—The consumer price index rose at a steep 7.2% annual pace in June, the Labor Department reported, double May's 3.6% rate. Officials said the surge was about half accounted for by food price jumps.

Government economists had indicated after the May report that larger increases lay ahead but the June rise was larger than expected, according to some analysts.

The cost-of-living measure climbed 0.6% last month to a record 127.6% of the 1957-59 average from May's 126.8%, the previous high, the department said.

The June index was 5.5% above the year earlier 120.9%, slightly ahead of the 5.4% year-to-year increase recorded in May. It was the 29th consecutive monthly increase.

The June gain matched the 7.2% annual-rate increase in April, but was down from the exceptionally rapid 9.6% of March.

In the first half, the index rose at a 6.4% annual pace, up from 4.6% in the 1968 period. For all 1968, the index rose 4.2%. Officials generally have said the Administration's anti-inflationary measures should begin to produce smaller price gains toward the end of the year.

In the first six months, prices of commodities rose at a 5.6% pace and services climbed at a 7.6% rate.

At a news briefing, Arnold Chase, assistant commissioner of labor statistics, attributed about half of June's increase to "sharply higher prices" for foods, particularly beef and pork. Consumer services accounted for about one-fourth of the advance, and prices of commodities other than food rose at a 4.8% annual pace, the report said.

Food prices climbed a strong 1.5% last month, the report said, up from a 0.4% rise in May. Leading the way, the meats, poultry and fish category rose 4.5%, after climbing 1.3% a month earlier.

Meat prices recorded the largest increase since June 1965, the report said, and in the second quarter, after seasonal adjustment, advanced nearly 9%. Beef and pork prices were especially high, the department said. Mr. Chase attributed this to a "strong climb" in livestock and wholesale prices of meats. He noted that an 18% gain in wholesale meat prices in the past year has "put a squeeze" on retail prices, which have advanced about 9.5% during the same period.

For the first half, fruit prices rose 3.5%, a sharp increase from the 1.8% rise in the 1968 period, Mr. Chase said.

Most other commodities also showed increases in June, he said, but smaller ones than the food gains.

Apparel prices climbed 0.3% in June after an 0.8% gain a month earlier. In the first six months, Mr. Chase said, apparel prices rose 2.2%, down from the 2.7% gain a year earlier.

Prices for services rose 0.4% last month after a 0.5 gain in May, the report said. Medical costs rose 0.5% following a 0.6% May gain.

Housing prices rose 0.4% last month, the same as in May, and rents continued to climb at an 0.3% monthly pace. Home ownership costs advanced 0.5% after a 0.7% gain in May.

Transportation costs rose 0.5% last month, in contrast to an 0.5% decline in May, as a 1.1% June rise in used-car prices reverse a recent downtrend. "Used car prices are back to their levels of a year ago, and apparently have recovered from their sharp decline," Mr. Chase said. New-car prices didn't register any change in June, after falling 0.1% in May.

Cost-of-living pay boosts provided in union contracts will go to about 77,000 workers as a result of June's rise in the consumer price index, the Labor Department said. The major increases: about 40,000 people, mainly in the aerospace industries, will receive an 8-cent hourly pay raise; 22,000 workers, mostly in public transportation, will get 4 to 6 cents more an hour, and 6,000 metal workers in California will receive a 7-cent hourly increase.

Despite the "substantial increase" in consumer prices, the department said, a longer workweek plus a penny gain in hourly earnings lifted workers' weekly purchasing power 46 cents, or 0.5%, in June, up from a 39-cent increase in May. In terms of 1957-59 dollars, the average non-farm, non-supervisory worker with three dependents had "real" weekly purchasing power in June of \$78.64, up from May's downward-revised \$78.18 but below the \$79.03 of a year earlier.

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

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

Mr. BROCK. I would like to say to my friend that I am delighted to see the evidence of his concern with inflation at this time. I noted a different attitude on the part of his party in the past 8 years under different Presidents, but I am delighted to see it changed now. I think it is timely and highly important.

Mr. UDALL. I must disagree with the gentleman. There have been few people on my side of the aisle who have talked or written as much about the need for fighting inflation as I have. I was one of those few who advised President Johnson in 1966 that the whole disastrous inflation was coming on and that we ought to have a surtax then and there. We did not get it until 2 years later. And I will put my record in fighting inflation in the past 8 years against the gentleman from Tennessee's or anyone else's, as a matter of fact.

Mr. BROCK. I appreciate that fact. I would like to take issue with the gentleman on just a couple of points. It does seem that we tried this jawbone approach under President Johnson. At the same time we in Congress, and the executive, exercised a degree of fiscal irresponsibility that exceeds any parallel in the history of this Nation.

Our deficits probably came close to \$100 billion in the last 8 years, and, despite the jawbone, prices rose year in and year out and are continuing to rise.

Mr. UDALL. Well, I would say to the gentleman—

Mr. BROCK. If the gentleman will let me proceed for just a moment I believe I may be able to add something to this colloquy.

Mr. UDALL. Certainly, I want to have

a dialog with the gentleman with reference to this very serious matter.

Mr. BROCK. Pressures built in this economy to an almost intolerable degree. Our working people were trying to the best of their ability to get by as they watched prices inch up and up and up. They tried to act responsibly as the President requested. However, finally, the dam broke. There was no recourse. They had to go to their union leaders and say, "We cannot continue to see our dollar erode; we cannot continue to accept wage increases which do not take into account the impact of inflation."

They got their wage increases in the last couple of years and now they are a part of the inflation problem as is the price of goods.

I wonder, as a matter of fact, what this situation has to do with, for instance, the price of tomatoes. The price of tomatoes has gone up from 31 cents to 48 cents in the last year. I wonder how much massive impact this Government can have on a little tomato farmer.

Mr. UDALL. I think the approach I am recommending is this: We do not ask the Government to do it. We ask the people—all of us together to do it. But we need the President of the United States and you and I to provide some leadership. I would like to see a campaign which will result in business firms beginning to advertise that it has held the price line when others had raised prices; a program where people would take pride in their union in holding off exorbitant wage demands.

We had something really precious going for us in this country in 1965. The gentleman keeps talking about what took place between 1960 and 1965. The average annual inflation 1960 to 1965 was 1.3 percent per year. The people ought to know today for the first time that it is going to be 7.2 percent in just this 1 year if the present rate continues. The dam broke in 1966 when we made a mistake as a country—and I place the blame squarely on the Democratic Executive as well as the Congress at that time, in trying to fool ourselves into believing that we could continue big domestic programs and also fight a new \$30-billion-a-year war in Vietnam, while at the same time refusing to raise taxes to pay the extra costs. That is why we are having this inflation today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What the gentleman is suggesting is an informal effort to control wages and prices without the formality of legislation. This Congress would apparently have to pass such legislation to provide authority to impose such wage and price controls since there is nothing now on the books to permit such controls. But, would the gentleman subscribe to the theory of economics that we have inflation as a follow-on of Federal deficits and untoward spending without taking into consideration the deficit of the economy in the form of taxation?

Mr. UDALL. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What we have

been experiencing in the last few months from the beginning of this administration and the end of the last one going back to 1966, as you know, is the result of the profligacy of the Congress and the executive preceding that time. Had we done a successful job of sound economics then, we would either have reduced spending to live within our income or imposed necessary taxes then to cover what we were spending. But we would not have had success in controlling inflation by imposing wage and price controls. We would still have had to pay for this profligacy sometime or other anyway.

This was the experience in World War II. We had imposed wage and price controls at that time. After World War II when we took off wage and price controls, everything shot right through the roof. So we have been paying for the last several months for what happened preceding the present period of time.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is right. Once this chain starts it is like a fever. To a degree, it has to run its course. But, we have now corrected the underlying imbalancing factors by balancing the budget and we will do the rest of the job that needs to be done by continuing the surtax. But psychology will determine as to how soon the thing runs its course.

Here is where we need presidential leadership, and here is where we need individual leadership in stopping the psychology of inflation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let us talk about that for just a little while. Actually psychological leadership does not have to be shown by the administration, but I believe the gentleman will agree that in several instances it has been shown.

The gentleman from Tennessee has pointed out that psychological leadership is not always successful. It takes more than that. I am trying to check right now to find out the exact time, but a number of hearings were held in the Committee on Government Operations a couple of years ago on this issue of the effectiveness of jawbone economics. When we got into it, we found out that President Johnson's jawbone, unlike the jawbone Samson used against the Philistines, was not tremendously successful in halting inflation.

The whole question of leadership has been raised by the comments made by the gentleman from Arizona, so I would like to ask the gentleman something further because I think he is in a position to speak to this problem. The gentleman is one of the few on the other side of the aisle who did support the President's leadership on the surtax vote; and I trust that the gentleman is not one of those who criticized the President at the time for his effort to influence Members on both sides of the aisle on this important economic issue.

Mr. UDALL. No. I thought the President exercised leadership in that regard. He used some of the same techniques which you used to call the arm twisting under the last administration. You now can call them "vigorous and effective persuasion." But the same techniques

have been used by Presidents of both parties. They are part of the system.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thought it was vigorous and effective, but most of all effective.

I would like to point out that the surtax is not the only effort against inflation which has been utilized by the President. As you will recall, when the President made his budget request he made requests that were some \$4 billion less than President Johnson had requested in his budget of just a few weeks before.

Mr. UDALL. I commend him for the total reductions though I might have preferred specific cuts in other areas.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think President Nixon's reductions show some leadership. The Congress then tended to freeze that budget request into a maximum spending limit by legislating it as such.

The President just yesterday—and I trust the gentleman read the message wherein he made note of the limit to the \$192.9 billion budget when he spoke about the supplemental appropriation that he had just signed—President Nixon announced that he would cut an additional \$3.5 billion to maintain spending within the statutory limit. He said he believed he could take additional funds or expenditures out of the budget, because of the increase of uncontrollable portions of our Federal spending, such as interest on the debt.

Now, in addition to that the President has asked for a postal rate increase which would take some more money out of the private sector and put it into Government funds which would further assist in balancing the budget. If we continue to cut spending and try to get more money out of the private sector, then the President has taken effective economic action.

I think these things will be reflected in just what the gentleman is seeking, and that is a dampening effect on the psychology of inflation.

I do not know whether the gentleman looked at the news wire this afternoon to see what the stock market did today. It did today just what it has been doing for the past several days. It went down again.

Mr. UDALL. This report today about the 7-percent annual rate of inflation is going to kick off another round of fears. It will kick off additional wage raises, and companies will decide that they had better make more profits now, and they will raise prices.

What the gentleman says is true. There are several levels of effort halting inflation. One is budgetary, and I give the President a high mark in this regard. I commend him for that leadership in extending the surtax. But moral leadership is the most crucial of all in stopping something which is basically psychological. The President ought to be saying, "People of the country, rally around me. Follow me. Defer purchases for a few weeks or months. Do not buy anything. And we are all going to point the finger at the companies, the people, and the unions who persist in feeding these fires." If he did this kind of thing, we could stop it in a matter of weeks, if we would just make up our minds to do it. Instead, he folds

his hands and rebukes Secretary Kennedy. In effect there is a burglar in the house. The ultimate weapon is a gun. We hope we do not have to use it—that of wage and price controls—but the President announces in advance that regardless of how desperate things become we will not use that weapon. I do not think really that wage and price controls will work in all probability. But maybe someday we will have to try them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent—wage and price controls do not work. They merely defer the impact of inflation.

The important thing that has to be said at this point is that in this administration unlike the administration that preceded it, we are taking specific action to do the things the gentleman would like to have done and not just talk quite so much about it.

In the previous administration the executive leaders talked a good deal about the problems of inflation, but it seems to me very little was done that created real economic impact. Talking about the surtax issue, President Johnson said it was a necessary thing and, as I recall, it was passed last year with a different dispersion of votes on the other side of the aisle than was the extension a few weeks ago. That is something I do not fully understand because I do not understand what happens in politics that changes people's views about the economy.

Mr. UDALL. I noticed changes in voting patterns on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it was passed under President Johnson, and as soon as it was passed his administration started the printing presses operating in this country and increased the money supply. I do not know whether that had anything to do with the fact that 1968 was an election year or not, but increasing the money supply tends to buoy up the economy and set the fires going in inflation.

The result was that the effect of the surtax was washed out by action to increase the money supply and credit at the Federal level.

I would hope that in spite of what was said by any President or administration leader, that economic policies and statements are consistent in our economic effort to meet the problem of inflation. I think this Nixon administration has been consistent.

I think President Nixon and most Republicans in Congress have been consistent in what we have done and what we have said. The difference is that before we had an administration which was talking an anti-inflationary game, but it was taking the actions that were inflationary and that is exactly how we got where we are today.

Mr. UDALL. I do not agree that the gentleman is entirely correct.

I am one who was critical of some aspects of President Johnson's campaign against inflation.

But I do claim that he took the tough steps which laid the groundwork so that the budgetary situation could be brought under control. I am willing to praise that just as I am willing to praise President Nixon for his action to bring about budgetary balance.

I do not agree as to some of the actions you pointed out with regard to the budget.

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

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

Mr. BROCK. I would just like to make one correction. The President did not bring the budget into balance by increasing income and decreasing expenditures. He did so by changing the way the budget was handled, by moving away from the administrative budget and adding income from trust funds. This "mirror" washed out what was under previous methods of accounting a \$6 or \$7 billion deficit last year and brought it into balance.

That is not really an exercise of the hard muscle that it takes to do something about inflation. That is a little bit of chicanery.

Mr. UDALL. I have seen no action by President Nixon to go back to an administrative budget system. The budget balance you claim for the present administration is based on the overall national accounts budget rather than the administrative budget.

Mr. BROCK. There was just announced further, may I say, a \$2.9 billion cut on executive agencies.

Let me point this out to you. I think the reason I am on my feet is not that I disagree with the gentleman on the terrible economic crisis facing this Nation, but rather to disagree as to the actions of President Nixon in this regard in the past 6 months.

I do not know that I can remember a person in my lifetime who has exercised more political courage than the President of the United States in bringing the Nation's attention to this problem. I really question whether or not it is the responsibility of the President to go out and chop down the tomato farmer. The tomato farmer is not looking so much to President Nixon, who has made his record clear by standing up and insisting on a tax surcharge, insisting on budget reduction, and advocating a tax reform, as his eyes are fixed on the Congress of the United States.

And what does he see? He sees a Congress raising its own salaries by 40 percent as the first official act of the Congress of the United States. Then we go on and we add more and more expenditures to every single budget item that is brought before the House. Then the coup de grace is administered when the House finally rises to its responsibility and passes a surtax bill. The bill is then sent to the Senate, and the majority leader of the Senate says, "We may get around to it in a few months, but only—only—when we consider tax reform." And the gentleman knows as well as any Member of this House that that is a false issue. It has nothing to do with the basic economic facts of life and the problem of inflation facing this country.

You cannot lay the charge of lack of leadership on the doorstep of this administration, with the gentleman's own party leadership acting the way it is in the other body.

Mr. UDALL. I do not want my silence

to imply that I agree with the gentleman's analysis of the situation, because I do not. I have tried to say frankly, candidly, and openly here that the President and the administration have taken some of the action that is necessary, and some of it has been painful. My charge is limited today to a default in this one vital area. The thrust of my remarks today has been that inflation is as much psychological as economic, and that we can stop it through counterpsychology. Leadership in this area is vital, and in this area the President has almost totally defaulted.

We have been waiting to see if he would come forward with a program to educate the people of this country and to lead them. Your tomato farmer in Tennessee is dying for someone to tell him how he can help fight inflation. I am not worrying about him making too large a profit. But I am worried about the profits of the steel companies, the auto companies, the drug companies, and the oil companies which are showing record highs and are still going up. Until we stop that kind of rise in profits, we will not solve the problem.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I have been interested in listening to the gentleman's special order and to the contributions of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN). I would like to address myself for a moment to the charge of the gentleman from Arizona that the President has been deficient in speaking out on the question of the inflationary psychology which grips many elements of the American body politic as a result of several years of overspending by the previous administrations and by previous Congresses.

I must say to the gentleman from Arizona that my recollection of what the President has said on this issue and what has been said most forcibly by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Stans, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Kennedy, is different from that of the gentleman from Arizona.

On Saturday of last week the Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans, in my presence and before an audience of some 1,000 Minnesotans, spoke out at great length about the inflationary psychology and the inflationary syndrome. In doing so he referred frequently to statements made by President Nixon in speaking out against this inflationary psychology and urging voluntary action on the part of elements of our society to which the gentleman from Arizona has referred, asking them to react, to protect their own interests by showing restraint in this area. So I must express a modest disagreement with the gentleman from Arizona in his charge that the President of the United States and his principal Cabinet officers have been silent in speaking out about inflationary psychology or inflationary syndrome. I believe that the record is to the contrary.

Mr. UDALL. I concede to the gentleman his very sincere views, and I regret

that we disagree on this point. A lot of pious sermonizing—and maybe that is an unfair characterization—but a lot of generalized conversation against inflation will not do the job. Someone must exert a specific moral force so that a business that raises its already exorbitant profits to a higher rate is going to know that the public is looking, and that the public will not patronize such a concern. The President seems so afraid of doing something that Lyndon Johnson did, or maybe overdid. Because he singled out some specific labor unions, or steel company, or some particular segment of industry, Mr. Nixon does nothing.

Perhaps there is a middle ground. I am suggesting that there may be a bipartisan approach. I am suggesting that the President get a half dozen economists, a half dozen specialists from both political parties, not identified with this administration, to tell the Nation that the profits in this industry or in that industry are too high, that a wage settlement in a key industry is really out of line in the present situation. That action would be taken, not with any legal force, but with some moral force. If the tomato farmer in Tennessee can read those findings, he will not buy from that kind of company which is raising prices to an exorbitant level. This is the kind of specific leadership I am calling for.

We do not have to be told about inflation. The gentleman from Minnesota knows how bad inflation is. I know how bad it is. The question is what to do about it.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman has used the word "psychology." He has said that there has been no speaking out by the President on the problem of America's inflationary psychology. It is on that issue that I must respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

OPENING UP OUR SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to comment on the future space program, and my hope—and I trust it is shared by most of my colleagues—to broaden it, that we might become even more effective in the years ahead.

However, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is still in the Chamber, I would like to say we in the Congress certainly share equally the responsibility for this inflation spiral in which we are caught. We could have set the tone in the previous administration. Inflation is a giant phenomenon that is very hard to resist and then to reverse. We in Congress share, to a large extent, responsibility with the previous administration for the inflation that we have had in the last 7 or 8 years and which will continue at least until this admin-

istration and this Congress do more than we have done to reverse it.

So far we have not made a very good start: We have increased our own pay, we have increased the appropriation that was requested for the Veterans' Administration, we have increased the request of the administration insofar as the NASA program was concerned, and yesterday we increased our pensions, and the liability of the government—and that means the taxpayers—for benefits that will eventually cost nearly half a billion dollars.

So we have to have stronger leadership on both sides and in both branches of the Government, if the inflationary spiral is ever to be slowed.

Now, as to my observations on the success of the Apollo program, Mr. Speaker, today the Nation and the world are united, as never before, in admiration of the brave men of Apollo 11. Their flight has brought mankind to a truly new frontier, and captured the imagination of us all.

Last Sunday night, the whole world was watching the exploits of our astronauts as they stepped onto the moon. Today, as they return from their epochal journey, all the nations of the world recognize again how much they have in common. For America's astronauts came to the moon in the name of mankind, and all of mankind shares in America's pride. As astronaut Neil Armstrong said with his first step onto the moon's surface: "One small step for man. . . . One giant leap for mankind."

This is a particularly appropriate time, I feel, for the United States to offer to join with other nations of the world in joint space exploration efforts.

For 10 years we have carried the total burden of developing our national space exploration capability. At the same time, as the world knows, the Russians have pursued parallel goals, with some success as well. But, the duplication of national efforts has caused a huge waste of money for both countries. And other nations—with specialized skills that could have proved most helpful—have only stood on the sidelines and watched.

Apollo 11 has shown conclusively that the planets are not our national province. The victory of our three brave astronauts over the extraterritorial vacuum was mankind's victory, not our own. It is time for all mankind to share the burden and the benefits, as well as the glory, of the conquering of this last, greatest frontier.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this is not a new concept. From the very beginning our space program has been based on the principles of openness and sharing of information.

The original legislation establishing NASA orders specifically that our space program be conducted for the benefit of all mankind, and in cooperation with other nations and groups of nations. And, we are today working with dozens of nations in various aspects of space exploration—from tracking satellites to exchanging meteorological data.

Now, when all the world's attention is focused on this arena—now is the time for us to tread new ground on earth, as

our astronauts have trod new ground on the moon. We have in the past offered limited cooperation, and gotten limited response. Let us now offer total cooperation. We may not get a total response—indeed, we may not get any response. But it would be a gesture in the finest American tradition—in the tradition of President Truman's Marshall plan and President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan and open skies proposal.

We have always been a generous, sharing nation, willing to contribute our skills and resources to the international good. To offer to share our space technology, in the wake of the Apollo success, would follow in that tradition.

Another reason for offering to share in the exploration of space is the less altruistic one of cost. Rich as we are, we as a nation cannot afford to spare the resources that a truly comprehensive space program requires. With other nations involved, we would not only be moving strongly toward decreasing international friction, but also toward easing domestic problems, since we could then afford more for our housing, our cities, and our environmental needs.

Let me suggest that there are many precedents for such cooperative efforts as those I envision. In oceanography, to some extent, and to a larger extent in fisheries, we have been holding successful joint research projects with the Russians and many other nations for a number of years.

I am under no illusions that this resolution will usher in the millenium. The Soviets have traditionally been cautious of western contacts. They have feared, with some justification, that exposure to different social systems, with such different ideas about freedom of thought and expression, would not be to their advantage.

This is how it has been in the past; but things are changing, perhaps even in the Soviet Union. Let me quote Dr. Thomas Paine, NASA's director:

We have seen in the past several years a more open relationship with the Soviet Union. They have revealed far more than they ever had in the past. It would be my guess that this trend would continue, and perhaps in the future there may be opportunity for this sort of thing, that in the past would have been precluded.

That future time about which Dr. Paine talked may be at hand. If we were to offer again our hand in space cooperation, and they were to refuse, we would have lost nothing. But if they were to accept, the cause of world cooperation would have gained immeasurably.

This is an unparalleled opportunity to emphatically and formally present America's invitation to other technologically advanced nations to join our space programs. Such a joint effort would certainly produce a more comprehensive space program than we alone can afford to support, wealthy as we are. More importantly, it would engender a spirit of cooperation and of unity that could significantly foster world cooperation and contribute to the lowering of world tensions.

Now is the time for the President to make such a generous gesture. I hope

that he will—such opportunities are rare indeed. Not often does the world feel the unity and pride in man's achievement than it does today.

And so, Mr. Speaker, today I am offering a concurrent resolution which I am glad to report is being cosponsored by several very distinguished colleagues, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, those colleagues number among them the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER), prominent members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. In addition, there are Mr. MEEDS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RODINO, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. REES, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. CHAIMO, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. WINN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. ROTH, Mr. COWGER, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. KOCH, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. RYAN, and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

The resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 305

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the future exploration of space frontiers jointly by the United States and other technologically advanced nations of the world

Whereas the flight of Apollo 11 has brought mankind to a truly new frontier and captured the imagination of all the peoples of the world; and

Whereas the Apollo 11 flight has made all nations of the world aware of how much they have in common in the exploration of the frontiers of space, as expressed in Astronaut Neil Armstrong's historic phrase, "One small step for man—one giant leap for mankind"; and

Whereas the combined efforts of the technologically advanced nations of the world would certainly produce a more comprehensive space program than the United States can afford to support alone; and

Whereas by sharing the burden of space exploration with other nations of the United States could increase its commitment to improve the quality of life here on earth; both at home and abroad; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as he may deem appropriate to formally invite other technologically advanced nations of the world to join with the United States in future efforts to conquer the frontiers of space exploration for the benefit of all mankind.

The eagerness with which these Members of Congress responded to the mimeographed letter I sent out to them, telling them of my intent to offer this resolution, indicates to me, and I believe to the Congress and to the country, the soundness of this principle.

I hope that the executive branch of the Government, regardless of what action is taken on this, will get the message and once again try more formally and more emphatically to make this a worldwide effort so that all mankind all over this globe might share in this great effort to open the secrets of space, and hopefully to help all mankind for all time.

INTER-AMERICAN LINK—CHARLES APPLETON MEYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon announced the appointment of Charles A. Meyer to be Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, few of us were acquainted with him or his unique qualifications for that very important position.

In the succeeding months we have had an opportunity to see Charles Meyer at work and I, for one, have been enormously impressed with his performance. In these few months he has demonstrated his complete grasp of the complex problems being faced by Latin America, and his ability to deal competently with them. He has shown a sense of humor and a long standing dedication to and regard for the people of Latin America which will stand him in good stead.

Although it appeared some months ago, an article in the New York Times outlined Mr. Meyer's background and I think my colleagues will be interested to become better acquainted with this outstanding gentleman who, in my estimate, is doing a very fine job indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

INTER-AMERICAN LINK—CHARLES APPLETON MEYER

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Charles Appleton Meyer admitted publicly today—probably for the first time in his life—that he was "a little bit frightened."

A few moments before, at an impromptu news conference, Secretary of State William P. Rogers introduced the tall, elegant New Englander as his new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. President Nixon, he said, would shortly send Mr. Meyer's name to the Senate for confirmation.

The State Department press corps, puzzled and rumor-ridden for the last eight weeks as to who would eventually fill the post, reacted to Mr. Meyer with unusual benevolence.

"He was good," said one hard-bitten observer. "He said little—which was smart. He declined to comment on policy questions until he could get briefed. He looks like a diplomat—and he behaved like one."

GRANDFATHER AN AMBASSADOR

Diplomacy runs in "Charley" Meyer's blood, although this will be his first taste of Government service. His grandfather, George von Lengerke Meyer, was President Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of the Navy and Ambassador to Italy and was a prime mover in persuading Czarist Russia to accept the United States mediation that ended the Russo-Japanese war at Portsmouth, N.H., in 1905.

The Assistant Secretary-designate has risen to eminence not through diplomacy but through retailing. Born into the Massachusetts "establishment" on both sides of his family—his mother was a Saltonstall—he entered Sears, Roebuck at the bottom upon graduation from Harvard in 1939.

He helped the company president at the time, the redoubtable Gen. Robert E. Wood open a company outlet in Havana in 1942. After service in the Pacific as an Army captain, he rejoined the company and spent the next 12 years—from 1947-60—expanding Sears, Roebuck operations throughout Latin America.

"We started out originally hoping to export our products to Latin America and sell them at competitive prices," he recalled today. "But between 1948-49 the Latin countries had run through the accumulated foreign exchange they'd earned during the war. This resulted in a totally different ball game."

From then on Mr. Meyer's main task was to travel throughout the hemisphere persuading Latin manufacturers to produce goods for sale through Sears outlets. From 1953-1955 he lived in Bogota, Colombia, acquiring fluency in Spanish and coming to know and appreciate the Latin American mentality.

From 1955 to 1960 he was based in Chicago as vice president in charge of Sears' hemisphere operations. Largely as a result of his policies, all goods sold now in Sears outlets in Colombia, Mexico and Peru are locally produced and in other countries the proportion of locally manufactured products is steadily rising.

For the last nine years Mr. Meyer has been vice president for the company's United States Southwest and Eastern areas—with about 85,000 employees under his supervision.

"We chose him," said a senior State Department official recently, "because we wanted someone who knew Latin America, who spoke Spanish, and who had broad administrative experience. We also thought that Charles Meyer had a personal manner—you might call it a style—that would help in dealing with our Latin American friends."

Mr. Meyer, who was born June 27, 1918, is tall, courteous and soft-spoken and still has a trace of his New England accent. He is likely to go over well with the Latin diplomats and officials—once they come to know him. The Latins are extremely sensitive to background and Mr. Meyer combines family background with a hardheaded sense of business, Latin politics and economics.

His directorship in the United Fruit Company may prove an initial handicap owing to the company's "big business" image among Latin leftists. But Mr. Meyer took pains today to point out that he has resigned from the board of United Fruit and five other companies to avoid any possible "conflict of interest" problems in his new task.

He is also conferring with State Department legal experts on his holdings in Sears, Roebuck and the Gillette company.

SEEMS "FIRST RATE"

"At least his background is retailing—and not oil or mineral mining," said one Latin ambassador. "We don't know him yet but he seems to be a first-rate appointment."

To help him with the complexities ahead—notably the gathering quarrel with Peru over expropriation of United States oil properties—the new Assistant Secretary brings expertise, a sense of humor and a wife and family who share his regard for the Latin American peoples.

His wife, the former Suzanne Seybur, and their two children, Brooke and Nancy, keep up their Spanish with two Colombian maids who have been in their service for 16 years.

"We bought a ski lodge in Vail, Colo., some years ago and it's the nearest to home the kids have ever had," Mr. Meyer said. "We try to get there several times a year whenever we can. But don't get the idea that there's any conflict of interest between my little ski lodge and skiing interests in Portillo, Chile. There isn't!"

NEW YORK BAR FOR ATLANTIC UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Federal Bar Council's Committee

on Legislation has recently added its prestigious endorsement to House Concurrent Resolution 283, the Atlantic Union resolution.

Toward the end of the last Congress, this resolution was approved and favorably reported out by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Although there was not sufficient time to get floor action on it in the rush to adjourn, prospects are much better this year. Presently, over 80 Members are listed as cosponsors of the Atlantic Union resolution. In addition, we have a new President who has himself recently and enthusiastically endorsed the concept of Atlantic Union. Hope for the peace and freedom which unity and confederation make possible is now nearer than ever before. I hope that we have the courage and wisdom to act now that it is within reach.

Because of the timeliness of the Federal Bar Council's endorsement, I include the text of it in my remarks at this point:

REPORT ON RESOLUTIONS CALLING FOR CONVENTION TO EXPLORE CLOSER UNITY OF FREE PEOPLES

Bipartisan resolutions offered by Representatives Paul Findley of Illinois (H. Con. Res. 283) and Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota (H. Con. Res. 284) in the 91st Congress first session on behalf of themselves and others seek to establish a United States delegation to discuss the possibilities of future union with other free nations. This concept, which has been endorsed by such diverse leaders as President Richard M. Nixon, Hubert H. Humphrey, Robert F. Kennedy, Eugene J. McCarthy, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller, was overwhelmingly approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in the 90th Congress. H. Rep. No. 1656, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. (1968). The proposal has likewise received the unanimous endorsement of the Committees on Federal Legislation of the New York State Bar Association and of the New York County Lawyers Association. 114 Cong. Rec. No. 157, H9168 (daily ed. 9/25/68); 115 Cong. Rec. No. 15, E434 (daily ed. 1/23/69).

We agree with the State Bar panel that: "The resolution approved by the House Committee would not commit this country to anything. It would merely give express Congressional approval to exploration of the possibilities of a future Atlantic federation or wider union of free peoples. Although the resolution is drafted in Atlantic terms, we see nothing in it which would preclude inclusion of other free peoples in the discussions proposed or in any resulting union. Likewise, we see nothing in the resolution to preclude consultation with non-governmental as well as governmental representatives from other free nations.

"The tragedy in Czechoslovakia in August 1968 has lent new poignancy to careful exploration of these possibilities. The need for such exploration is emphasized by currency crises and the need for cooperation for aiding developing nations. . . ."

Winston Churchill told a joint session of the Congress of the United States on December 26, 1941, that "Prodigious hammer strokes have been needed to bring us together. . . ." He also said of the tragedies of his time that their explanation was that ". . . there was no unity. There was no vision. . . ." The pending resolutions offer us the opportunity to move toward such unity without waiting for further hammer strokes in the form of currency crises or tragedies such as that of August 1968.

As stated by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, greater than national problems require greater than national solu-

tions. The needs of the last third of this century cannot be met without great new initiatives such as those proposed by Representative Findley and Fraser in their resolutions and approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee in July 1968. We therefore urge favorable action on the resolutions.

Respectfully submitted,
Committee on Legislation, Federal Bar Council: Richard A. Givens, Chairman; Peter K. Leisure, Secretary; Harold Baer, Jr., Robert Belton, Vincent L. Broderick, Thomas Cahill, Sol Neil Corbin, Clarence Dunaville, Thomas R. Farrell, Mahlon M. Frankhauser, Victor Friedman, William J. Gilbreth, Federick Greenman, James Grellsheim, Arthur M. Handler, Robert L. King, Moses L. Kove, Pierre N. Leval, Anthony P. Marshall, Robert McMillan, J. Edward Meyer III, Edith Miller, Gary Naftalis, Paul Perito, John Robinson, Mortimer Todell, Nancy F. Wechsler, Gerald Walpin, James D. Zirin.

CAPTIVE NATIONS DECLARATION SIGNALS FOREIGN POLICY RE-TREAT

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1961, I addressed the House and pointed out that the Kennedy administration had shown incredible naivete in its soft and useless declaration on Captive Nations Week. I contrasted the late President's weak and apologetic proclamation to the dynamic and hard-hitting declaration of President Eisenhower in 1959 and 1960.

As a strong supporter of President Nixon, I hoped that we would see forceful and effective pronouncements in the field of foreign relations and a strategic shift in foreign policy. After waiting for 6 months, I must say that I have seen no basic change in either the State Department or our foreign policy. Possibly the best example of this "business as usual" trend at the State Department is indicated by the President's 1969 Captive Nations declaration. It was frustratingly inane and perfunctory.

What did President Eisenhower proclaim? Note his statement well:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the people of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been

achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week."

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations.

What did President Nixon proclaim? Note it well, too:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

By Joint Resolution on July 17, 1959, the Eighty-Sixth Congress authorized and requested the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. Ten years have passed and there have been many changes in international affairs. But one thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to renew their devotion to the high ideals on which our nation was founded and has prospered and to sustain with understanding and sympathy the just aspirations of the peoples of all nations for independence and human freedom.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eleventh day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-fourth.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Think of that. No mention of Czechoslovakia, no mention of the repressive Communist policies, no mention even of the word "Communist" or the Soviet Union.

This is merely one of the many cases of the State Department thumbing its nose at the Congress and at the American people. The Congress did not anticipate the type of declaration that President Nixon announced when it passed the original resolution calling for a Captive Nations Week in July of each year. Lest there be any doubt, reread the text of the joint resolution embodied in law:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—PUBLIC LAW No. 86-90

RESOLUTIONS

S.J. Res. 111

H.J. Res. 454, 459

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations

and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

President Eisenhower clearly knew who the subjugator, the captor was. He referred to "imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism" and the "peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations" throughout his declaration. Have the 10 years from 1959 to 1969 found communism mellowing or changing? Of course not. Hundreds of examples could be given of Communist brutality, treachery, and subjugation of its people and those of the captive nations. The events in Czechoslovakia are but one of recent memory. I recently placed in the RECORD the 10-part series of Anatole Shub which vividly portrays the vindictive repression of civil liberties within the Soviet Union by the Kremlin leaders.

In the face of all of this, why such a meaningless Captive Nations declaration? Those of us who have always been distrustful of the State Department have no reason, whatsoever, to think that we are any better off there. I have more confidence in the President than his predecessors, but even he has not lived up to his promise of cleaning out the State Department.

As a daily State Department watcher,

I will make one case in point. Contrasted to the weak and disappointing Captive Nations declaration, Secretary Rogers publicly complimented Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko last week. The front page of the Saturday, July 12, 1969, issue of the Washington Post contains the following three-column heading: "Rogers Praises Gromyko for 'Positive Tone' of Talk."

Is our foreign policy one of complimenting the enemy when they make a favorable gesture and then saying nothing when they continue on their regular conspiratorial, aggressive, and subversive way? Balance the July 12 statement with the Captive Nations declaration and you get some idea why many of us do not trust the State Department.

We have not seen any real change in the State Department. Even worse, we have not seen anything that would indicate there will be a change in the State Department. We were promised a change. As a loyal Nixon supporter, I told people there would be a change and I will not be satisfied until there is a change.

Whether you liked John Foster Dulles or not, it was at least recorded in history that there was a fundamental change in policy from the Truman administration to the Eisenhower administration. There has been no such change from the Johnson administration to the Nixon administration. Like many Americans, I am still hoping but it would be the height of cowardice to sit back and supinely wait. What we Republicans criticized under Johnson and Kennedy we should continue to criticize under our party's President if we are to retain any of the faith that the American people have in us as legislators and as Republicans.

MEAGER APPROPRIATION FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, although I voted today for the passage of H.R. 12964, appropriating funds for fiscal year 1970 for the Department of Justice and other departments and agencies of Government, I must express my dismay and dissatisfaction with the funds included for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. I am particularly discouraged at the meager appropriation for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice established by the 1968 omnibus crime bill, which was intended to provide a large measure of support for our States and municipalities in the fight against crime.

Mr. Speaker, as the author in the House of Representatives of the amendment to establish the National Institute, I am particularly distressed that the Appropriations Committee report—page 12—recommends a distribution of funds which would leave the National Institute with a mere \$7.5 million. This is almost \$13 million less than the administration recommended in its conservative budget

estimate. It is far below the figure of \$30 million which my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. MacGREGOR) recommended during debate on this measure on August 8, 1967, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 16, page 21843.

Mr. Speaker, in the considered judgment of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, by establishing a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice it was expected that through grants, studies, research, and the collection and dissemination of information, the Institute might serve as the focal point for advancing modern techniques for combating crime and for providing improved training facilities to enable local and State law enforcement officers to deal with every aspect of criminal activity and violence.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, by short-changing the National Institute, and by second guessing the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate, as well as the responsible elements in our administration dedicated to reducing crime in America, the goals of the National Institute have been seriously set back.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the corresponding committee of the other body will deal more generously with the needs of the Nation to combat crime and with the responsibility of the Congress to direct that effort. In addition, I am hopeful that members of the Appropriations Committee, when meeting in a committee of conference, will recognize the importance of more adequate funding of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Indeed, a full funding at the figure recommended by the administration of \$20.9 million should be a minimum for fiscal year 1970. It would be my hope that the conference report might include a figure of \$30 or \$40 million in order that a substantial and effective program of research, development, and training might be initiated—in fulfilling the objectives of the omnibus crime bill passed in the 90th Congress.

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

Mr. McCLORY. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York, who has been an active supporter of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, and who is extremely well versed on its provisions and potential.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my colleague from Illinois for his remarks and to congratulate him for his fine leadership in the successful effort to establish the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

I would strongly echo my colleague's eloquent testimony that the research and development funding for the Department of Justice's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is totally inadequate. The Department's request for \$20.9 million for R. & D. covering all of criminal justice has been cut by the Appropriations Committee to \$7.5 million. With crime rates mounting and citizen fear of crime reaching unprecedented levels in our history, this \$7.5 million represents less than four-hundredths of 1 percent of the total Federal expendi-

tures for research and development in all fields and only 3 percent of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration appropriation. Recent polls show that crime is the No. 1 concern of American citizens, and this low level of investment in research and development, to me, reflects a scandalous and irrational establishment of national priorities and allocation of resources.

Our police are solving fewer than 20 percent of crimes reported to them; our courts are clogged so much that the threat of deterrence is all but depleted; our corrections establishment produces recidivism rates up to 70 percent. Mere infusion of new "action" money for more police, more judges, and more prison guards is not going to make a dent in the current deplorable performance of criminal justice. These dedicated men need new methods, new equipment, new organization, new procedures. Indeed, as the President's Crime Commission stated, the greatest need is the need to know.

The budget cut for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice severely affects their program. Development programs for personalized transceivers for police, for license plate scanning, for aerial mobility, for vehicle locators, for automatic fingerprint search and retrieval, for command and control system, for mobile facsimile equipment—each of these could cost over \$1 million just for the design and development of prototype models. And yet this is just a small list of possible needs of the police alone. It excludes moneys needed for courts and corrections, for criminal law revision and for criminal procedure developments to cope with constitutional restraints and the need for speedier justice. It excludes the whole field of crime prevention, demonstration programs and juvenile delinquency. Indeed, \$7.5 million could be swallowed up in four or five hardware projects and leave no funds for the broad mission of the Institute.

With all our talk about crime and criminals, about fear and the breakdown of law and order, I simply cannot understand the false economy of cutting back development of new ways in a field long bound to obsolete, 19th-century practices. If we are to move ahead, we can do so only through a crash program utilizing the best scientific minds of this Nation. The sum of \$7½ million represents a commitment to a perpetuation of today's ineffectiveness. Let us now begin to make some sense and appropriate the full \$20.9 million for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) for his statement.

U.S.S. "KANSAS CITY"

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

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present at an event some time ago which, in my opinion, is significant enough to deserve recognition in the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I say this not only because the event in-

volved one of our colleagues, but also because the event represented a stride forward in the effort to maintain superiority of the seas.

I refer to the christening of the U.S.S. *Kansas City*.

It was my pleasure to be in the audience at Quincy, Mass., on Saturday, June 28, upon the occasion of the christening program of the *Kansas City—AOR3*. It was a beautiful morning. A crowd of several thousand had assembled to witness the launching of this new ship at the Quincy, Mass., yards of General Dynamics.

The lovely and gracious Mrs. Harry Darby, wife of the Kansas industrialist and former U.S. Senator, was the sponsor of the U.S.S. *Kansas City*.

A resident of Kansas City, Kans., Edith Darby is a person who is loved by all. She has participated with her husband for years in the civic and cultural affairs of her home city and State. She kindly asked my wife Joan to serve as matron of honor.

Because the matron of honor is a sort of stand-in, to serve or perform the actual act of christening a ship if for some unforeseen reason the sponsor cannot serve or act, no one was more pleased that the popular sponsor of the *Kansas City* was able to fulfill her assignment with complete efficiency and enthusiasm, as did Mrs. Darby, than was my wife Joan.

The principal speaker for the occasion was our colleague, WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of the Fourth Missouri District, who represents a portion of Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. Speaker, to me the invocation which followed the national anthem that morning, given by the Reverend G. Harris Collingwood, Rector of the Church of the Advent of Boston, Mass., and a former constituent of mine opened these christening ceremonies in a beautiful and impressive way when in the invocation he intoned:

Let us pray almighty Father—strong to save—whose arm hath bound the restless wave. Protect, we beseech thee, this ship from the moment of her launch until the ending of her days as thou has blessed the labors of those who designed and built her. Bless also we pray thee, those who shall command and sail her.

We humbly acknowledge that she was built for war but thou in thy mercy grant that she may sail in peace, and for the nation of Peace. May she carry her name proudly and may she always move with the courage, determination and accomplishment of those pioneers who founded the twin Kansas Cities on the vital growing edge of this nation. Oh, Father, as the *Kansas City* plies the vast ocean reaches, keep her in the hollow of thy hand, grant her fair seas and a mission of peace. This especially we pray thee. Oh, Father of all—make the *Kansas City* an instrument of thy Peace. Amen.

The christening of a ship is somewhat like the countdown of a space project such as the Apollo. The countdown commences at midnight and every foot of the ways are checked on which the huge vessel must slide into the water. Supports are balanced one against the other and removed in sequence to the point where, when all is in readiness, only the slightest pressure is necessary to cause the

great new beautiful ship to slide down into the waves.

Following the invocation the words of welcome and introduction were well timed by Mr. Robert V. Laney, vice president of General Dynamics and general manager of the Quincy division. He was followed by Mr. Roger Lewis, president of General Dynamics, who made some appropriate remarks for the occasion and introduced the speaker.

It is my pleasure to report that the remarks of the principal speaker, Congressman RANDALL, were to the point and that his selection as speaker was certainly an appropriate choice because he is a member of the House Armed Services Committee and served in World War II with the Amphibious Forces in the Pacific Theater of Operation. The remarks of Congressman RANDALL were as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL

It is a rare privilege and high honor to be permitted to participate in this traditional launching ceremony. One quite apparent reason this is such a happy day is that this ship, the *Kansas City*, bears the name of two fine Midwestern cities—Kansas City, Missouri (a portion of which it is my good fortune to represent), and Kansas City, Kansas, our sister city across the state line. It is a thrill for all of us here assembled to welcome this fine ship to our fleet.

I am here with a sense of humility. The reason I feel humble is that I am not sure I fully contemplate the potential added to our fleet by this ship and her several sister ships of this same class.

It is most pleasant to be here with our lovely, charming and gracious sponsor, Mrs. Harry Darby. Today she is the first lady of this christening but she is a first lady wherever she may be and a great lady every day. She is the wife of a great Kansas industrialist, Harry Darby, and former United States Senator, whom all of us on the Eastern side of the Missouri-Kansas state line are proud to call "Good neighbor, Harry Darby." On the other side of the state line he is respectfully regarded as "Mr. Kansas." I know he feels much at home on this shipyard because he happens to be a shipbuilder. In World War II it was his LCT's, LCM's and LCJ's which enabled the "Infantry of the sea," our Marines, to make possible the capture of the Pacific Islands from the Japanese which would otherwise have been long delayed, if not impossible.

Behind us this morning is one of a new class of versatile replenishment ships. It is designed to replace the Navy's aging oilers. 80% of our Navy's present service forces are over-age, until very recently the replenishment fleet has truly been the "forgotten force" of the Navy. It is now on the way to being remembered. There is hope for a brighter future because this and other ships are the forerunners of a substantial modern replenishment fleet.

The *Kansas City* will be capable of provisioning destroyers while underway by means of a newly developed high speed transfer system known as "FAST" which means fast automatic shuttle transfer, using highlines for packages, and conduits for liquid transfer between ships. On board will be complex machinery which can accomplish a gentle transfer of delicate missiles and munitions. She can service combatant ships with a wide range of supplies, petroleum, refrigerated items and ammunition. She will carry all types of ammunition including missiles and torpedoes. The *Kansas City* will be equipped with electric powered fork lift vehicles to raise the stores from inside the ship, thence to be transferred across highlines to the receiving vessels alongside.

The vessel to be christened today is a fast ship with a 20-knot capability. She is not only fast but exceptionally maneuverable, for a ship of her size. Moreover, there is an alternative transfer capability called VERTREP meaning Vertical replenishment, accomplished by at least two helicopters to operate from a landing launching platform on the stern of the ship.

This morning we are honoring a new improvement of an old concept in naval logistics. Logistics means getting the right amount of military materiel and men, in the right place at the right time. It is always a complex operation. Throughout military history the repeated lesson of logistics is that too little, too late sets the stage for defeat. In World War II it was "Underway Replenishment" that was the "Secret Weapon" that won the war in the Pacific. By adding the *Kansas City* to the fleet we are making a substantial step toward more efficient replenishment.

In the Viet Nam conflict I am convinced too many people have been bedazzled by the headlines which acclaim the capabilities of our giant cargo carrying airplanes. The truth of the matter is that almost 98% of war materiel goes to Viet Nam by ship and less than 2% by air cargo.

I am most mindful of the good people of Kansas City are proud this morning. They will be greatly pleased to know that this fine ship will carry the name of our fair city around the world. Some of the participants in the ceremony this morning are convinced Kansas City is already known around the world, because Kansas Citians, as they travel, are always proud to say they are from the friendly heart of America. But this ship will add significantly to the good name already earned by our city. It is my prediction she will be a sort of sea-going advertisement because there will always be some of the crew of the *Kansas City*, as they replenish a combatant ship at sea, to be proud to pass the word that they are carrying oil from Kansas and remind the recipients that the fresh fruit and vegetables are from Missouri, and the meats, including the famous steaks, are packed in Kansas City.

The beauty that sits before us here on the runs this morning is the product of the work of many thousands of men. I called her a beauty because shipbuilders take greater pride in their craft than perhaps other workmen, blending art and science to shape a vessel to serve the men who will sail her.

A ship's christening is a thing of deep significance. It is a time when a vessel takes on its own unique personality which will forever be hers alone. Until this moment the *Kansas City* has been a gaunt mass of steel and machinery, or just so much equipment without a soul. The breaking of this bottle of champagne will transmute this mass of steel and brass into a vibrant and living thing of grace and charm. You will observe I have repeatedly referred to this ship as "She", or to "Her." The vessel before us may be christened the *Kansas City*, but it will always be called "She" because sailors believe that ships have the attributes ascribed to woman, including beauty, mystery and endearment, along with those other qualities which give them their vital place in our hearts.

The christening is really the birth of a ship. It is the most important moment of her life. She is endowed from this moment on with a spirit and will of her own. I hope you would agree that this thing of beauty here before us is possessed of charm and a personality comparable in some degree to the unique personality of our gracious sponsor, Mrs. Harry Darby. For men of the sea, ships are not cold, inanimate objects, but cherished friends endowed with individual personalities.

The ancient ceremony we celebrate today links us to the past centuries of man's super-

stitutions and fears. To give him strength as he faced the unknowns of the sea, a sailor turned to his Gods. All the way back to the days of paganism, sailors have found the need to make a ship a living creature. Although the Navy assigns to a ship a name before she is launched, the ship does not receive such a name until the sponsor christens her in a ceremony such as ours today.

The builders of the "Kansas City" are to be commended. The Quincy Division of General Dynamics is to be congratulated on its effort at New Assembly Line Methods and the New procedure for Preoutfitting of subsections of ships. In short, to try to hold down construction costs.

All at once it seems to have become fashionable and popular to be critical of any industry which happens to be working on defense contracts. There is no need to deny that there have been some cost overruns or cost growths due to abnormal inflation over which bidders have no control. But defense contracts should be put in perspective, by comparison with other non-defense contracts. I think we should recall and recognize that there have also been cost over-runs in non-defense expenditures in our Government much greater than in defense oriented industries.

Our Interstate Highway system experienced a huge cost overrun. In the space field the Lunar Module which hopefully will be landed on the moon sometime after July 16th and which is being so well acclaimed in this country at the moment has suffered the highest overrun of any project, Military or Civilian.

Let us not lose sight of the fact the cost of services has also experienced some overruns in the field of expenditures for the medical care of our aged. The Medicare Program has seen a very substantial percentage increase over the original estimates.

Cost overruns are not limited only to Military procurement. They exist in many worthwhile non-defense projects. My point is the Congress should and must be equally interested in controlling cost overruns no matter where they may be found. We must find a way to locate this kind of a trend toward cost growth and arrest it before it grows too great in size. The procedure we plan to adopt in the Armed Services Committee is called "Milestone" and calls for a thorough study of cost trends every 3 months, that is every quarter on all defense contracts. Let me say straightforwardly that every member of the House Committee on Armed Services intends to scrutinize very carefully every escalating defense procurement cost. Our objective is the same as yours—to obtain the best equipment for our defense forces at the lowest possible cost.

But we must replace the aging ships of our fleet. Nearly two centuries ago, John Paul Jones said, "Without a respectable navy—alas America."

In the light of that quotation, the Kansas City is not only a thing of beauty, but an important addition to our fleet and moreover, to our Maritime Power. We have for far too long neglected our Navy and also our Merchant Marine. There is no denying the Soviets have become a major Naval and Maritime power. They know it. The Chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Georshov, has insisted they intend to become master of the seas. They are building with the Number One spot in mind. If we were only in the automobile rental business like Avis, we could tolerate being number two, and then try harder. In the deadly game of national defense, there is no prize for second place.

In conclusion we may have to concede the Kansas City may never become a famous fighting ship. Yet it will always be a ship that will sustain our sailors on the fighting ships of our fleet. She will supply the 3-B's—Beans, Bullets, and Black Oil," which are

necessities for our fighting men and our combatant ships.

Given tools for our Military Forces like the Kansas City, we will be able to weld a mighty shield behind which we can work to adjust to a happy America and a safer, saner world.

As we are about to launch the Kansas City, we bestow on her our heartfelt wish for Good Luck and Smooth Sailing. To you, our Kansas City—may your winds always be fair!

Mr. Laney once again, perfectly on time as the countdown proceeded, introduced the sponsor, who without hesitation and acting as though she had been a veteran of repeated christenings, grasped the bottle of champagne with both hands and with a beautiful swing broke the bottle square upon the bow and at the exact second of 10 o'clock, with the countdown complete, the beautiful *Kansas City* began to slide down the ways and into the Fore River.

It was an impressive ceremony. The countdown was perfect. The remarks were to the point. The sponsor performed in an excellent fashion and distinguished herself by her perfect timing and with the poise and grace characteristic of her qualities as a lovely lady.

Thus the U.S.S. *Kansas City*, an important addition to our fleet, was baptized, in accordance with all of the customs of an ancient christening. In a few months, when she is fully equipped, she will be commissioned and will join the growing new fleet of the United States Navy.

NATIONAL MAN IN SPACE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all our citizens to be particularly proud of being Americans. It is also a time for us, in humbleness and humility, to give thanks for the blessings that have been so abundantly bestowed upon us.

Today, with the safe landing of the spacecraft *Columbia*, I cannot think of a more appropriate time for Congress to call on the President to proclaim a National Man in Space Week so that each year the American people and people around the world can celebrate and commemorate our space pioneers and our space program.

I believe that more than mere congratulations should be accorded to the three astronauts, Mission Commander Neil Armstrong, Col. Edwin "Buzz" Aldrin, and Lt. Col. Michael Collins, the Apollo 11 crew, and to all those connected with the space program. These individuals have worked long and hard to make this singular success possible for our Nation and our world. They all have been inheritors of centuries of painstakingly accumulated knowledge, and they have used the fruits of the ages wisely and well.

The scope and excellence of the Apollo 11 mission and the courage of our three astronauts is in the tradition of greatness that has made the United States what it is today. The determination and

ability of our men in space reassures us that man can reach unlimited heights of achievement when there is total commitment to a worthy goal.

The momentous feat of landing a man on the moon will rank in history with Columbus' landing on this continent and discovering a new world. The seconds before the landing of Eagle on the moon's surface will be remembered as one of the moments of greatest drama in the history, and the phrase, "the Eagle has landed," will be added to the collection of immortal phrases that have marked man's progress through the ages. Man's first step on the moon truly was a giant leap for mankind. Man throughout history has been engaged in the never-ending process of increasing his knowledge and expanding his horizons—the successes of Apollo 11 are a watershed in this regard.

My longtime friend Col. Buzz Aldrin made a particularly compelling observation when he informed the world yesterday:

We have come to the conclusion that this has been far more than three men on a voyage to the moon. More still than the efforts of a government and industry team, more even than the efforts of one nation. We feel that this stands as a symbol of the insatiable curiosity of all mankind to explore the unknown.

I firmly believe man's curiosity to explore the unknown, and his desire to fathom the mysteries of his being, his world, and his universe, will be well served by space exploration.

Mr. Speaker, there will be many honors and celebrations awaiting our three astronauts after the completion of their mission duties. But after the ceremonies have been concluded and the honors accorded, we must provide some means by which the American people can recall, rejoice in, and be inspired by the deeds and achievements which our men in space have made a part of our national heritage.

I believe I have found such a means, Mr. Speaker, and at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution setting aside the third week in July of each year to be designated by Presidential proclamation as National Man in Space Week.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today H.R. 12964, the appropriations bill for fiscal 1970 for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, passed the House without providing for the expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 which was passed in the last Congress.

The House Committee on Commerce reported out the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968, unanimously agreeing that this legislation was essential because of the inadequacy of efforts being made to protect the American public

from the perils of fires. The hearings brought forth particularly disturbing evidence to warrant serious consideration of the problem and effective action to provide solutions.

The United States has the highest per capita death rate from fires, causing approximately 12,000 deaths back in 1965 and property damage amounting to almost \$2 billion. This situation is necessarily being compounded yearly by the growth of our society especially in the absence of comprehensive fire research and safety programs. What else can be expected but a continuing rise in the per capita number of fires—dramatized daily by the number of deaths, injuries, and amount of property damage. The Congress has recognized the need for legislation to cope with this problem by enacting Public Law 90-259. All that is needed now is the appropriation to implement at least part of our commitment to the American people by establishing a Commission as provided for in title II which would undertake a "comprehensive study and investigation to determine practicable and effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire throughout the country . . ." The Commission would be composed of the Secretaries of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development and 18 other members appointed by the President, plus four advisory members from Congress. The report would be submitted in 2 years. More specifically, the Commission would look into fire preventive and suppression methods, evaluate present and future needs of training and education for fire service personnel, analyze the administrative problems affecting the efficiency or capabilities of local fire departments or organizations, among other things.

The need for this appropriation is clear. I am hopeful that this small sum can be included in this appropriations measure before its final enactment into law. The benefits that will be reaped will be far greater in the long run.

THE SHERIDAN TANK—ANOTHER MILITARY SUCCESS STORY

(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 listened in shock, disbelief, and increasing apprehension to repeated revelations of overspending on military projects. Certainly basic truths have been revealed regarding the entire military procurement and contracting process. Reform is in order and in the fullness of time will arrive.

It is bad enough that billions have been thrown away. It is another stench entirely when we have incontrovertible evidence that American soldiers have been placed in jeopardy, wounded, crippled, and killed because of faulty equipment. When our system tolerates full knowledge of such faulty hardware, insisting upon shipping it to a combat zone, the evil is compounded. When injuries and deaths result, guilt becomes criminal.

We know one American soldier is

dead, three severely burned, and others made casualties because of technical faults and failures of the Sheridan. We also know the Army took a calculated risk in sending it into combat, after being told before it left the United States that it was prone to breakdowns and deficiencies which would jeopardize American troops.

Congress again and again has been assured by high-ranking Army officials that the Sheridan tank has been operating successfully under Vietnamese combat conditions, that it was the greatest thing on wheels and treads since the model T and the first panzers.

Yet there is an as yet unpublished report telling another story entirely.

According to the report, the Sheridan has had "16 major equipment failures, 125 electrical circuit failures, 41 weapons misfires, 140 ammunition ruptures, 25 engine replacements caused by overheating and persistent malfunction of the 152-millimeter cannon." One can imagine the overwhelming confidence among crews who must live or die by this tank's performance.

Another gem of note is the Army's field manual on the Sheridan, which as every veteran knows is essential to operation and repair of the vehicle. It did not arrive in Vietnam until after the first 64 tanks had been in combat for 6 weeks. The 20-page manual makes heartening reading for crews, informing them the electrical system is prone to failure and its new combustible cartridge is subject to malfunction. Yet we are positive all this was known to the Army before the tank entered combat or even left American shores. The test manager warned:

The Sheridan is of limited dependability and unknown limitation. I do not believe that a combat situation where mission and lives depend so heavily on equipment reliability is the test environment to question and resolve these problems.

The project manager said this on November 5, 1968. On February 8, 1969, the tank was on its way to Vietnam. On February 15, one of them hit a mine that would not have severely damaged one of the Army's older tanks. The explosion ruptured the vehicle's hull, ignited ammunition stored directly over the rupture, and killed the driver. Three crewmembers were severely burned when an exposed cartridge was struck by an enemy shell as they tried to extract it from the chamber. The shell had misfired twice. Reports show that the combustible cartridge leaves a residue which must be removed manually. They also tend to break open from vibration and swell from moisture.

Engines become overheated when air intake grills, because of faulty design, become clogged with grit and because aluminum fan belt pulleys proved too weak.

Yet during the first week of June, Lt. Gen. A. W. Betts, Chief of Army Research and Development, told a New York audience that the Sheridans had "clearly proved their worth in combat, in spite of the technical bugs." Perhaps the general would care to take command of one of his prizes and lead the next charge.

Mr. Speaker, the Army now plans to ship 171 more of the vehicles, built by

Chrysler as prime contractor, to Vietnam. Good news for America's soldiers.

Here we see the proof of the pudding. We not only spend a fortune on what turns out to be worthless hardware which is delivered late and at ridiculous cost. When the test comes, they are sent to combat regardless of danger to the men involved. Critics are hushed up or ignored, and young boys are exposed to death needlessly, all to preserve reputations, continue appropriations and preserve a facade of military performance and infallibility. Is this how some of our other expensive and highly touted weapons systems will perform? Indications point to an affirmative answer in more than one case.

In the lexicon of many of these gentlemen, anything which smacks of criticism or questioning borders on the edge of high treason. If there is anything this proves, it is that we in the Congress must subject each and every one of these projects to the most intense and pitiless scrutiny.

As for the Sheridans, I feel we should recall every one from Vietnam forthwith. I leave it to your collective imagination as to what we might seriously consider doing with those responsible for this state of affairs.

NONE DARE CALL IT REASON

(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 Petroleum Industry Research Foundations, Inc., has assailed minimum reductions of oil industry tax privileges just recommended by the Ways and Means Committee. Not only do they assail oil tax reform proposals in toto and on principle, but these public servants claim that discarding depletion provisions would inevitably result in gasoline price increases. To be precise, 2.5 to 3 cents per gallon.

To begin with, their response is a threat as well as an answer. It is aimed squarely at the Congress, which must vote on these tax reform recommendations. Their secondary target is our general consuming public. In effect, they are mounting a crude, blatant offensive in order to blackmail this Congress into opposing tax reform of oil industry privilege. Boldly and callously, they seek to frighten an already overburdened public into inundating Congress with protests against reform on the grounds that prices will rise. No effort could be more ill-fated or fraught with disaster.

Let us recollect that this very same oil industry, bloated with profits gained in large measure through tax privilege, raised its crude oil prices on March 21, 1969. This was the second general price hike this year, and can be condemned as nothing more than a \$600 million annual swindle of the gasoline consuming public. Its motivation was pure greed rather than economic necessity. Now, in the face of a massed national outcry for at least minimal reform, these modern swashbuckling desperadoes of the marketplace shreik bankruptcy and threaten the Nation with yet another price rise.

To our oil industry, the public marketplace is a private, lucrative plaything. In the face of damning, overwhelming proof that their industry is sucking millions of citizens dry of billions of dollars, they dare stand up and plead for reason, decrying emotionalism on the part of critics. Reason and logic have fallen on deaf ears. Suasion has failed. It is time for sledgehammers to be employed.

There is a superabundance of low cost oil in the world. Yet the American consumer is paying twice the going world price for every oil product. He is subsidizing the oil industry through special tax treatment, import quotas and cartel restrictions on domestic production. Now these looters in three-button suits dare to publicly threaten an entire Congress and consuming public with still higher prices if we dare bleed off even a fraction of their stupendous profits. Logic is not the least of their sworn enemies.

Their pledge of allegiance reads:

One oil industry, under an umbrella of tax privilege, unassailable, with tax evasion and ever-growing profits for all directors, officers and major stockholders.

Mr. Speaker, the reply of Congress should be swift and uncompromising. Let us drive these reforms home with dispatch, and dare the oil industry to raise prices again. If during the debate or immediately afterwards, they do raise them, a cry will go up for a thorough, massive investigation of the entire oil and gas industry's price structure. Our entire consuming public would demand and applaud such a probe. Who knows what peculiar forms of industrial life we might find under this particular rock.

I fear this industry is living in the past. Fondly do they recall those gaudy days, when no one dared challenge them. Those times are gone forever. National interest requires such a challenge. I would refer them to the study of French literature and the words of Victor Hugo.

Nothing can stop an idea whose time has come.

Tax reform of oil privilege is a concept whose time has come. Resistance only invites drastic reform. Previous assaults will be pinpricks compared to what will follow if they deny the public its due. This is not a threat. Rather, consider it a fact of life.

ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS PERSONNEL TRAINING ACT OF 1969

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to extend and modify the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act for 3 fiscal years. The present law expires on June 20, 1970.

This law was first enacted by the 89th Congress and signed into law on November 3, 1966. It was amended in the 90th Congress by Public Law 90-490 which extended the program for an additional fiscal year, through fiscal year 1970.

Basically, the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act authorized four types of grants in aid to "training centers

for allied health professions": Such a training center means a junior college, college or university which provides an associate degree or higher in medical technology, optometric technology, dental hygiene, or other allied health professions curriculums.

First, the act provides grants for the construction of new or expanded teaching facilities for training centers and affiliated hospitals. Fiscal year 1968 was the first year for which construction grants were made and thus far for 2 fiscal years the appropriations have totaled only \$4.8 million, although \$25.5 million was authorized for fiscal year 1967 through 1969 and another \$20 million is authorized for fiscal year 1970. Three universities, Ohio State University, New Hampshire Institute of Technology, and the University of Vermont, have received construction grants totaling \$3,522,932. Yet, unfunded applications from other schools total nearly \$12 million.

Second, the act provided for basic improvement and special improvement grants to upgrade the quality of training careers. Basic improvement grants are awarded on a formula basis of \$5,000 for each eligible curriculum plus \$500 for each eligible student. In fiscal year 1967, 164 colleges and universities and 28 junior colleges received basic improvement grants. In fiscal year 1968, 197 colleges and universities and 33 junior colleges received such grants, and over 280 applications have been received for 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the basic improvement grant program has been impressive but the picture is not so bright when we look at the special improvement grant program. This is so because special improvement grants are made on a project basis, utilizing funds remaining after the basic improvement grant entitlements are satisfied, and can only be made to an institution for which a basic improvement grant application has been approved.

To date no funds for the special improvement grants have been made available and no awards have been made.

The legislation that I am introducing today would correct this problem by providing separate appropriation authorization for the special improvement grants. This change in the act would remove the restrictions on the special improvement grants which now make their award dependent on a prior basic improvement grant award and there would be no formula basis on which the award would have to be made.

This change in this bill recognizes the existence of a weakness in the existing law which, due principally to a lack of funds, prevents a training center from receiving funds to provide, maintain or improve the specialized function that the training center serves.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, by changing the special improvement grant provisions of the act, we will be providing funds to capture an untapped reserve of health manpower: the thousands of military medical personnel who will be returning to civilian life and who possess extensive knowledge about allied health professions techniques and training.

The Department of Defense estimates that there are presently approximately 109,000 medical personnel in the Armed Forces, and that some 30,000 to 35,000 return to civilian life each year, but no specific data is available to determine how many of these remain in the allied health field. Estimates range anywhere from 3 to 20 percent, but this is hardly encouraging in face of the national civilian need—a present shortage of over 100,000 such personnel—and the number returning each year.

I believe the corpsman or "medic" can be a valuable contribution to the overall health care system and this bill will help encourage more corpsman to remain in the allied health field.

The special improvements grants in the bill that I am introducing could be used to gear up a junior college, college, or university to encourage enrollment by these former military medical personnel in order that they may continue to improve and use their talents and skills to provide better health care for all Americans.

The basic act also provides for advanced traineeship grants awarded to public or nonprofit allied health training centers that in turn make awards to students who have completed the basic professional preparations required for employment in one of the designated eligible disciplines and are pursuing advanced training to qualify them for positions as teachers, supervisors, administrators or specialists. Thus far 718 students have benefited from the traineeship grants at 107 institutions.

Finally, the act also provides developmental grants to allied health training centers for the development of curriculums for training new types allied health personnel. The act provides that grants may be awarded to agencies, institutions, and organizations to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate methods as well as curriculums for the training of known as well as new types of health technologists. Sixteen such grants in 10 States have thus far been awarded.

This last area covered under the act is of particular interest to me because I sincerely believe that if we are to really improve the delivery of health services to millions of Americans, we must create new types of health personnel who can better deliver the expertise and technology that we are developing. These so-called paramedical personnel hold the key to reducing health care cost and at the same time are improving the quality and time of delivery of health services.

I am talking about such concepts as a diagnostic microbiology technician, a biomedical photographer, a radiopharmacist, an extra corporeal circulation specialist just to name a few of the projects currently underway to find new ways and new positions to deliver services.

In conclusion, let me say that we should not be lax in realizing the significance of the problem of meeting our allied health personnel needs. In 1967, it was estimated that there was a deficit of some 110,000 medical allied manpower and this deficit is expected to more than double by 1975 unless some corrections are made.

I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare will be able to hold hearings on this legislation in the near future.

ADMINISTRATION'S POPULATION PROGRAM A GOOD FIRST STEP

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, this week President Nixon outlined an ambitious program for population and family planning policy; now it is time for Congress to act in this critical area.

The race between a rapidly expanding population and the ability of a society to meet the demands posed by an ever-larger amount of people is already entering a crucial stage. Even as technological advances increase utilization capabilities of scarce resources, these same technological breakthroughs can also rebound and amplify already streaking population growth rates.

Thus, while technology increases the total amount of goods and services, it also tends to raise income and health levels, and, as death rates drop—resulting from the higher income and health services available—overall population rates begin to spiral as long as birth rates remain relatively unchanged.

Too often, the population squeeze so created has become a characteristic of lower-income areas—here in America and throughout the world. And, it is in these lower-income areas where there are usually fewer available resources devoted to active population control programs.

Last year, the President's Committee on Population and Family Planning issued an outstanding report which focused on the main problems of overpopulation here and abroad. As the committee noted:

For the one-fifth of Americans who are poor or nearly poor, however, current programs will not be enough. The current availability of family planning is of little help to those who cannot afford the services, who do not know that they are available, or who live where medical services are scarce.

The lack of family planning services among the poor is not a problem confined to one race, nor is it confined to the urban areas; in fact, two-thirds of the nation's poor are white, and only one-third live in central city slums. Neither is the problem confined to certain geographic areas; the people needing services live in all sections of the country.

Moreover, the poor are precisely those for whom a lack of family planning services is most disastrous. While surveys indicate that poor people want no more children than those who are not poor, they have in fact many more children. Excessive fertility can drive a family into poverty as well as reduce its chances of escaping it. The frequency of maternal deaths, the level of infant mortality, and the number of children who are chronically handicapped are all markedly greater among the poor than in the rest of the population. One of the most effective measures that could be taken to lower mortality and morbidity rates among mothers and children would be to help the poor to have the number of children they desire.

It is estimated that five million American women want family planning services but cannot get them because they cannot afford them or have no ready access to them. Basic

legislation already exists, but modifications to provide adequate authorizations and appropriations will be needed. Under present legislation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity have programs to bring family planning services to the poor. Such programs and private efforts now reach about one million needy women. In view of the scarcity of health resources in poor neighborhoods, services needed to reach an estimated five million women will require dedicated effort and careful planning.

And:

A number of countries have recently adopted official policies or programs designed to make family planning services available as health measures or to decrease their rates of population growth or both. The policies and programs differ widely. In some countries, policy statements are unaccompanied by programs; elsewhere, programs are operating without official policy statements. Yet in all the developing world, perhaps two thirds of the people live in countries where programs have been started or policies announced.

In many countries, family planning is gaining support as a means of improving the health and welfare of families. More and more countries are also explicitly recognizing that their plans for economic and social progress are being jeopardized by high rates of population growth. In terms of the recency of the effort, the progress is impressive. However, given the magnitude of the problem and the objectives set by many countries, the scale of the effort is grossly inadequate.

While a great deal can and should be done now with the personnel and knowledge already available, this is a new field in which it is essential to build a sound base for larger efforts in the coming years. Population problems will almost certainly be of urgent concern to the world beyond the end of this century. Every delay now will increase the difficulties of future generations.

POLICY

The policy of the United States for international assistance in this field is based on the fact that excessive rates of population growth impede economic and social progress and on the principle that effective access to family planning information and service should be universally available.

The United States should encourage all nations to consider the impact of population factors on their development programs and to undertake action appropriate to their own situations. At the same time, this nation should not require any particular population policy as a condition of economic or other aid. The United States should continue, through appropriate public and private agencies, to be ready on request to assist any country to develop or strengthen population policies and programs based on respect for individual conscience and choice. Such assistance should be available even to those countries not presently receiving U.S. foreign assistance funds.

As the main thrust of their report, the Committee made eight recommendations for immediate Government consideration, and earlier this year, I introduced a series of bills based upon a number of those proposals.

I am pleased to note that President Nixon's request for a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future closely approximates H.R. 9107, my bill calling for a Population Commission. H.R. 9108 would establish a Federal grant program for construction of population study centers, and H.R. 9109 creates a National Institute for Population Research within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

While I commend the President for putting priority on the need for population control programs, I hope that Mr. Nixon's proposals are only his initial suggestions and that a larger scale effort already is under consideration.

Today, I sent the President the following letter which explains more fully my position in these matters:

JULY 24, 1969.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The proposals offered this week by the Administration in the crucial field of population control and family planning represent a major step forward in government's response to the serious problems posed by overpopulation pressures. As noted in your Message to the Congress, an impending population crisis ranks as a prime issue facing all society, and solutions can only result from thorough advance planning.

Last November, a distinguished panel of experts in the population policy field presented to President Johnson a report as members of the President's Committee on Population and Family Planning. I am pleased that many of the specific recommendations suggested by the Committee are reflected in your Message on population growth.

Earlier this year, I introduced in the House of Representatives a series of bills based upon the President's Committee recommendations. One of these bills, H.R. 9107, calls for creation of a Commission on Population identical to the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future you described in your Message.

I am also happy to see your Administration requesting higher funding for family planning services. According to the President's Committee report, "increases of \$30-million annually for the next few years can be put to high priority use regardless of later variations in unit costs. In any case, costs are low compared to health and social benefits." I hope that the Administration can heed this recommendation and push for further increments so that fiscal 1970 appropriations for family planning services could reach the minimal level of \$60-million proposed by the Committee.

Your Message emphasizes the need for increased research. The President's Committee proposed that a larger research program could be developed in both size and scope, and that a full-scale National Institute for Population Research be established within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. H.R. 9109, which I introduced in the House in March follows this recommendation, and I urge you to give consideration to this important proposal.

In addition, the President's Committee requested that population studies centers be set up primarily in universities to undertake research and training programs in the biomedical, health and social sciences. I also translated that recommendation into legislation, and H.R. 9108 would provide Federal grants for construction and support of such centers.

Debate and rhetoric over national priorities capture much attention these days. Unfortunately, the dialogue too often unduly prolongs final decision-making while severe problems fester. I stress the importance that must be given to population control policies—both here in America and throughout the world—as a key factor in maintaining the quality of life for our generation and for the future. I commend the proposals already presented to the Congress, and I look forward to even more emphasis by your Administration in this crucial area.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Already, during this session of Congress, many new and forward measures relating to population control have been introduced by Members of both parties. The administration finally has made an initial move; it is time now for Congress to respond to this crucial need.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following articles from the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times concerning various aspects of population policy in the RECORD at this point:

LOWERING THE BABY BOOM

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Some people may think it both ironic and a betrayal that a President who's talked so much about getting the Government out of this and that part of our lives should be the man who sent Congress a message on birth control. If there were ever an activity that we have considered nobody's damn business but our own it's how many kids we're going to have. No amount of keyhole peeping by J. Edgar Hoover appears to be such an intrusion on our private liberties.

In effect, the message said the number of children we have is as much the state's business as our own. The message is correct and the men who wrote it and the President who signed it should be given cigars and the same kind of hearty congratulations we accord to people who have so many babies. The only criticism you can make against it is that it didn't go far enough. However, it was probably as much as an elected politician could do in a country of many Catholics, sexual conservatives and baby worshippers. Now it's for the rest of us to raise a supportive clatter.

The document predicts that within our lifetime there will be a hundred million more Americans. This country needs that only slightly less than an atom bomb attack. We're already running around like the old lady who had so many long-haired children she didn't know what to do. We can't accommodate the people we have without the most drastic changes in our living patterns.

When some people deprecate worries about our excessive production of babies, they say there will be enough food to go around. They talk about how we can avoid mass starvation by making protein comestibles out of fish scales or sea algae. They don't speculate on the pleasures of a life sustained in perpetual scarcity by processed help. For human beings there is a distinction between survival and living. They also overlook the fact that we are learning that many of the methods we use to increase food production—chemical fertilizers and insecticides, for instance—boomerang and turn out to be dangerous to health.

The easiest and most practical course is to cut back on our baby production. Nothing in the presidential message indicates the Government's willingness to do that, even though its own figures demonstrate the need. The program envisioned by the Administration draws a line at "infringing upon the religious convictions or personal wishes and freedom of any individual . . ."

That means the Catholic Church, the largest, best organized and most-moneyed enemy of birth control. There is some reason to believe that very large numbers of otherwise obedient Catholics use contraceptives, but you can't blame a politician for drawing back from asking such a hefty percentage of the voters to choose between themselves and their bishops. (Though one American bishop has resigned rather than buy the Vatican line.) The rest of us also are loathe to say much because it may smack of religious intolerance.

Yet something has to be said. The unchecked begetting of kids isn't like other religious practices. If an orthodox Jew wants

to stay away from pork, that's his business. He isn't hurting anybody else, but that's not true of babies. What is true is that the 70-year-old Italian celibates who cling to their aversion to contraceptives won't be alive to suffer the consequences of their erroneous teachings.

There's little we can do about the erroneous teachings, but do the taxpayers have to subsidize them? Do we have to give tax exemptions and financial aid to Catholic educational institutions while they teach children to follow practices that are going to ruin all of us? The least the Government could do is support only private schools which teach and advocate birth control.

This is the barest of beginnings. The Catholic problem is the hierarchy's political opposition to population-reduction programs: Catholic birth rates aren't that different from everybody else's birth rates. We're all having too many children, but changing that isn't going to be easy. Many long-lived ideas must be stamped out first.

There is the notion, absurd in the era of the ABM, that many babies makes us militarily strong. This idea is not only connected with raising cannon fodder for the infantry, but also the masculine definition of virility. You're a man, you really got what it takes, lotsa you know what, because you can make a female pregnant. If you can do that you're a bull, a stud, a rooster. When we hear of a 70-year-old male fathering a child, we make awed sounds and exclaim about what a man he must be. It's going to be hard to convince men that impregnating women is an anti-social act.

The case with women is more desperate. Many American women are brought up to believe their essential worthwhileness derives from motherhood and childrearing. From the cradle they're schooled in attitudes that make them disdain any other occupation but the manufacturing of babies. Unmarried or childless women are spinsters, career girls, barren soil, somehow less than female.

Often people get married and have children because they have no other real choice. By their mid-twenties, women who're not married frequently are in a state of near panic as the source of likely husbands is used up, and they contemplate being single persons in a married people's world. It's somewhat better for a man, but not much. With both sexes the married majority tends to exclude the single minority during the years between 25 and 50, when the men begin dropping dead. Everything is set up to encourage getting married and having unholy numbers of kids; the married couple with children gets tax incentives to reproduce, gets credit more easily, is considered a better risk for car insurance and is regarded as a potentially more stable and therefore more desirable employe.

People have children as a form of social security. A bunch of kids is a better health and retirement program than anything the Government is offering or proposing. Moreover, we're weighed down with a lot of balderdash about perpetuating ourselves or that particular genetic pool known as our family through baby making. Life ought to be sufficiently fulfilling and satisfying that we don't feel the urge to recoup our own disasters by living it out again through our children.

Limiting population production will exact other very large changes. We must divest ourselves of the belief that a stable or declining population is a sign of a stagnant or degenerate society. This means a good deal more than accepting abortion for any reason a woman wants it; it means reordering our economics. Our whole profit system is based on the proposition that the higher we can push the volume, the lower we can depress our per unit costs. This once useful way of arranging things is outliving its utility. If some other way isn't found to provide Ford

or GM with another basis for profit, we will perish from the most horrible and painful lung diseases.

Men like Ralph Nader have shown us that with cars, with drugs, with food and many other items what we need isn't more but better quality. But we've managed our economics and technology so that money is made out of quantity. Our big manufacturers have as much of a vested interest as the Pope in frustrating birth control.

Viewed from this point of view, our lunar escapades aren't high human adventures, man realizing his destiny or the rest of the high-sounding blige we've been dishing out; from this point of view it is tragic escapism, an enormous entertainment, a romance that distracts us from our peril unless one of our astronauts can find a new, large inhabitable planet and get about three billion of us rocketed on to it while there is still time.

OVERPOPULATION AND WORLD STARVATION

(By David Kaplan)

According to the best scholarly estimates, it took thousands of years to reach a world population of 250 million by AD 1. By 1650 world population doubled to 500 million. Another doubling took place by 1850, when world population reached one billion. Then, 80 years later in 1930, population doubled again to two billion people. By 1975, 45 years later, if present trends continue, population will have doubled to four billion people.

At our present rate of growth, we can look forward to 14 billion people in 2035 and 28 billion by 2070. Why has there been such an acceleration of growth in world population? The answers are easy.

Medical advances have eradicated the dreaded plagues of the past centuries and conquered other serious diseases by devising processes which make our food and drinking water clean. In addition, modern sanitation has sharply reduced insect-spread diseases, such as malaria.

In short, we have instituted various forms of death control.

No longer, and happily so, is world population going to be decreased by any of the ancient pandemics. While we should applaud these medical advances which have saved so many lives all over the world, we also must observe that historically it was high death rates that accounted for the slower rates of population increase.

ECONOMIES ARE HIT HARD

The eradication of high death rates while high birth rates continue has led to an increase in the rate of world population growth which in many cases has had pernicious economic effects, particularly on the underdeveloped nations.

If one were to describe these economies generally, one would see a pattern of poverty, capital shortages, low agricultural productivity, limited development of markets, and unequal distribution of income. One would also see that the poorest economies are located in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Perversely, these areas have the highest rates of population growth, which act as a serious drag on economic growth. More people mean more mouths to feed. This cuts down the amount of product that can be saved. With low savings rates, little capital is available to modernize agriculture and industry—a modernization these economies desperately need if they are going to increase their production of food and other products.

What little production is obtained, say in agriculture, must be immediately consumed. These economies thus have very low savings rates, and these translate into low rates of capital formation. One of the basic prerequisites for economic growth for these economies—increasing levels of capital accumulation—is being seriously impeded by rapidly increasing populations.

LATIN AMERICA IN TROUBLE

Latin America clearly reflects how population increases have all but eradicated economic growth. Latin America has had a 4.7% increase in gross national product annually. However, when you include population growth of 3% yearly, the per capita growth rate actually comes down to 1.7% annually.

In 1900 Latin America had a population of 63 million. It now has a population of 268 million. This population, if the present rates of increase continue, will double in 23 years. By the end of the century, Latin America will have 650 million people. It will be growing then at a rate of 100 million people every 5 years. Obviously, with geometric population increase of this magnitude, Latin America will be very fortunate if it is able to record any per capita growth in the final 30 years of this century.

All of these areas which have rapidly increasing populations have extremely low annual per capita incomes: under \$400 for Latin America and under \$150 for Africa and Asia. (Those incomes look especially low when compared to North America's annual per capita income of well over \$3,500.) Yet, Africa and Asia have rates of population increase which will result in a doubling of both their populations by the year 2000.

Latin America, Africa, and Asia have approximately 2.6 billion people now. If present rates of population increase continue, these areas will have approximately 5.2 billion by the end of the century.

The ominous consequences of this spiraling population growth are clear.

First, there will be a continued exacerbation of the gross inequalities in the shares of world income going to the underdeveloped countries and to the developed nations. Economist Barbara Ward, in her book *The Lopsided World*, states that 80% of the world output is now going to only 20% of the world's population. This inequality will become even more pronounced if the underdeveloped nations continue to experience rapid population growth.

As an example, India's real national income has risen about 3.5% annually in recent years. However, India's annual population growth is about 2.5%. Thus, her per capita increase in income is only about 1% yearly or, in dollar terms, about 75 cents. The U.S. per capita increase in income is about 3% yearly or, in dollar terms, about \$120.

For the near future, at the very least, we are going to have wider disparities in the shares of income between the "have" and the "have not" nations. Rapid population growth can only accelerate these disparities.

Second, the famines that the people of various nations are experiencing now will be dwarfed by even more massive and prolonged famines in the 1970's. William and Paul Paddock, writing in *Famine—1975!* have said that the people are already born who will be the future victims of the race between food and population growth—a race which, according to the authors, already has been lost.

Furthermore, population pressures have already compelled the poorer countries to become importers of basic foodstuffs where, in the recent past, they were exporting these commodities.

Thus, Tadd Fisher writes that before World War II, Africa, Asia, and Latin America exported 11 million tons of grain yearly. By 1964, they were importing 25 million tons yearly. In addition, and even more ominously, she reports that Latin America's population increased 11.5% between 1959 and 1964, but food production increased only 6.5%. Thus, we see more evidential support for the accuracy of the predictions of more pervasive famines in the 1970's.

Third, the low incomes and prevalence of hunger in the poorer countries can only mean a continuance of political instabilities. It is the underdeveloped nations that are most

often wracked by military coups, civil wars, and violent revolutions. Future uncontrolled population growth can only increase these instabilities.

Fourth, overpopulation means increased pollution. In the United States we are caught between two very malevolent forces: a population that will grow from roughly 200 million today to 300 million in the next 35 years; and an increase by 1980 in our urban population to 175 million people. The results of these two forces are already discernible. A growing population consumes more energy, drives more cars, and produces more waste products. All this will result in our air and water becoming even more contaminated than they are now.

MASSIVE COMMITMENT NEEDED

It is easy to come to the conclusion that some drastic measures must be taken immediately. It is imperative first of all that we have a massive increase in resources committed to the overpopulation problem. Special care should be taken with the underdeveloped countries.

It should be made abundantly clear to these nations that excessive population growth is one of the central reasons for their lack of economic development. Family planning programs should be initiated where the country does not have a program, and the program should be strengthened and extended where we find one already initiated. Further, more research should be done to discover the most effective methods of family planning. We must realize, however, that even effective voluntary systems of family planning may not be a total answer to the problem. We are at a point in time when serious consideration may have to be given to mandatory governmental programs for population control.

It is obvious from the evidence that it is already too late for many people now living. We must be concerned, however, that the millions who are going to starve to death in the 1970's should not be followed by many more millions, yet unborn, in the 1980's.

QUERIES FOR OPPONENTS

Those who argue against contraception and family planning on the basis of their fundamental immorality must be prepared to answer the following questions:

Is it moral to bring a child into a world where he will suffer daily the ravages of hunger, where the poverty is so abject and the life of that child so desperate than an early death is hoped for as a way to end his seemingly interminable suffering?

Is it moral to add to the two-thirds of the world's population, approximately 2.5 billion people, who are living in a dehumanizing poverty?

Is it moral to markedly increase the pollution of our air and water?

No one, of course, would claim that increasing the levels of poverty and starvation, pollution and filth, pain and suffering is moral; yet, if we tacitly assent to the present rates of world population growth, we are then implicitly consenting to this claim. That is the immorality, not the advocacy of birth control and family planning.

In the time it took you to read this article the population of the world increased by approximately 750 people. Each day the world adds 190,000 more humans, each year approximately 70 million. Given the present food-population ratio, millions of these are doomed to early tragic deaths. If we do not act now, countless millions more, yet unborn will face the same fate.

SALUTE TO MORMON PIONEERS

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

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we have just received the happy and welcome news that the Apollo 11 astronauts have returned safely to earth following their historic journey to the moon. It is fitting that this event comes on the same day that we commemorate the end of another historic journey 122 years ago.

On July 24, 1847, a small band of sturdy Mormon pioneers led by Brigham Young entered the Salt Lake Valley. Thus ended one of the most remarkable events in the history of the American West.

The early Mormon pioneers endured many months of hardship and privation as they crossed the mountains and plains. Hundreds of graves along the wagon trails attest to the severity of the conditions they faced in their westward trek.

When they arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, the Mormons immediately began to colonize vast areas of the mountain West. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints has been a creative and constructive force in the building of our Nation. During the 30 years following their arrival, under the leadership of Brigham Young, more than 350 communities were established in six States.

Dozens of these communities are in my own State of Idaho. The pioneers who laid their foundations brought little with them in the way of material goods, but they were sustained during periods of great trial by their unswerving faith in God and in the work they were doing.

They built a civilization out of the wilderness. Idaho owes much to the Mormon pioneers whose courage, dedication, and energy caused the valleys and plains to blossom and bear fruit. They demonstrated the value of hard work, sacrifice, and a willingness to help each other.

The bold pioneers of 1847 have set an example that will serve us well today as we face a future filled with great danger and bright promise. The kind of faith, courage, and vision that was exemplified in the lives and achievement of the Mormon pioneers are no less needed today as we enter the dawn of the Space Age.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting, therefore, on this day when parades and other activities mark the anniversary of the entry of the Mormons into the Salt Lake Valley that we in the U.S. Congress take note of this historic event and pause to pay tribute to those who have contributed so much to the building of our American Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, 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. UDALL, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEITH, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MORSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. McCLORY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WINN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEICKER, for 60 minutes, on July 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, for 10 minutes, on July 28.

Mr. MIKVA, for 30 minutes, on July 29.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. CEDERBERG) immediately following the remarks of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. CEDERBERG) in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. GROSS in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York to revise and extend his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole and to include certain tables.

Mr. McCULLOCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS immediately preceding passage of State and Justice Departments appropriation bill.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) to extend his remarks following those of Mr. UDALL on his special order today and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SEBELIUS.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. MORSE in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. UTT in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. GUDE in two instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN in two instances.

Mr. CAMP in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WOLD in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. BURTON of Utah.

Mr. MESKILL.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. MOLLOHAN in three instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. GONZALEZ in four instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. MCCARTHY in three instances.

Mr. DORN in four instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 28, 1969.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

990. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Albuquerque Job Corps Center for Women at Albuquerque, N. Mex., operated by the Packard Bell Electronics Corp. under a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a proposed amendment to the draft Foreign Assistance Act of 1969; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

992. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication, "Alaska Power Survey"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3687. A bill to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7621. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 491. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 681, joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President (Rept. No. 91-390). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 13111. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13079. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing interest equalization tax (Rept. No. 91-392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13080. A bill to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withholding at source (Rept. No. 91-393). 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. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 13079. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13080. A bill to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withholding at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 13081. A bill to encourage employment among the needy and to provide job opportunities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13082. A bill to permit an individual who is eligible for a civil service retirement annuity to waive his right to have military service after 1956 included in the computation of any benefits to which he is or may become entitled under title II of the Social Security Act, and to include such service instead in the computation of such annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13083. 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 service plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 13084. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13085. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 13086. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 13087. A bill to establish an independent agency to be known as the U.S. Office of Consumers' Counsel to represent the interests of the consumers of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13088. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require persons operating sewage treatment works to be licensed; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13089. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13090. A bill to provide that Federal assistance to a State or local government or agency for rehabilitation or renovation of housing and for enforcement of local or State housing codes under the urban renewal program, the public housing program, or the model cities program, or under any other program involving the provision by State or local governments of housing or related facilities, shall be made available only on condition that the recipient submit and carry out an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13091. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to detect and treat incidents of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 13092. A bill to provide for a comprehensive and coordinated attack on the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13093. A bill to amend section 412(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, with respect to contracts relating to the selection or appointment, or the utilization of the services, of ticket agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DORN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 13094. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the Alaska Highway, and to authorize construction, reconstruction, and improvement of part of such highway, including a connecting highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 13095. A bill to permit the exportation of certain copper mined in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 13096. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 13097. A bill to provide that hearsay evidence shall be admissible at preliminary examinations in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CXV—1304—Part 15

H.R. 13098. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13099. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a personal exemption for a dependent who is his grandchild and is under 19 years of age or a student, without regard to whether such grandchild's income is less than \$600, the same as would presently be allowed the taxpayer if the dependent were his son or daughter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13100. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 years the programs of assistance for training in the allied health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 13101. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H.R. 13102. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of State to participate in the development of a large prototype desalting plant in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 13103. A bill to designate certain lands in the Petrified Forest National Park in Arizona as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 13104. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLOREY:

H.R. 13105. A bill to provide that Space Exploration Day shall be a legal public holiday which shall be celebrated on the third Monday in July; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13106. A bill to extend for 3 years the period of time during which certain requirements shall continue to apply with respect to applications for a license for an activity which may affect the resources of the Hudson Riverway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DORN, Mr. JONAS, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SLACK, Mr. UTT, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 13107. A bill to establish a uniform Federal policy for repayment of costs of Federal electric power projects, to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority to carry out this policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 13111. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. KARTE, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. WAGONER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CABELL, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. KOCH):

H.J. Res. 835. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Astronauts Memorial Commission to construct and erect with funds a memorial in the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Fla., or the immediate vicinity, to honor and commemorate the men who serve as astronauts in the U.S. space program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. ROUBUSH, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. PELLY, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WINN, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

H.J. Res. 836. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Astronauts Memorial Commission to construct and erect with funds a memorial in the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Fla., or the immediate vicinity, to honor and commemorate the men who serve as astronauts in the U.S. space program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 837. Joint resolution designating the third week in July of each year as "National Man in Space Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.J. Res. 838. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the terms of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 3 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH (for himself, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. WINN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. ROY, Mr. COWGER, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the future exploration of space frontiers jointly by the United States and other technologically advanced nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEITH (for himself, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RODINO, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. REUSS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MOSHER, and Mr. CONTE):

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the future exploration of space frontiers jointly by the United States and other technologically advanced nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. UDALL):

H. Res. 493. Resolution to provide that the employees of the House restaurant, cafeterias, and snack shops shall have the right to form and/or join an employee organization for the purpose of entering into a collective bargaining agreement with the Architect of the Capitol regarding working conditions, hours, and wages; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. 13108. A bill for the relief of Maurice Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 13109. A bill for the relief of Larry G. Piper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 13110. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain land located in the State of California to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

188. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Future Political Status Commission, Congress of Micronesia, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, transmitting the final report of the commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE—Thursday, July 24, 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:

O Thou Infinite and Eternal Spirit, on this day of days, with reverent and thankful hearts, we rise to celebrate a glorious triumph of the human mind and spirit, the fulfillment of man's obedience to Thy directive "to have dominion over the works of Thy hand." We thank Thee for the intrepid voyagers to lunar lands and spaces, for their dedicated talents, for their disciplined demeanor, and the constancy of their devotion. We thank Thee, too, for all those whose vision, toil, and talents combined to support their mission. We thank Thee for the managers, machines, and money, but above all for Thy guiding light and Thy providential care.

Lift our vision now to behold the time when nations compete not for markets or money but for treasures of the spirit. Prepare us and all the people of this land, in the depths of our nature, that in the new age we may export only good will, brotherhood, and the peace of Thy kingdom.

In the Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 23, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF SPEAKING TIME FOR SENATORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the past week or so, the leadership has been receiving an extraordinarily large number of requests for speaking time to be allocated to various Senators. While we are delighted to accommodate the proceedings in the Senate to the wishes of individual Senators, we think that it should be signified that this manner of operation goes contrary to Senate procedures. Unless Senators want the Senate to convene early for a stated period of time to accommodate them, Senators hereafter are requested to take their chances and will not be given special consideration by being recognized in sequence, as was the case yesterday with respect to six or seven speaking requests, one after the other. When other Senators who are not aware of the special consideration that had been extended to colleagues enter the Chamber, they are disappointed and chagrined that they are unable to obtain the floor, and problems are created.

So we hope that Senators will understand the position in which the joint leadership finds itself and will act accordingly. If any Senator wishes to come in early for the purpose of delivering a speech, we shall be delighted to accommodate him as much as we can, but we would not want the procedure to get out of hand.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the position of the majority leader. I know that he could not take any other position. I have been guilty, to a degree, of making these requests, but it was in an attempt to accommodate Senators on each side as best we could, so far as that is concerned. I knew the time would come when we would have to decline.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has made very few requests.

If it happened only once in a while, the joint leadership would be glad to go along. But it seemed that it was becoming a habit, and we felt that before it went too far, we should serve notice on the Senate that, with its cooperation, we would like to get back to the regular procedure.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the majority leader's procedure now will do much to move the debate along and possibly bring the matter to a vote soon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was one of the

purposes behind the joint leadership's statement: that we could speed up debate and begin to get votes at least on the beginning amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF THE INCOME TAX SURCHARGE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the bill passed by the House of Representatives to provide for a limited extension of the income tax surcharge has been reported favorably by the Committee on Finance and is now on the Senate Calendar. Previously, Congress had adopted a measure providing for a temporary extension of the surtax. As we all know, this measure will terminate on July 31.

I believe it to be imperative that the Senate take prompt action to adopt the bill passed by the House of Representatives prior to the July 31 expiration date of the temporary extension. To fail to pursue this course of action would, in my judgment, seriously weaken the fight against inflation and would unduly jeopardize the economic health of our country.

I will not at this time belabor the fact of inflation except to say that during the past 6 months consumer prices have risen at an annual rate in excess of 6 percent, a rate that would double the cost of living within 15 years. Only yesterday, the Department of Labor announced that food prices throughout the country were increasing at an annual rate of 7 percent. It is apparent that this trend cannot continue, and I believe that the extension of the surtax would be a significant factor in alleviating this inflationary pressure by continuing the reduction in the purchasing power of the private sector of our economy.

The alternative course of action for Congress would be to permit the surtax to lapse, thereby permitting a continuation of the inflationary spiral which is, in its effect, not unlike a tax. In fact, as inflation occurs and the real purchasing power of the dollar decreases, the people