

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, September 8, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

And thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord, that it may be well with thee.—Deuteronomy 6: 18.

O God, our Father, the light of all that is true, the life of all that is good, and the love of all that is beautiful, we lift our hearts unto Thee that we may find wisdom, strength, and love sufficient for all our needs.

Help us to walk in the light of truth, to live the life of goodness, and to share the love of the beautiful that we may play our part and do our full duty in this high hour of our national life.

We pray that Thy spirit may enter the hearts of all people that our Nation, and all nations, may be free from malice and bitterness and be filled with goodness and good will. To this end and by Thy grace may we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee.

Bless the family of our beloved Senate colleague with the comfort of Thy presence as they walk through the valley of the shadow of death.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 4, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 719. An act to establish a national mining and minerals policy; and

S. 1499. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 17 on the Verdigris River in Oklahoma for the Chouteau family.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

S. RES. 253

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, late a Senator from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the President of the Senate appoint a committee, of which he shall be a member, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

S. RES. 254

Resolved, That the Secretary invite the Members of the House of Representatives to attend memorial services for the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen in the rotunda of the Capitol on Tuesday, September 9, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon; and be it further

Resolved, That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the

members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the diplomatic corps (through the Secretary of State), the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard to attend the memorial services in the rotunda of the Capitol.

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

SEPTEMBER 4, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Room H206, Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This will inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of the State of New Jersey my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 8th District of New Jersey.

I am deeply grateful for your many courtesies.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. JOELSON,
Member of Congress.

THE LATE HONORABLE SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

The SPEAKER, The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, of the many tasks I have been called upon to perform in the course of my many years in Congress, this is for me the most difficult.

It is with a heavy heart that I officially advise the House of the untimely passing of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the distinguished senior Senator from my State of Illinois, and the beloved minority leader of the U.S. Senate.

He was indeed, as President Nixon said yesterday, "a giant in the history of Congress." In the courage of his convictions and in his oratorical eloquence of their advocacy, Senator DIRKSEN will forever stand tall on the pages of the history of our day with the Clays, the Calhouns, and the Websters of yesterday. It is not whether he or they were right or wrong in what they did or said; it is that they were fearless in what he and they believed and eloquently persuasive in expressing their beliefs.

He is the last of the old school of orators. Among his contemporaries in the Senate while he was serving in the House, were Tom Connally, of Texas; Hiram Johnson, of California; and Bill Borah, of Idaho. With the passing of Senator DIRKSEN something has passed that was truly American in the history of the greatest deliberative body in the world. They distinguished themselves not only from the ideas they advanced but the persuasive manner in which they articulated them.

Senator DIRKSEN was such a man. He was endowed with a melodious voice and was unique among us with his rich ora-

torical style. Happily, the magic of tape recordings will preserve for history not only what he said but how he said it. His speeches sparkled with Biblical references and quotations from the classics of literature and history. All of which bespeaks the wealth of his knowledge and keenness of his intellect, as well as the richness of his voice. When he spoke he knew whereof he spoke.

It was while serving here in the House that the Senator established his reputation not only as an accomplished speaker but as one who knew every fact and facet of the subject on which he spoke. He did his homework, so to speak; and the extensive "burning of the midnight oil" in studying legislative matters contributed to his having to leave Congress that he might better insure recovery from an eye illness.

When I was considering being a candidate for Congress in 1934, I went to Ev DIRKSEN who had just concluded his first term in Congress to solicit his advice. His encouragement and the advice he gave me account in large measure for my being in Congress. He emphasized with me that as he saw it the secret of success in Congress was being a man of the people, and well known to the people as one who would speak for them. He pointed out that while it was important to respect their views, it was even more important, as their representative, to persuade them to your point of view.

It is hardly necessary to say that Senator DIRKSEN and I were close personal friends. Our friendship began even before he was elected to Congress. Both of us were active in the American Legion in Illinois.

While Senator DIRKSEN may be best known for his uniqueness as an orator, he will live in history as a man who placed country first and above all else. He served as our Republican leader in the Senate under both Republican and Democratic Presidents. He served them all, Republican and Democrat, because he saw that his largest obligation was not to the political party for which he spoke, but to the country as a whole. EVERETT DIRKSEN was a giant among men, a towering statesman.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Senator DIRKSEN, our country has lost a truly great leader and I have lost a very fine friend—the finest any man could possibly have.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Arends and I extend to his gracious and loving wife Louella and to his fine daughter and her husband Senator and Mrs. Baker, of Tennessee, and his wonderful grandchildren our sincere sympathy.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN takes from our midst one of the most colorful Members of the Congress in the history of our country.

Senator DIRKSEN was a great American

and an outstanding legislator. In this trying period of our Nation's history, he was a bulwark of strength, always advocating and fighting for a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy, and he did this without regard to whether the President of the United States was a Democrat or a Republican. He placed the national interest and the national defense of our country above political considerations.

Throughout his years of public service, Senator DIRKSEN evidenced his dedication to his public trust by assuming and performing his duties and responsibilities with great ability, with vision, and with courage. His fine and refreshing outlook on life, and his broad and philosophical mind, and his colorful personality were an inspiration for all others to follow.

EVERETT DIRKSEN, as a Member of the House and of the Senate, has made marked contributions to the progress, the dignity, and the strength of our country. He has made his constructive imprint on the pages of our Nation's history.

Senator DIRKSEN will be missed. It will take a long while for someone to come across the political horizon to take his place.

I extend to Mrs. Dirksen and her loved ones my deep sympathy, and also the deep sympathy of the Members of the House of Representatives, in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and a deep feeling of personal loss that I learned Sunday afternoon of the death of the much beloved Republican leader of the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the skies outside should be overcast today and should weep, for I think this reflects the mood of the Nation bereft of the services of the grand old man from Pekin. It is with a somber heart that I address this House today.

I was most fortunate. I knew EV DIRKSEN well—perhaps better than most. Even though I did not serve with him in this body, I have had many opportunities in the last 4-plus years to be closely associated with him. I will cherish all my life these many opportunities to have worked with him. Ours was a close personal relationship because of our respective positions. Yet, while I am proud to have been the junior half of the "Ev and Jerry Show," I must say that EV DIRKSEN never made me feel that I was junior to him. That was not his style. He was understanding, stimulating, and a friend under any and all circumstances.

Ev was a giant in American politics. He had no need to steal the show from others in order to feel his full stature. As a Republican legislator he wrote many memorable pages of American history, but, as has been said before by the gentleman from Illinois and by the distinguished Speaker, EV DIRKSEN was an American first and a partisan second.

Ev, as all know who worked with him, was a giant as a legislator. He left an indelible imprint on many major laws

that will live in the statute books for many, many years.

Perhaps more than any other statesman in modern American history, EV DIRKSEN was a master in the art of compromise. He captured the essence of American democracy in that he made democracy work. He made manifold and tremendous contributions to the legislative shelves of this Nation.

As we all know, Ev was a giant as a speaker. He was one of the greatest in the history of the Congress—probably the last of the old school. I know of no man who was more articulate than Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, whether he was speaking of landmark legislation or reminiscing about his days in the European Theater during World War I. When he was called the "Wizard of Ooze," it was a good-natured compliment. It was in fact the supreme compliment.

Mr. Speaker, the flag hangs at half-mast over the Capitol today. It tells what we all feel—the loss of a great American and the heavy sorrow for having lost a dear friend and a good friend. My wife Betty and I extend our deepest condolences to Mrs. Dirksen and the entire family. Words are inadequate to express our grief.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the news report, which I, like many others, received while listening to television yesterday afternoon, that Senate minority leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN had died left me shocked and saddened.

I have had the privilege of knowing EVERETT DIRKSEN since the day I took my first oath of office in this House nearly 23 years ago. I have known him over the years as a remarkable man, an extraordinary legislator, and a personal friend.

Senator DIRKSEN was a man of many parts. He was among the last of the great orators of the old school to serve in the Congress. His flair for the dramatic, his knowledge of great literature, his uncanny memory, his rare imagination served to make him the most colorful speaker of our time.

If there was ever an institution in the Congress or the country it was EVERETT DIRKSEN. His name was a household word. He was truly a legend in his own time. With his death the Congress has lost perhaps its best known and most famous Member.

Senator DIRKSEN tenaciously pursued ideas in which he was interested. Sometimes these were in areas that caused many of his critics to consider him an obstructionist. Certainly I did not share all of his legislative interests, but I never ceased to admire his relentless pursuit of his goals.

Above all, when the chips were down, when the national interest was at stake, Senator DIRKSEN was always the patriot, always the towering statesman.

In him there was ever present an element of greatness which stood out in critical hours. His defense of the Marshall plan, the Test Ban Treaty, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, at crucial moments, made it clear that he was more than a skillful politician. He was, when great is-

sues were at stake, not only a great legislator but also a fearless and indispensable leader. He was indeed one of the great statesmen of our time.

In the death of Senator DIRKSEN every Member of both Houses of Congress has lost a friend. The Congress has lost not only one of its most illustrious Members, but also one of its greatest champions. No Member of either House was more dedicated to the importance of the legislative department of Government. No one, either publicly or privately, was ever more determined in his defense of Congress as an institution or of the rights and prerogatives of its Members. In every bill designed to upgrade congressional service EVERETT DIRKSEN was a front rank leader. He loved congressional service. Even in his last years, though often haunted by illness, he worked tirelessly at his job. He believed in it, and he made no apologies for his support of the importance of congressional service.

This great and unique man who for decades has seemed almost as familiar and indispensable in this city as the Capitol dome has departed his friends and colleagues.

To paraphrase Edwin Markham, like the giant oak that falls on the hillside, the death of EVERETT DIRKSEN has left a lonesome place against the sky. It is a sad farewell when we say goodbye to our friend, EV DIRKSEN. May his soul rest in the arms of the Almighty and may the peace of God comfort Mrs. Dirksen and their daughter and all the family, as they, above all others, must bear the burdens of his loss.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my most famous constituent is gone. "My most famous constituent"—that is the phrase I have often used with pride and not a little amount of affection when referring to our beloved senior Senator, EVERETT DIRKSEN, who passed away yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital. It was my privilege on many occasions to have the honor of introducing the Senator when he spoke to official party rallies as well as to various public groups over the years.

I remember on one occasion I referred to him as one of the monuments of Washington and, indeed, with his distinctive appearance, his style of oratory, his deep, rolling voice, and his marvelous sense of humor, he had become truly a national figure.

I believe the shock of his death was so great because he had an air of indestructibility about him—you just had the feeling that he would live forever—and of course he will live forever in the hearts and minds of those of us who had the privilege of knowing him, working closely with him, learning from him, and witnessing at close hand his great legislative contributions to this wonderful country which he loved so dearly.

His whole life was wrapped up in our country's heritage and its institutions. When he returned from his volunteer service overseas in World War I he gave unstintingly of his time to all our veter-

ans organizations and all those who would listen to him speak so eloquently about these institutions, patriotism and Americanism. As a matter of fact he was at his best when these very institutions were under attack.

I can recall his even speaking to our small high school civics class in those early days of his political career. Some years later at the close of a Constitution Day speech in Peoria, I was prompted to send him a telegram saying: "Senator, again you moved us to tears in appreciation of our Constitution."

He was a student of the Bible and the classics before becoming one of the best-informed men in or out of the Government.

It was my good fortune to introduce the Senator on so many occasions and I was tempted at times to compare him with our most notable citizen from Illinois, Abraham Lincoln, but hesitated to do so because it would have embarrassed him. But certainly in terms of his impact on our party, on our State, and in this Congress, there were good grounds for making just such a comparison.

As a matter of fact, the Senator's personal life parallels to a remarkable degree that of Lincoln. The Senator's father died when he was only 5. He went to work at a very early age selling vegetables from door to door from his mother's garden and like Lincoln, he tried a number of occupations, ranging all the way from being a baker and driving a bakery truck in the family business to the manufacture of washing machines. He was proud of the fact that he carried a lunch pail and labored with his hands as a youth and it cannot be denied that these very rough and trying days of his early life played a significant role in forging his character and personality.

The Senator was given to quoting Biblical scripture and I am reminded of one he used from the prophet Job several years ago in a eulogy to a dear friend, which reads:

If a man die, shall he live again?

And the Senator's response was:

Surely he shall, as surely as day follows night, as surely as the stars follow their courses, as surely as the crest of every wave brings its trough.

This seemed to be the foundation of the Senator's philosophy of life and this was his firm conviction.

I shall sorely miss him, for he was such a good teacher. I shall always cherish the memories of both the serious and lighthearted get-togethers particularly with family and friends for this was where one got to know him best. To know him well was to love him for all his qualities.

There will never be one to take his place or fill the role as he played it. My heart is heavy for Louella, Joy, and the grandchildren, for they were his heart and soul and we try feebly to share the burden of their profound loss.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority whip yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, the majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the beautiful tributes that

have been paid to our late honorable and distinguished colleague, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

I had a relationship with him—an abiding one—which started in the House of Representatives 30 years ago. I had the greatest respect and admiration for him as a man, as an American, and as a leader.

I say, as a man, because he was a man who suffered much in his life but complained very little. I remember when as a young man he left the House of Representatives mainly because he suffered an attack of glaucoma which is a very disabling eye disease. For years he suffered chronically from sundry ailments, heart difficulties and lung complications. But, I never heard him complain. I wondered about the strength of this man.

Mr. Speaker, there were so many things that gave him strength. First, he has a wonderful wife and a fine family. He was a great scholar of the Bible, of the classics, of Shakespeare, and of history. He was also very close to nature. He loved to garden and in that diversion we had very much in common because I, too, love to plant things and watch them grow.

Many times when we were discussing matters of highly important affairs of state at joint leadership meetings dealing with these matters, the distinguished Senator from Illinois and I would discuss our respective crops, he some type of flower and me some type of vegetable.

He was a man that lived in the heart of all of us and of all humanity.

Mr. Speaker, as the poet was asked "For Whom The Bells Toll," they toll for all of us because each of us is lesser for his departure.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Boggs and I will miss him and we extend to his wonderful wife, children, and grandchildren our deepest sympathy.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the death of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN the country has suffered a great loss and the State of Illinois a distinguished son.

No man within my recollection has served more ably, more earnestly, or with greater distinction in the Congress of the United States than has Senator DIRKSEN.

For 16 years he was a Member of the House of Representatives and for 19 years a Member of the Senate. In those years history has been made, and EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN not only has been a part of that history, he has helped to create it. Senator DIRKSEN moved with the times. Some people and a portion of the press often alleged that he changed his mind. He once made the statement:

There is no more powerful force in the world than an idea whose time has arrived.

He was not one to put off the inevitable.

What I have thus far said does not mean that Senator DIRKSEN did not have positive ideas about fundamentals—and on fundamentals he never surrendered. He had great insight about history and where we were and what we were doing

at this point in history. He had a strong feeling about the Constitution and its interpretation. He was a great believer that it meant certain things, and they could not be amended by judicial decision. He was a believer that this country was great because of its freedoms. One of his famous statements is:

I am going to leave this country for my grandchildren at least as good as it was handed to me. These are crucial times through which we are going. If the cause of freedom is lost in the future, I do not want those grandchildren to say to me, "But, Grandfather, you were there, and you could have done something about it."

One of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN's favorite quotations was from Matthew:

Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Thou has been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.

It fits him especially well at this time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last year we celebrated the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois to the Union. In that period of a century and a half our State has produced a great many distinguished political leaders of truly national stature. Today we mourn the passing of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN and add his name to that illustrious roster. None was more distinguished.

He enjoyed a career that enabled him to rise from very humble circumstances to the heights of public acclaim. Yet, through it all he carried the remembrance of a life of early struggle and perseverance to aid a widowed mother, to gain an education and still later to overcome the physical adversity that had threatened him with blindness.

He was rugged like the Illinois prairies under the scourge of the winter's north wind. At the same time he was a gentle man who loved nothing better than to work among his flowers. He was a man of sophisticated wit and wisdom. Yet for surcease from his arduous responsibilities as the leader of his party in the U.S. Senate he loved to retreat to the Virginia countryside and with his own talented hands construct the birdhouses which were then lodged in the trees surrounding his home where he could watch the arrival and departure of his favorite species.

I have so many vivid memories of Senator DIRKSEN. Among the first that I have is almost a score of years ago. He had come to the square of the courthouse in my own town in pursuit of the Senate seat then held by the late Scott W. Lucas who was also the Senate majority leader. We had heard of this man DIRKSEN before, of course, because for 16 years he had served in the Congress only to be forced into retirement when threatened by blindness. Now he had recovered and we heard that he had worn out two automobiles and traveled a quarter of a million miles up and down and back and forth across the State of Illinois in his effort to unseat the man who was then one of the most powerful and able men in the U.S. Senate. There in the pale of

half-light of an early evening in summer I heard him speak of the war in Korea that was then raging and how the sacrifice and treasure of our country was being expended in that conflict. He spoke then of the importance of finding a means to resolve that tragic episode in our history in a manner compatible with our national honor but also in a way to hasten the advent of a more peaceful world. I was thrilled that evening, as were the thousands who heard him over a public career that was to span almost four decades, at the rich imagery of his speech and his ability to intone a sincerity and conviction that held you literally in his thrall until the last sonorous words had been spoken.

Later, as a young Congressman I was to have the honor of sharing many platforms with him as we campaigned northern Illinois together. This year, with the advent of a Republican President, it has been my privilege to observe him each week at leadership meetings with the President of the United States. There I observed his mastery of legislative detail and saw the evidence of his prodigious memory for the facts surrounding the multitude of different tactical situations that confronted him as a Senate leader. He had a large mind which, although deeply immersed in these facts, could also see the broad sweep of events both domestic and international which had an impact upon those decisions which he and the Presidents he served obliged to make. Thus, out of the rich tapestry of his varied experiences he could distinguish the particular thread that would be helpful and relevant to a present crisis.

He was not a small or mean man. Even in confronting his political foes, and in so lengthy a career, there were many, he could not descend to the level of vituperation, but used the gentle balm of humor and good nature. It was he who practiced what he jocularly described as a political philosophy that "the oil can is mightier than the sword."

He was kindly and avuncular in his relations with those younger than he; he was the essence of patience in giving of his time and advice to those of us who often sought his advice and assistance on matters concerning our mutual constituency in the State of Illinois.

He had a deep love for young people. His Christmas records of recent years were best sellers because children loved him. How many times I heard him proudly tell the story of how he would talk to his grandchildren just as if he was the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and how they would listen at his feet.

He was a warm and humorous man, accomplished as a raconteur and able to relish a story no matter how often he had repeated it to an audience which in turn never tired of hearing the Senator tell one of his favorites.

He was an effervescent part of authentic Americana who will be remembered as long as men gather to talk about the most colorful and effective political figures in the history of the American republic.

Yet, he contributed more than color. He stood in the breach at critical mo-

ments in our history and gave both his vote and his mellifluous voice to those causes which periodically emerge on the tides of political, economic, and social changes. He was a conservative who thought it no crime to see the virtue of some flexibility when it would promote solutions to the needs of the Nation. Thus it was that the monumental civil rights legislation was enacted in this decade with his support, and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was ratified.

For more than a third of a century, EVERETT DIRKSEN participated in making some of the most momentous decisions of our times as first a Congressman and then as a Senator. We will proudly remember him as a distinguished son of Illinois, but the entire Nation will mourn his loss. He was a man of immense political stature because of his truly extraordinary gifts. He was also an orator who could and did delight thousands. It was once said of him that he was one of very few men who actually made votes when he spoke on important issues.

He was a warm and humorous man who enjoyed a rapport with virtually everyone whom he met. He was a political tactician of consummate skill. Yet above all, he was an American patriot in the deepest and most reverential sense who could and did subordinate partisanship to what he considered the overriding national interest.

We are all of us diminished by the loss of a great American. My wife and I wish to join millions in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and their daughter, Joy.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I first met EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN on the first day that he came to Washington to take his oath of office as a Member of this House. I was beginning my service as a secretary to a Member. He was starting his distinguished career as a legislator.

Through all the years following, I enjoyed a close, personal friendship with him.

It has been said that he was a great man, and he truly was. He brought honor to the State he represented and he brought honor to all of us who had the pleasure of serving with him in the Congress of the United States.

I knew him well. When I became a Member in 1945 I had the opportunity morning after morning to have breakfast with him in the House restaurant. I knew his philosophy of government. We had disagreements in the political field, but never on the basic philosophy that he held.

He was, first of all, an American. He was a great servant to the people he represented in the House and in the Senate of the United States. Truly Illinois has lost a great citizen, but so has the United States of America lost a great citizen and a great statesman.

My wife, Garry, joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife Louella. We enjoyed a fine friendship with the Senator.

The full Illinois Democratic delegation in the House joins me in expressing

sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and her family.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the death of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, all Americans—indeed, freedom-loving people everywhere—have lost a warm and wonderful friend. In life, as he remains in death, he had become a legend in his own time—truly a giant in our history. No chronicle of the 20th century can ever be complete without its chapter on the life and deeds of EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, who rose from a modest background in the land of Lincoln to become one of the most brilliant legislators and legislative leaders the Nation has ever known. Certainly in this he has no peer.

But for those of us who had the rare privilege of working with him closely in the Illinois congressional delegation, of visiting in his home, of knowing his charming and devoted wife, Luella, we will remember what no history book can ever capture. Historians will write about the role he perhaps liked best and in which he was greatest—that of statesman and patriot. They will recall for coming generations the impact of this colorful and courageous American on the social and political life of our Republic and the world, and here his contributions are immeasurable.

We who knew him so well will remember all of this, too, and we will be eternally grateful that he walked among us at this critical time in our history. But we will also remember that wonderfully curious and warmly human intellect—his infectious zest for living. He loved to sing and I remember many happy hours gathered around the piano with him and his family and close friends singing the old song he loved best. We will remember him both as an articulate and homespun philosopher of the American scene and his ability to bring humor and compassion to even the most trying affairs of state. We will remember as well the skill and deep understanding with which he was able on many dramatic occasions to bring harmony and unity to a divided party.

Yes, EVERETT DIRKSEN was unique in our time in many ways. An avid student of the world's finest literature and its history, he loved to share his inspirations with his fellow men, whether they be reflections on the world's great events or tender thoughts on Christmas. His voice was known everywhere, and few men in public life have been more loved or more admired. He stood tall in the Senate because he lived what this country stands for. He understood our heritage, and he had confidence in our future. People listened because they respected his ideals.

Senator DIRKSEN's seat in the Senate must necessarily be filled, but no one will ever be able to replace EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN in the hearts of his colleagues or his countrymen.

At this time, let me extend my heartfelt sympathy to his beloved wife Louella, his daughter Joy, his son-in-law Senator HOWARD BAKER and his grandchildren who adored him and whom he

adored. They have lost a loving and devoted husband, father, and grandfather.

The Nation has lost a brilliant leader and great patriot, and I have lost a dear friend.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of my colleagues in the Illinois delegation on this side of the aisle would join me in stating that the loss of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN is irreplaceable to the people of Illinois, to the people of America, and, yes, to the people of the world.

His vast experience in both the House and in the Senate had given him tremendous ability to develop, design, and construct compromises on important issues.

Jack Kennedy could not have achieved many of his programs without the help of EVERETT DIRKSEN, and Lyndon Johnson could not have achieved many of his successes without EVERETT DIRKSEN.

On the many major issues passed on by the Congress of the United States, EVERETT DIRKSEN's brand is indelibly imprinted.

He did not hesitate to change his mind when he believed it would serve the best interest of the Nation.

He changed his mind on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

He changed his mind on the Consular Treaty.

And he changed his mind on the 1968 Civil Rights Act. Without his help this act could not have been passed.

When a friend asked EVERETT, "Why did you change your mind on the civil rights act—something you felt so strongly against at one time?" EVERETT DIRKSEN said:

We are living in a world of changing times. New circumstances require new thinking. I believe that the time has come when we ought to have this legislation.

Ev DIRKSEN disagreed often, but he symbolized the highest tradition of this Congress by never being disagreeable. In debate he was a strong foe, but, above all, he was always a gentleman.

His homespun philosophy is a hallmark of Americana.

He was a fierce patriot. He used to tell a wonderful story that I think could be a lesson to all of us, particularly at this time when we are paying tribute to his memory and honoring him today.

One day EVERETT DIRKSEN prepared a speech on "The Frog and Patriotism." A friend said "EVERETT, how can you be talking about the frog and patriotism? What do the two have in common?"

In typical Dirksenian homespun philosophy, the Senator drew a parallel. He said:

My friends, the very sensitive nervous system of the frog will permit that frog, when thrown into a kettle of boiling water, to hop right out. But that same frog, if he is put into a kettle of cold water, and then the heat is turned up, will stay there, and when the water comes to a boil, he will be destroyed, because he does not realize the water is reaching the boiling point. That is the way it is with Americanism and with patriotism. We see our patriotism and our rights as Americans slowly being eroded here and

there, and as individual circumstances that does not mean too much, until one day it will be too late, and, like the frog, we will not be able to jump out of the boiling water, and we will lose our freedom.

He had an uncanny ability to put ideas into a new sense of meaning and persuasiveness.

All of us are experiencing a great loss. Senator DIRKSEN was a great leader, he was a great patriot, and he was a great American. Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending our condolences to his widow and his family. We shall all miss him deeply.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY.)

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the Nation has lost a great leader, the U.S. Congress has surrendered its most honored lawmaker, and Illinois has given up her most famous citizen since Abraham Lincoln.

The privilege of an intimate relationship with Senator DIRKSEN and his family is an experience which I treasure almost reverently. To have known and worked with this great man on a first name basis is to have felt the warm breath and blood of history in the making.

For, Senator DIRKSEN was a maker of history whose deeds and acts and words will live as long as history is recorded.

Indeed, the historymaking of EVERETT DIRKSEN is recorded in sound, on film, and on longplaying records that preserve the sonorous and penetrating tones of his mighty voice. Those recordings are among the most eloquent expressions of faith and love for our Nation and our posterity which it seems possible to produce. Their meaning and importance to this and future generations of Americans cannot be overestimated.

Today as we reflect on the life and deeds of the great Senate minority leader, I am inclined to recall most vividly the hundreds of occasions when EVERETT DIRKSEN and I were together. These involved many and varied circumstances, in Illinois and Washington and elsewhere. I recall his visit to our home in Lake Bluff, as well as the occasions when he and his wife, Louella, were in our home in Washington. Most recently, I recall the afternoon at the Dirksen farm in Virginia where the marvels of nature dominated the conversation and he expressed a love for the simple and beautiful products of the soil as well as the birds and other wildlife which inhabited the farm.

Words were Senator DIRKSEN's stock in trade. He selected words more carefully and uttered them more eloquently than any other man of our time. But words are utterly inadequate to express the deep and tender feelings of those who mourn his passing.

In addition to honoring his memory, it is entirely fitting that we should extol his humanity as well. Perhaps this word "humanity" characterizes best the rare qualities which EVERETT DIRKSEN possessed. He had respect and deep concern for every human being of every race, color, religion and position in life. To his family and friends, he was very down to

earth, very easy to talk with, as well as engaging to listen to.

EVERETT DIRKSEN is gone but the virtues he possessed, the human progress he helped make possible, are indelibly interwoven in the fabric of mankind.

There are many thousands of citizens of the 12th District of Illinois who would want me on this occasion also to express their feelings of loss and compassion. In behalf of Mrs. McClory and myself and the citizens of the 12th District, I extend to Senator DIRKSEN's wife, Louella, his daughter, Joy—Mrs. Howard Baker—his grandchildren, and all members of the family, our deepest sympathy and affection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLNBORN).

Mr. ERLNBORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Illinois has given a number of great leaders to the Nation; and one of the greatest surely is EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. He was a great man, more importantly, a good husband, a good father and grandfather.

His death means that the Republicans in Congress have lost a leader whose unique talents make him irreplaceable. He is dead, and Illinois has lost a spokesman of surpassing eloquence. His passing will deprive our Nation of a political leader whose patriotism showed through his every act.

Quite apart from our official relationships, it was my privilege to count him as a friend. I know all the Members of the U.S. Congress join me in mourning his death. Our sense of loss is a personal one.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I share the sentiments expressed by my colleagues here today as we extend our sympathy to the widow of Senator DIRKSEN, to his daughter and his son-in-law and his grandchildren.

It would be an oversight, and a most unfortunate one, I believe, if we failed to include in the family circle Mr. and Mrs. John Gomien, the team that has loyally served the Senator here on Capitol Hill all through his years in the House and Senate, as well as his able and longtime assistant in Illinois, Harold Rainville.

The close association these people have had with Senator DIRKSEN and his wife through the years made them very much a part of the Dirksen family, and I am sure that my colleagues from Illinois join me in extending to them, as well as to the immediate members of the Dirksen family, our deepest sympathy.

As the Representative who serves a portion of the district Abraham Lincoln once served in this House, I feel most keenly the importance of the Lincoln heritage to the world, the Nation, and the State.

Senator DIRKSEN was in the great Lincoln tradition. I have had the occasion several times to introduce Senator DIRKSEN at public gatherings. At Springfield, Ill., 2 years ago, I chose to present him

with the words that he was the greatest citizen Illinois has produced since Abraham Lincoln, and that still sums up my estimate of his great contribution to this Nation.

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding to me.

It is with a very heavy heart that I rise to express my own personal sense of loss at the death of a great Senator from the State of Illinois, Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN was indeed a good friend to many of us who had the pleasure of knowing him both as an individual and as a great practitioner of the art of legislation. He was truly a legislator's legislator. This was a man who had the faculty of being able to put his legislative concepts into a workable form, and to get them enacted. I think his finest legislative efforts came when he was guiding legislation through the Senate which came from his own Committee on the Judiciary. This was because Ev DIRKSEN never ceased to remember that he was a lawyer. In fact, he was one of the fine lawyers of our country, and took great pride in his acknowledged legal prowess.

Senator DIRKSEN possessed a very unique ability to communicate with his fellow man by the use of the English language. He had a fine vocabulary and a lucid style of expression which was unsurpassed by anyone of my acquaintance. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is mainly because of this particular ability that his work will be remembered. This ability enabled him to influence people and to cause legislative occurrences to take place which might not otherwise have been possible. We who are also the practitioners of the art of legislating, I think, can appreciate beyond the abilities of most people the importance of this particular talent.

The gentleman from Illinois will indeed be long remembered as a man of character, a patriot, a father, a grandfather, a friend and, above all, will be remembered as an American.

Mrs. Rhodes and I extend to Mrs. Dirksen and to her family our deepest sympathy on the passing of a very dear friend, and a great citizen of the world in the 20th century.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the "gallant man" is gone. The senior Senator from Illinois—the land of Lincoln—has departed this earth, but his words and deeds will live forever.

A legend in his own time, Ev DIRKSEN played many roles, and played them all with equal verve.

The champion of the marigold.

A fearless antagonist.

A master politician, who journeyed to Joplin, Mo., and delivered one of his great speeches in my first election 1960.

A lovable rascal.

A scholar of the classics.

An authority on Lincoln.

A confidant of Presidents.

And a man who had a deep and abiding love affair with his country.

The passing on of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN will leave a void in the Congress, a lump in the throat of America, the loss of a great statesman to the world, and thanksgiving on the part of this humble physician-legislator for his quick and easy passing.

In the words of William Shakespeare, a man he loved to quote:

His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him, that nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man!"

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Illinois and others as we join in paying tribute to the life and memory of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, late a Senator from Illinois and the Republican leader of the U.S. Senate.

Today is a day of sadness in the Capitol Building and in America. In my own State of Georgia I know of no one outside our State who was more beloved by Georgians than was the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of interest which has been manifested in the possible constitutional convention was due to the fact that if and when such a constitutional convention might be held, the Senator from Illinois might have been chosen to preside over the deliberations of the first constitutional convention held in the United States since 1787.

EVERETT DIRKSEN walked long and tall on the stage of American public life. His contributions to his State, the Nation, and to the people whom he devoutly loved will long be remembered. Those contributions caused America to be strong and to grow from strength to greater strength. He will be missed by those of us who have been privileged to serve with him in the United States Congress. He will be missed even more by his close circle of friends and by his colleagues in the Senate of which he was indeed an outstanding and effective leader.

Mr. Speaker, our country is a better place because of the work he has performed and the contributions he has made during his 73 years as a citizen, as a legislator, as a loyal and patriotic American.

I remember when he called upon the people of this country to reassess the fact that our resources are not unlimited and that in the reassessment and reappraisal of those resources he called Americans to establish priorities on the spending and distribution of those resources. He frequently called upon Americans in all walks of life for a return to a greater understanding of and respect for law and order.

I feel that EVERETT DIRKSEN practiced what he preached. He was one of the greatest orators that this country has produced and he spoke words of wisdom as well as words of eloquence. The Senate of the United States listened attentively when he spoke—and indeed,

Mr. Speaker, the people of all America listened when EVERETT DIRKSEN spoke.

Mrs. Flynt and our family join me in the expression of our condolence and sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen, Senator and Mrs. Baker, his grandchildren, and other members of the family.

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

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a Member from the State of Illinois I, of course, feel especially saddened by the unfortunate loss of Senator DIRKSEN. I was close to him and appreciated his friendship, as well as recognizing his tremendous leadership. We all recognized that he was without a doubt a most outstanding Member of the Senate and an effective leader of his party. Throughout his career he demonstrated the most effective type of statesmanship that any Member of Congress can give to his country.

His loss is one the State of Illinois will feel deeply, as indeed will the whole Nation, and there will be a gap that will not be filled. It is proper that we stress his great contributions to the country, the statesmanship that he always exhibited, the very effective leadership that he provided and the cooperation that he gave to Presidents of both political parties. He truly was a giant in the history of the U.S. Congress.

Mrs. Derwinski joins with me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and the members of their family.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing the sympathy of my family and myself to Mrs. Dirksen and to Senator and Mrs. HOWARD BAKER at this time of sadness to their entire family.

Mr. Speaker, in the days and years to come, we will hear and read much about this man whose passing we mourn today—the Dirksen wit, the Dirksen voice, the Dirksen leadership that has meant so much to his Nation and his constituents.

So for this moment, let me talk about something else—the Dirksen spirit.

Years ago, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, he met an old friend, our colleague MENDEL RIVERS, in front of the Capitol. Mr. RIVERS noted that he looked tired and wan, and asked him if he felt well.

"No," that famous voice purred back. "I've just been to see the doctor, and they want to take my eye. They're not sure they can save the other one, and I'd be blind. And I'm so discouraged, I've let the qualification deadline slip past me back home, so I won't be back next year."

The official biography only says "retired voluntarily January 3, 1949." Then it says "nominated for United States Senate April 11, 1950, elected November 7, 1950."

Nowhere does it say, "refused to surrender his eye, 1949, refused to be finished, 1949, refused to knuckle under to

adversity, 1948, 1949, 1950 and all the years before and after."

And it will not say, though it should, "helpful and understanding to his colleagues, 1932-69."

I am grateful to Chairman RIVERS for the story of his discouragement in the postwar era. It helps me know him better, and feel closer to him. I admire his courage even more, just as I admire his ability, his courtesy, and his understanding.

And I am grateful that he extended to me the opportunity to call him my friend.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved as I join with my distinguished colleagues who eulogize today the life and accomplishments of one of America's greatest statesmen, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. Words alone cannot adequately express the contributions that this great man gave to his constituents in Illinois, as well as to all the people in our country.

Senator DIRKSEN was a man who possessed a keen intellect, coupled with a flair for colorful oratory. With these tools he became well known, not only in the hallowed halls of Congress where he lived for 35 years, but also in the highest counsels of the executive branch, as was evidenced by four Presidents who continuously sought his sagacious advice in legislative matters. He was not only a legend in his own time, but his was a reputation that will live on in the annals of American civilization. For whenever men assemble to discuss the history of politics in our Republic, they will not be able to escape the Dirksonian imprint as it was so astutely interwoven through the events of the first half of the 20th century.

On behalf of myself and of Mrs. Rostenkowski, I would like to extend my sincere condolences to Mrs. Dirksen and the entire Dirksen family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened over the news of our colleague, the late EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. I always considered Senator DIRKSEN one of my closest personal friends as we served together as members of the House District Committee for 7 years when I first came to Congress. In fact, he was my first Republican chairman during the 80th Congress and I was serving as ranking Democrat on the committee during his term as chairman of that committee. We experienced no difficulty in working out the legislation problems of the Nation's Capital and no one ever mentioned politics on that committee. He understood and I understood that we were members of the House District Committee to serve our Nation's Capital and it actually made no difference whether a member was a Republican or Democrat.

His only reason for being a member of that committee was to try to keep our Nation's Capital a safe and clean place to live and a place where the millions and millions of visitors who visited the Capitol could visit without any fear. I do not remember serving with any Member of Congress who had the full command of the English language as did Senator DIRKSEN. When I first came to Congress, I would listen to the Senator speak on

several occasions for 1 hour and the time would only seem like 5 minutes.

I am certain that everyone privileged with Senator DIRKSEN's acquaintance knew that he was first at all times an American. He believed in the U.S. Constitution. He also believed in taking care of America first.

One of the outstanding memories I will have during my term of service in the Congress of the United States is the opportunity to serve very closely with the late Senator DIRKSEN and Mrs. McMillan joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and their daughter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans in grieving the loss of EVERETT DIRKSEN and extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family. Mr. DIRKSEN was a truly memorable spokesman and devoted workman for the people of this country. Even those who did not always agree with him, did always have to respect him.

As minority leader of the Senate, Mr. DIRKSEN has been a powerful spokesman for the Republican Party for better than a decade. The power that he wielded in that position has been the deciding factor in action upon more legislation than can ever be counted. His death creates a void which is felt not only by his colleagues in Congress, but by all America.

We have lost a great leader, a great patriot, a great Republican, and a great American. I join with my colleagues in expressing my dismay at his untimely death and in expressing my deep appreciation for Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN's outstanding service to his country.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the mellifluous voice of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN is stilled and this Nation mourns. However, his words shall live on to help us guide this country during the days of crisis that are before us.

We who were privileged to serve with him during his many terms in both bodies of the U.S. Congress felt a deep sense of gratitude to him for the hand of brotherhood that he extended to us all.

Senator DIRKSEN was a great man but more importantly for us he was a good great man—dedicated to service to God and his country.

He began his service to this Nation 52 years ago when he entered the service of the U.S. Army in World War I. Even this early in his life, we can see the pattern that was to follow him during all of his days for though he entered military service as a private he was commissioned in France as an officer. He served 17 months overseas during that conflict.

His service in our Armed Forces gave him great insight into the problems of the veteran and we who served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee found that he supported our efforts on behalf of the veterans of our wars.

Like many of us serving in the U.S. Congress, EVERETT DIRKSEN used the hoe and the plow during his youth. He never lost his love for the soil and the men who tilled it. He understood full well the problems of agriculture and created legislation that benefited those that remained on the farm.

Again like many of us here, he worked his way through college. He left the university when our Nation called and returned to it when his service was completed.

Here we see his steps followed that of another great American from his State of Illinois, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln, too, was a son of the soil who became first a fine lawyer and then a reputable statesman.

We Ohioans have long acknowledged the greatness of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. He was the most loyal friend and colleague of our own late great leader, U.S. Senator Robert A. Taft. We in my home city of Akron, Ohio, often welcomed him to our city.

During my 19 years in the U.S. Congress, I valued my friendship with this great spokesman for the people of our country. I am sorry at his passing.

The United States of America is a finer Nation because of his coming amongst us—for this we are grateful not only to him but also to his wonderful family who so unselfishly shared him with us.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, who leaves as his legacy a brilliant and dedicated career of public service.

Senator DIRKSEN was a courageous, colorful, eloquent leader, a great American and a great statesman, a strong party man and yet a national leader who placed the national interest above party considerations.

When the chips were down on a bill in the public interest, Presidents leaned on EVERETT DIRKSEN to provide the needed margin of support. Senator DIRKSEN, beneath his dry wit and colorful eloquence, was a skilled legislative leader—he knew and understood the art of legislation.

I felt a personal affection and admiration for Senator DIRKSEN, as in recent years he was often referred to as the third Senator from Tennessee. His daughter is the wife of Senator HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee, and Senator DIRKSEN frequently visited in Tennessee.

Mrs. Evins joins me in extending our deepest and most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen, Mrs. Baker, and other members of the family.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I share the shock and sorrow of our land today over the passing of Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN. This is a loss shared by all segments of our society, both personal and political.

And, as the voice of this leader is stilled, so is a long and colorful political leadership. EVERETT DIRKSEN was the last of a special brand of political strategists, and his leadership will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I join all Americans today in expressing my sympathy to Senator DIRKSEN's wife and family in this time of sorrow.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, EVERETT DIRKSEN would have been the first to stand to say something good about another legislator who had died. It seems almost presumptuous now to reflect on his life and his contribution to government by the people. Few must be the men today who do not feel a sense of inadequacy as they struggle to capture

in a few words the loss suffered by this Nation and this world.

Those of us so fortunate as to have been privileged to work closely with the Senator and who find it difficult to think of American Government without thinking of EVERETT DIRKSEN are perhaps the least able to measure his real accomplishments. We are too close to the man as a warm, compassionate, and singular human being to realize he was even more in the larger sense as an American institution. History is better suited to eulogize Senator DIRKSEN than are his contemporaries.

The Senator himself asked what he believed was his greatest contribution to Congress, said it was keeping many bad laws off the statute books. It might be better to say that Mr. DIRKSEN set a standard and a mood that worked to everyone's advantage as it made itself manifest throughout the whole fabric of lawmaking. His voice that became so distinctive grew to represent measured, conscientious consideration of issues on their own merit. That voice, described as the sound gravel makes in a jar of honey, will be missed. Missed too will be the "gallant man" behind it.

Perhaps the only man endowed with the gift of oratory equal to the task of eulogizing EVERETT DIRKSEN now lies dead. That may be the most we can say of him. I thank God for EVERETT DIRKSEN.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the most colorful Senator, statesman, and legislator of modern times, showed us there is still fun to be had while we grapple with the problems of the world. Our Nation—and especially the Members of Congress and the press—will always be grateful for the life and services of this lovable man.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, Colorado has lost a good friend, this Nation has lost a great statesman.

Senator DIRKSEN was a man of sharp wit, deep human compassion, and absolute dedication to his country.

Mrs. Brotzman and I extend our condolences to Mrs. Dirksen and the members of his family.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I join millions of Americans in paying high tribute to my beloved friend and leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN's death ends an era in American politics. "Mr. Republican," a title he richly deserved, has passed away. Yet no one who remembers his melodic voice, watched his legislative craftsmanship, observed his forensic ability or was touched by his friendly good humor will soon forget this great Senator from Illinois. In the tradition of the great public figures of this era, he will live on in the hearts and minds of the American people, not only because of the command of his performance, but also because of what he said.

Senator DIRKSEN was a student of the English language and a true believer in the ability of the spoken word to communicate to his fellow man. His mastery of this talent always insured attention to his never frivolous messages.

Senator DIRKSEN was a great Ameri-

can, and a leader among Republicans. Yet his bipartisan approach to matters affecting the public weal coupled with his always eloquent presentations, contributed to the passage of landmark legislation under Democrat as well as Republican administrations.

I have had, for the last 7 years, the distinct privilege of serving with EVERETT DIRKSEN as a member of the joint House-Senate Republican leadership. I have observed in awe and admiration the continuing contributions he has made in our joint leadership meetings prior to the Nixon administration and since that time in joint leadership meetings with the President. His razor sharp mind and ability to grasp, dissect, and give direction to the solution of the most complex problems will be sorely missed.

I extend my condolences to Mrs. Dirksen and the other members of his family.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, we mourn today the profound loss of a great American—Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. I feel a deep, personal loss in his passing because it had been my privilege to have a close friendship with this great man—a man great not only in his chosen profession, but great in every respect.

My association with him as a member of the Republican leadership brought admiration and respect for his ability and far-reaching foresight to make decisions in a level-headed way. He was direct with everyone. He had friends on both sides of the aisle, and certainly was a tremendous help to the Presidents under whose administrations he served.

The Tournament of Roses is in my congressional district and each January 1 the association honors an outstanding American by asking him to be grand marshal of the tournament. At the request of Mr. H. W. Bragg, the then president of the Tournament of Roses, I asked Senator DIRKSEN to honor my district on January 1, 1968, by serving as grand marshal. He said:

Now, Allen, you know I couldn't ride a horse.

When I explained to him what the Tournament of Roses was, he agreed to be grand marshal.

He and Louella came to Pasadena and attended all of the festivities during the entire week, which few grand marshals have done. He endeared himself to all who were connected with the tournament and they are still talking about the fact that he was the greatest grand marshal we have ever had. I know he did this as a personal favor to me. It was strenuous for him, but in talking with him later, he said it was one of the greatest experiences of his life which makes me very happy and proud.

I had the privilege of working closely with Senator DIRKSEN during the 1968 Republican National Convention in Florida. I have never ceased to be amazed at the tremendous regard and respect everybody had for this great man at every place.

As an example of this respect and regard, even during the Tournament of Roses President Johnson called him to

get his opinion on a decision that had to be made.

In my opinion, Senator DIRKSEN rates among the greatest men that I have ever known. Another great era in American politics has now been closed forever.

Elizabeth joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Louella and to their daughter, Joy, and family. To us there was, and only will be, one EVERETT DIRKSEN.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was not long after my arrival in Congress that the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN came to the House, where he served with great distinction for eight consecutive terms. During this period, I knew him well and came to have great affection and respect for this man whose outstanding statesmanship and tremendous gift for universal friendship have so profoundly influenced the future of America. When he overcame the temporary physical handicap, which had led to his resignation from the House, it was a foregone conclusion that he would continue his fine career, as he then did in the Senate of the United States with rare distinction and epic success.

Mr. Speaker, I join today with the entire membership of the House and Senate, with our Government and our citizens, and with all the peoples of the world who respected and admired this titan among senatorial leaders, in expressing my deep sorrow and heartfelt sympathy for the family he cherished. Our prayers are offered in the knowledge that Senator DIRKSEN was a deeply devout and sincerely religious man, and that the God he worshiped has called him home from his years of unceasing and intrepid labors, labors he devoted to exalt the Master he humbly acknowledged, the country he proudly loved, and the wide world of constituents he unselfishly served.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I speak now not as a member of the leadership of my party; nor as a colleague of that great statesman, EVERETT DIRKSEN in the U.S. Congress; nor even as a personal friend, since I was not privileged to share in this honored relationship. I speak as an American citizen who in limited associations with the late Senator share with millions of citizens a profound respect for his ability; his leadership; his warmth of affection for others; his knowledge; his talent and his dedication to our constitutional institutions.

His death brings over the people of this Nation an impenetrable pall of sorrow which while difficult to push aside is not all loss, though at the moment there is bared a gaping hole in the legislative processes.

These words—the name of the author which at the moment escapes me—are most prophetic in these days:

I walked a mile with Pleasure,
She chatted all the way,
But left me more the wiser
For what she had to say.

I walked a mile with Sorrow,
And ne'er a word said she.
But O, the things I learned from her
When sorrow walked with me.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we walk in silent sorrow but because of the stature of the

man, whose death we mourn. We will learn in this sorrowful journey some of the most prized lessons that will serve us well in the critical times through which we pass.

I am grateful to Almighty God that I have been privileged to have shared this earth with such great and wonderful men like Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN who was to America what Winston Churchill was to Great Britain—one who in travail helped bring our Nation through some of its finest hours.

May his soul rest in peace, for his works bear continuing testimony to his indomitable spirit.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow and profound regret that I learned of the passing of our senior Senator, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. He was not just a Senator from our great State of Illinois. He was a tradition.

He had a style all his own. He brought great credit upon our State and our Nation.

Although we did not agree on all matters affecting our State in the legislative field, we could always disagree in a friendly manner. This was a great trait of Senator DIRKSEN.

I strongly supported his efforts to pass a constitutional amendment to allow prayers in public tax-supported schools and other public buildings.

His mark upon the legislative history of our country is indelible for all time to come. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues and the Nation.

I want to join the minority whip, Mr. ARENDS, the Speaker, and the Members of both bodies of Congress in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen, Mrs. Baker, and the other members of the family. Our thoughts and prayers will be with them during this sad time of bereavement.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a legislator and a statesman of very considerable stature. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was a man of great ability, deeply committed to serving his country, his State, and his party. His loss will be felt by the Nation.

Much of the history-making legislation passed in recent years would not have become law without Senator DIRKSEN's efforts. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, which completely altered the social fabric of this Nation, owes its passage in great part to this one man.

In 1963 his decision to support ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty was of major significance in assuring its approval. He explained his decision in words that have a special poignancy today.

One of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have written on my tombstone, "He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step."

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN did not hesitate to take that step and many others in his long service. He is one of those few men of whom it may in truth be said, "He changed the path of history."

I join my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a great American has passed away. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRK-

SEN has meant much to me and to my family. I first met him shortly after his election to the U.S. Senate. My father and he were friends through the years. On my election to the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator DIRKSEN was ever ready to counsel and advise a young Congressman. In every contact and meeting I had with him, he was constantly a fair, even-tempered gentleman.

Recently, Senator DIRKSEN paid a particular, personal tribute to my father on the occasion of a special award and recognition program honoring my father. For this I will be forever grateful.

We who knew him, who admired him, who worked with him, will remember him always. He was truly one of the great ones.

To Mrs. Dirksen, and his daughter, Mrs. Baker, I would like to extend on behalf of my entire family, our most sincere and heartfelt condolences.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I speak for the people of the State of Illinois as well as for myself, when I express profound sorrow over the death, on September 7, of the senior Senator from Illinois, the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN was one of the most skilled legislators of our time, a great statesman, and a great American. Even those who disagreed with his thinking on the issues of the day could not help but admire and respect the eloquence, the wisdom, the showmanship, the strength and resolute commitment to our democracy that characterized the Senator from Illinois.

At the time of his death, Senator DIRKSEN was serving his 10th year as Senate minority leader, and had served over 18 years in the Senate and 16 years in the House of Representatives. He was an influential member of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Special Committee on Aging, and the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality.

He had a genius for finding the key to agreement on conflicting political issues, and because of his flair for bringing divergent views together, he served an invaluable role for President Nixon as minority leader, and for former President Johnson as leader of the "loyal opposition." In these roles, he had unequalled influence and accomplished much, as evidenced by the crucial part he played in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and on the ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

When Senator DIRKSEN spoke, not only his colleagues, but all of our citizens across the Nation paused to listen. He could drop his voice to a whisper and have the people hang on his every word, or he could point a finger and thunder dramatically at his audience. He was at his best when he was drawing on his vast knowledge of the Bible, Shakespeare, and world literature. In turning the tide for the civil rights bill in the Senate, he borrowed a line from Victor Hugo and declared:

Stronger than all the armies is the idea whose time has come. The time has come for

equality in sharing in government and education, and in employment. It will not be stayed or denied. It is here.

And so, the civil rights bill was passed in the Senate, and Mr. DIRKSEN had again played a constructive role in shaping the ultimate outcome of another historic event in the development of our country.

Senator DIRKSEN was born in Pekin, Ill.—a small town of 22,000 inhabitants. He was one of twin sons and he was only 7 when his father died, so both he and his brother went to work on the small family farm. Young Ev DIRKSEN was industrious and by working, paid his own way through the University of Minnesota Law School, and subsequently, became a member of the bar of both Illinois and the District of Columbia.

He also served in the U.S. Army during World War I, from 1917 to 1919, fought in France with an artillery unit and won a field commission.

Senator DIRKSEN died in Walter Reed Army Hospital after undergoing lung surgery on September 2. Though he had been in ill health for several years, the Senator always maintained a rigorous daily schedule. His outstanding career of public service, which covered a span of almost 40 years, is testimonial indeed to his dedication and devotion to the cause of our Nation's strength and freedom. He was incomparable to any man who had served with or before him in the Senate, and it will be a long, long time indeed before we see someone come close to the legendary role he played in the service of our beloved America.

Senator DIRKSEN's loss leaves a void in the Senate and in our country which will be difficult to fill, but his family and his friends can be proud of the tremendous contribution he made as one of the outstanding leaders of the American people. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing Ev DIRKSEN as a friend and colleague for so many years deeply mourn his passing, and our hearts go out to his bereaved family.

He is survived by his wife, Louella Carver, and his daughter, Joy, who is married to Senator HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., from Tennessee. Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and to Senator and Mrs. Baker on their great loss.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, several years ago Senator DIRKSEN made a record about the gallant men in American history. With the sudden passing of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, it can certainly be said that the United States has lost one of its most gallant men.

During his 10 difficult years as the Republican leader of the Senate, Senator DIRKSEN played a key role in preserving the two-party system which is so essential to the effective operation of a representative republic. In the months following the Republican debacle of 1964, it was to a great degree the leadership of Senator DIRKSEN that made the Republican opposition meaningful and not token.

Leaders and Presidents of both parties have long respected Senator DIRKSEN's political acumen and his sense of what is right. As a team player, he worked for

and, indeed, was instrumental in the election or nomination of every recent Republican presidential candidate. He also campaigned actively for other Republican candidates, including myself.

However, Senator DIRKSEN was not dogmatic, and as a true statesman, he would at times differ with his Republican colleagues or attempt to lead the party in a new direction. He always abided by those principles which he felt were fundamental to a democratic and free people.

The legacy which he leaves will serve as a touchstone for future generations of American leaders. His mark will never be erased.

Mrs. Adair joins me in expressing sympathy to the widow and other members of the family.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, with the death on Sunday of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, this Nation lost one of its most skilled—and certainly most colorful—political leaders.

Although not of the same political party or conviction, I always respected the distinguished minority leader for his genuine human qualities. During the nearly four decades he served in Congress he was always a gentleman, ever friendly with a happy word for everybody.

Recognized as a controversial and often contradictory figure in American politics, Senator DIRKSEN made his mark on history. He will be remembered as the last of that old school of distinguished politicians who shaped history by the power and eloquence of their oratory, the sharpness of their wit, and the force of their personality.

By his own reckoning Senator DIRKSEN set aside partisan views to "do what was right for the country." What more noble principle could serve to guide all of us who remain to carry on.

My wife joins me in expressing our deep and heartfelt sympathies to his widow, daughter, and family.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the people of Illinois and of America have sustained a great loss in the passing of the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, minority leader of the U.S. Senate. With his death, the Nation has lost an elder statesman whose outstanding record of public service covered more than half a century.

He served in the House of Representatives from 1932 to 1949. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1950, and was serving as minority leader at the time of his death. The career of Senator DIRKSEN was exemplified by his devotion to duty and the best interests of his State and Nation. He was a kind, gentle, and able man. All those who had the privilege to share his friendship came to admire and respect his sterling virtues.

Senator DIRKSEN was a loyal party man but he believed in the two-party system and contributed to its strength. For this, he earned the respect of all Members on both sides of the aisle. He lived and labored through a great era in the history of our Nation and our country is a better place in which to live and work by reason of the dedicated service of EVERETT DIRKSEN. He has passed from the earthly

scene of his many accomplishments, but he will long be remembered as one of the great Americans of his age. His personal example provides for all of us here, and those who will come after, a permanent inspiration for the type of patriotic service for which this Nation will never cease to be indebted to him.

In this time of great loss and sorrow, we extend our heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved wife and other family members.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, President Nixon, and the Nation have lost a valuable leader in the death of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. The personal grief and sense of loss that so many of us feel as his friends and followers are overshadowed by the deprivation we suffer in no longer having his sound judgment, his boundless imagination, and his infinite experience upon which to draw. He was above all a legislator of great skill and wisdom. At times this led some, without justification, to question his consistency and his dedication to principle. It was rather that he knew and practiced well the necessary lubricant of the law-making process, the art of compromise.

Serving as Senate minority leader, he has been an invaluable assistant to the President in the formulation and initiation of the legislative program of the Nixon administration and deserves much credit for the progress made despite the numerical superiority of the other party. Never an unthinking partisan, he drew respect and support from differing quarters. But well he knew and frequently he noted, that in the process of legislating, it is often a question, as he might have said, of "whose quadruped is quartered."

Kindly in his demeanor and understanding in nature, he could be fiercely loyal to his friends, and that friendship and loyalty were the treasured gift of my father, with whom he worked so long and so closely. But he was forgiving, too, of his opponents, in the best of Christian tradition.

We shall miss him, but not forget him nor his great contributions as a full-game player on the American scene.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a great tree in the political forest has fallen with the death of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

For many years he was a dominating feature on the landscape of American life.

EVERETT DIRKSEN was unique. His extraordinary voice, his utterly personal, individual use of the English language captivated and often inspired the Nation.

He brought rare gifts to his leadership role. He had a great understanding of human nature. He possessed an extraordinary sensitivity to differing personalities and the changing circumstances into which they were thrust and swirled by shifting fortunes. He understood and loved the drama of life, especially as it is found in the clash of strong men and women in our political system.

No man of his time in our country could so beautifully and dramatically sum up and set the tone of a great issue as could EVERETT DIRKSEN in the Chamber of the Senate.

A great craftsman, he was master of

myriad details with the capacity to recall them all at will and on command. He was a virtuoso of the legislative art.

He withstood the tensions and pressures to which he was exposed by his prominence better than most men could. It is not a cause for wonder that they ground him down eventually; it is a wonder that he withstood them so well for so long.

His death has taken a unique, colorful figure from our national life. His work will long merit attention from students of our times and of our governmental processes. In this work they will find an almost limitless mine of patriotism and knowledge, welded to the service of his people. Such students, as they progress across the record of his life, will be entertained, enlightened, and frequently moved—as were we who were fortunate enough to live and work with EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Virginians have been proud that Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN selected the Commonwealth as his home away from Illinois.

We honored his search for privacy as much as we admired the skill and quality of his oratory in his dealings with the wide-ranging interests that occupied his thoughts.

We reflect now, in this hour of sadness, on the great heart that beat so strongly in life and is now still in death.

He had time, always, for the little things, the common things of life; growing things, children, local concerns, individual ambitions and hopes. He was a great man in a lofty position in life, yet he never lost his personal concern nor his capacity for a kind or soft word for a distressed fellow man.

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN needs no marble monument to his memory, Mr. Speaker. His is engraved on the hearts of our people; the ordinary citizen who enjoyed his homespun humor, who enjoyed his full grasp of life; the men and women in government who felt the acid of his convictions but never the burn of his rancor.

He enjoyed verbal combat and found solace in a blossoming flower when it had ended; he spoke to the mighty and mulched the earth with his worn hands; he dealt with the greatest issues of his time, but was proudest of his poetic bent.

His favorite reading was the Bible; his greatest heroes were the man, the wife, next door who were raising the growing generation that would soon, he knew well, pick up the burden from his tired shoulders.

To all men Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was a leader. To many of us he was a hero of his age, a man of many parts, but most of all one who walked among us as equals.

He touched humanity with the deftness and sureness of a soul at peace with itself.

I admired him, as all men must; I shall miss him, as all men will.

He returns to the earth he loved, in the land he revered, Mr. Speaker, and we mourn his going, never to forget him, never to be lesser men because he passed our way.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I

join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to that great Member of the other body, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

Senator DIRKSEN will be remembered as a towering figure among the great men who have served in the Halls of Congress. During his 16 years in the House and 19 years in the Senate, he worked with tenacity and courage for the causes in which he believed. For the last 10 years, he performed with remarkable skill and intelligence as the Senate minority leader.

EVERETT DIRKSEN was a genuine patriot who fought for those causes that represent the best interests of the United States and the time-honored principles for which our great Nation stands. His recognition of the rightful role of our religious heritage has been an inspiration to millions of Americans. His eloquent advocacy of constitutional government and individual freedom underscored his deep interest in the preservation of democratic ideals.

We all mourn the loss of a great legislator and statesman—a man of monumental stature who spoke and worked for a freer, stronger, and wiser United States of America.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Senator DIRKSEN, in his own right and as a Republican leader in the Senate, added zest and color to the American political scene. If at times he espoused flexibility more than constancy there were other moments when his leadership was decisive, notably in his support of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963. He will be missed by his many friends, by the great State of Illinois, and by his legislative colleagues who deeply respected his skill at bringing together opposing factions in the national interest.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague and longtime friend in the well, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS). We are all deeply saddened by the death of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, a great leader of his party and his Nation.

I feel a special loss because of the personal relationship two of my predecessors in the district I represent had with the late great minority leader of the other body. Ev DIRKSEN came into the House of Representatives 5 years before my own father, but the two of them served together in this body as intimate friends for 10 years from 1938 through Mr. DIRKSEN's temporary retirement in 1948. They enjoyed a fellowship of philosophy and an approach to the practicalities of politics which saw them working together in concert on common causes. They shared their fervor for the late Senator Robert A. Taft for President and exchanged and often confirmed each other's assessments of the well known and little known political personalities of a generation.

While my predecessor's career continued in the House and brought him into the joint leadership as ranking Republican on the House Rules Committee, the Representative from Illinois became the Senator from Illinois and, in time, the minority leader of that august

body. He also became clearly one of the most colorful political figures of the day. They shared the joys and frustrations of party responsibility, taking delight in defeating their adversary colleagues for some partisan advantage and more delight yet in joining with their adversary colleagues to advance some program for the common good of the Nation.

This association in common causes and interests ended only with my late father's death in 1965.

An area recently added to the Seventh Ohio District I represent is Marion, which was the home of Dr. Frederick Smith, who represented the old Eighth Ohio District at the time Representative DIRKSEN was afflicted with problems that affected his eyesight. It was Congressman Smith who counseled his colleague medically to seek the treatment and care that saw him retire voluntarily from the House in 1948. This move ultimately led to the saving of his vision and his return to public life as a Senator and eventually as a national leader.

And what a leader the late Senator was. A persuasive counselor to his legislative colleagues and others in seats of power, he was also persuasive with his eloquence. So influential, in fact, was he that his former colleague and good friend, President Johnson, found him to be almost as powerful a leader of a heavily outnumbered Republican minority as had Senator Johnson been when he led a Democratic majority in the Senate with which President Eisenhower was obliged to deal.

There is a parallel between the Eisenhower-Johnson relationship and the Johnson-Dirksen relationship. But an even stranger coincidence is that between the loss President Eisenhower experienced within his first year in office because of the death of his leader in the Senate, Bob Taft, and the loss which President Nixon now faces because of Senator DIRKSEN's passing.

But it is not just the President and the Grand Old Party which have lost a champion. All Americans will feel the impact of his sudden passing. His leadership was influential because affection for him was almost universal. He was the idol of all ages and his voice was perhaps the best known since Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was a combination of many virtues, but high on the list must rank kindness and generosity. While politics may be a game of rancor and retribution for some, it was mostly love and kindness for Ev DIRKSEN. He liked to help his friends and he had few enemies. He enjoyed helping young people in politics and he made his assistance available to me as a new Member of Congress. He loved his profession and was proud of it; but he never took himself or the great moments with which he struggled during his career so seriously that he could not find joy or humor in them.

His sense of dedication to doing what he thought was right and to doing it within the framework of the system undoubtedly grew from his personal experience under the system—the experience of rising from humble origins to become the leader of humble men and a

counselor to the great. And I feel sure that he knew that the system would see his various roles in Government filled by others in the days and years ahead. But that does not suggest that he can ever be replaced.

So while I sorrow at the loss of leadership he provided, I know that this void will be filled by the system. I mourn for the family who have lost a precious husband, father, and grandfather who can never be replaced. But I rejoice for the rest of us who had the joy of knowing him and who were benefited by his efforts in behalf of the Nation he loved literally more than life. For all of us who are Americans he has left an example, but particularly for those of us in public life.

He was flexible because politics is the art of compromise. But he was willing to stand in unpopular causes because politics is also the dedication of doing what one perceives to be one's duty. He filled his important role humbly because he knew the cause is greater than those who advance it. But he lived his life with confidence and joy because he knew the system in which he operated is the best possible one to meet the requirements of self government.

Our prayers should be to sustain the family and for those who must advance the causes without his aid or who will be chosen to replace him. But those prayers should also express our joy for having had the pleasure of knowing him and for living in a Nation that produced such a man from the rich earth of Illinois to which we must now return him.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, EVERETT DIRKSEN was a unique institution in American politics whose life was a true profile of courage. His fierce sense of dedication was tempered by a deep sense of humor. His eloquence and style were unmatched in our time. His statesmanship and leadership of the loyal opposition during those years in which our party was out of power was unparalleled. Above all, EVERETT DIRKSEN was his own man.

I have lost a good friend. The Republican Party has lost one of its greatest leaders. The Nation has lost a dedicated servant.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has lost one of its most prominent, most human and colorful leaders. EVERETT DIRKSEN was a man who could be firmly partisan when partisanship was appropriate but who could be thoroughly nonpartisan when the best interests of his Nation required it.

The Illinois Republican has been so much a part of the Senate and the American political scene that it is difficult to imagine either without him. Americans will always remember his many contributions to the Nation, such as his role in winning approval of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963, his efforts to restore prayer in public schools, his famous reversal of position which insured passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and his battle for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

These are but a few of his contribu-

tions. Many of his greatest found him, the leader of the Republican Members of the Senate, joining hands with a Democratic administration to champion programs in which EV DIRKSEN believed.

Often, EV DIRKSEN hurled party lines to assist Presidents Kennedy and Johnson when the distinguished Illinois Senator recognized that America would be the beneficiary. He has left a mark on this Nation that will not be soon forgotten.

I share the sorrow his family and friends feel, and extend to them my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, we, who live in what is often described as an age of conformity, pay tribute today to the colorful life and dramatic career of one who was singularly nonconformist, a genuine original who prized the virtue of individuality and who exemplified it in his long and distinguished record of public service: EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN in whose untimely passing we all are the poorer. His passionate love of life and of the political process, allied with a deeply personal style, made him a legend in his lifetime. His comic spirit, nourished in the Lincolnian tradition of frontier humor and the anecdotal jest, embraced both the satirical and the sentimental, neither of which he feared; essentially un pompous, he delighted in the rhetorical flourishes of another age, and in this respect gave delight to millions.

Yet, it would be unjust to see him merely in terms of character, however striking and unique. He was first and last a politician in the best tradition of American life—one dedicated to that complex process of compromise, adjustment, and conciliation on which the survival of representative government depends. His often quoted aphorism, "The oil can is mightier than the sword," is a continuing commentary upon and rebuke to the so-called "politics of confrontation" which on the left and the right alike advocate violence in the pursuit of simplistic solutions to complex problems.

"A foolish consistency," wrote Emerson, "is the hobgoblin of little minds." It is the measure of EVERETT DIRKSEN's mind and spirit that, while essentially conservative, he was never afraid to change. Politically speaking, he will be remembered for his crucial role in "the three great reversals," instances in which he demonstrated a sensitive responsiveness to the larger issues which transcended the merely partisan. In the United Nations Bond Bill in 1962, the Voting Rights Bill of 1965, and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963, he gave genuine substance to his own words, "Change is an inherent way of life." Certainly, no one has ever spoken more movingly of the nuclear threat which encompasses all mankind in its grim embrace than did EVERETT DIRKSEN when he noted that he did not want written on his tombstone:

He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he didn't take a first step.

We remember today his impressive words explaining his refusal to be bound by narrow, rigidly inflexible views on

public policy, words fresh and pertinent in every age and perhaps his most significant memorial, and message to our Nation:

On the night Victor Hugo died, he wrote in his diary, "Stronger than all the armies is an idea whose time has come."

EVERETT DIRKSEN was a man of strong views, vigorously and eloquently upheld. Inevitably many of his special concerns were controversial. No man in his position of leadership could hope to escape criticism, just and unjust. Yet withal, he possessed unflinching good nature, especially impressive in light of the toll exacted by sickness and injury. A dislocated vertebra and a broken hip gave constant discomfort through the years. His brief retirement in 1948 was the direct result of an eye illness.

We remember that he served a full 16 years in this House from 1932 to 1948 through decades marked by depression, recovery, war, and the tasks of peace building and the cold war. Elected to the Senate in 1950, he served as minority leader from 1959 to the day of his passing.

Perhaps the key to EVERETT DIRKSEN's life is to be found in the small farming community of Pekin, Ill., in which he was born in 1896. For it was here that he learned that respect for hard work and the related virtues of the American Midwest at the turn of the century. We recall that he worked his way through law school at the University of Minnesota and completed his degree by night courses during his service in this House. The personal, private dimension of his life reveals such things as his intense love of gardening and of flowers: he would have heartily endorsed the words of Henry Ward Beecher:

Flowers are the sweetest things that God ever made, and forgot to put a soul into.

His business experience in Pekin gave him practical insight into the problems of the business community. We are told that he wrote five novels and over 100 short stories which, though unpublished, witness to his fiercely creative impulse. His understanding of war derived from his service in 1917-19 with the American Expeditionary Force during which time he was made a second lieutenant in the field.

Especially at the time our sympathy goes out to his wife whom he wed in 1927 following a romantic stage-courtship in which she, the former Louella Carver, played the princess of Pekin, wooed by her future husband in Percy MacKaye's "A Thousand Years Ago," celebrating the centennial of Pekin. Such a romantic encounter is wholly in keeping with the life story we honor here today. Mrs. Kluczynski and I share the sense of loss felt by Mrs. Dirksen and by her daughter, Danice Joy Baker, wife of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable HOWARD BAKER. But beyond the grief which they feel, we share their deep sense of pride in the life and career of EVERETT DIRKSEN, a life of service to the people of Illinois and to the Nation at large and, thanks to the power and prestige of America in this century, to the whole world. He takes his special

place with those illustrious few who, from the Halls of Congress, have given an enduring example of leadership in effecting significant change in days of crisis for this country and all mankind.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois will long be remembered as a man of principle and dedication. He was dedicated to the service of his party, his State, and his Nation.

As minority leader, he was highly partisan without losing sight of the fine basic principles by which he was guided. Possibly the greatest contribution that Senator DIRKSEN made to his country was his demonstration that opposition did not mean obstruction.

The gentleman from Illinois was admired, respected, and genuinely liked by both the Democratic and Republican Presidents with whom he served. As minority leader, he elevated that position to new heights by making it a forum for diverse viewpoints and helpful criticisms rather than an irritant and regressive influence. This attribute was recognized and appreciated by all of us who had the pleasure of knowing and serving with him in the Congress.

I know that his wife and daughter are comforted in knowing that their loss is shared by all Americans.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a bright light has left the American scene with the passing of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

History will record him as a giant in his time, for he had a blend of talents and personality that made him unique and distinctive in the eyes of his fellow men.

As a legislator, EVERETT DIRKSEN had the depths of understanding that comes only to those who have labored long and hard in the legislative vineyards. He had the rare ability to pinpoint the meaningful and, in effect, to separate the chaff from the wheat. His reputation as a prime cross-examiner in congressional committee proceedings was well established.

As an orator, writer, and dramatist, he had the facility to say the right thing and to pronounce it in such a way that it came thundering in upon you, or it touched your funny bone, or it stimulated your mental and psychological cores, or it lulled you into a deep quiet.

As a patriot, EVERETT DIRKSEN was dedicated to his country and to his congressional service. Although he was plagued with various illnesses, he had a heart stout enough to cast off the chains of pain and fatigue and perform nobly and effectively in the legislative chambers.

As a person, he had compassion and understanding, being more inclined to help than taunt. And his human superstructure rested on the firm foundation of a deep conviction that principle was an honored objective that must never be surrendered upon any altar.

In the wake of his departure, there is a multitude of bright reflections. We will always remember EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, fondly and respectfully, for he

was of that substance that men never forget.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the untimely passing of the senior Senator from Illinois and the distinguished minority leader in the U.S. Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

The Senate, and indeed the Nation at large, will miss this colorful figure. His eloquence has rarely been surpassed in either House and he holds a place on the pages of history with Webster and Clay. His oratorical style was colored with references to the Bible, the classics, and history. He quoted often, and flavored the issues of today with a continuity of lessons learned from the past and this was no mean indication of the man's intelligence and deep perspective.

Above all, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN represented the people and as he traveled up the political ladder of success he never forgot this. As Senate minority leader he backed Republican and Democrat alike without regard to political consideration in matters of national interest and national defense.

EVERETT DIRKSEN was a politician of the old school. He viewed politics as an art and used his oratorical ability and gently persuasive powers to best advantage. Master of the compromise, he seemed to relish this role.

As the complex politician displayed his expertise on the Senate floor, so there was the simpler, homey philosophical man from Pekin, Ill., who was a devoted husband and delighted in the magic of his flowers and garden.

The Congress will deeply miss this distinguished gentleman and statesman, and to his wife and family go my most heartfelt condolences at their great loss.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN from the American political scene is more than the loss of a great Senator. Indeed, the minority leader of the Senate was both an expert and an articulate technician in the complex field of lawmaking. He was a master in the art of legislative compromise which offers the only alternative to an insoluble stalemate. Because he possessed these qualities he became a symbol of the U.S. Congress in this generation and is now an integral part of its history and tradition.

Senator DIRKSEN was a great Constitutional and a man who cherished the fundamental principles of our great free enterprise system. He was unsurpassed in his ability to develop the basic issues from the conglomeration of the most difficult legislative measures. He was gifted with a sense of expression which allowed him to paint a masterpiece with words as the most accomplished artist does with his brush and oils.

Many of his speeches have been indelibly written into the history of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

To review his many political achievements of leadership in his long decades of public service would take more pages than any author would attempt to write. But one can say in summary that no man of our time has contributed more to the accomplishments of the Congress

than the late illustrious Illinois Senator, and it is very improbable that anyone will in future generations.

Personally, he was a vibrant, compassionate and lovable human being. He possessed a rich and wry sense of humor which was a source of delight to all who participated in his intimate conversations. He had a million friends in every walk of life, and he had a quality of making everyone's presence felt even while he was the focal point of attention in both official and informal groups and gatherings.

To his loyal and gracious wife and lovely daughter, Mrs. Howard Baker, and to all other members of his distinguished family, I extend my condolences. But I do so knowing that they have been left with a rich heritage and the cherished memory of the works and achievements of one of the truly great American statesmen of the generations. Like my colleagues in this esteemed body and millions of others across this Nation, I shall miss him greatly.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, our dear departed friend, was a leader held in highest esteem, respect, and admiration by his constituents and his colleagues.

In his devotion to providing a "more perfect union," EVERETT DIRKSEN excelled, because he was the moving spirit behind any cause which he championed. His eloquence and great ability as a statesman breathed life into often disagreeable endeavors. He constantly sought that middle ground on which all honorable men could agree.

We are, indeed, greatly saddened by the death of Senator DIRKSEN. Separation, sudden and unexpected, is always difficult for those left behind. And yet if quality be the real test of life, the life of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN should in itself serve to mitigate our sadness as his friends and colleagues, and to afford a source of pride and inspiration to those closest to him.

To those of us who survive, he has tossed the torch, and ours is the duty to carry on. Let us rededicate ourselves to the patriotism and love of country he felt, emulating his virtues and his consecration to duty. In memory of a fine, upstanding American, let us resolve, in this dark and threatening period which menaces our Nation, to eschew all bitterness and strife, forget racial and religious differences, forego partisan politics, and unite as one great people, under one flag, and with one destiny—that of strengthening America.

The votes which Senator DIRKSEN cast and the speeches which he made are preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and elsewhere, but their memory is enshrined forever in our hearts.

We shall remember best not his official record but our association with him, and the ties of lasting friendship which death cannot sever and which are among the compensating joys of our service in Congress.

The greatest comfort and consolation that can come to his family is not only the splendid record which he made as a faithful public servant, but also the heritage he has transmitted to his wife and

daughter, and the love, loyalty, and generous devotion which he bestowed upon his friends and family.

EVERETT DIRKSEN has passed away, but he died as he would have wanted it—in service to his country.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in expressing my feeling of a deep personal loss on the death of the great minority leader of the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN will be remembered by all Americans as one of the great legislative leaders of our time. His service in both the House and Senate represents a lifetime of legislative achievement. He was not only a great leader of the Republican Party but he was also a party leader always ready to put his country ahead of partisanship. His masterful oratory will be missed and the Nation has suffered a great loss. The people of Illinois and the country have lost a great national leader.

Certainly an era has ended. With the passing of Ev DIRKSEN one of the last great practitioners of the art of "being a Senator" is no more. The tousled hair, the rise and fall of a commanding voice in debate on some of the great issues of our country will be no more.

In behalf of Mrs. Cederberg and myself, I want to express to Mrs. Dirksen and to Senator BAKER and his wife my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the eloquent oratorical voice of a great man was stilled last Sunday when Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN passed away at Walter Reed Army Hospital.

With his death, the Nation lost one of the most skilled and certainly most colorful, political leaders of our time.

Senator DIRKSEN was a Member of this House of Representatives from 1932 to 1949. In 1950 he was elected to the U.S. Senate, and was serving as minority leader in that body at the time of his death.

Mr. Speaker, today we walk in silent sorrow to give our final respects to a man whose mark is written upon legislative history for all time.

He had the hidden genius for finding the key to agreement on conflicting proposals and political issues. This genius served him well, as evidenced by the crucial part he played in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and on the ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

Many have heard his booming voice thundering dramatically through the Senate Chambers, then gradually lowering to a whisper which had his audience hanging on in silence lest they miss something of his speech as he made his point.

Mr. Speaker, I join all Americans today in expressing my condolences to Mrs. Dirksen and her family. May his soul rest in everlasting peace.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, when Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN passed away on Sunday, America lost one of its greatest and most talented legislators. In my judgment, Senator DIRKSEN was an institution, and of himself. He will long be remembered as the great mediator.

The senior Senator from Illinois had an

exceptional quality, personality, and character that made him stand tall in the minds of his colleagues, the American people, and people throughout the world. He will always stand as tall as the giant Redwoods from my native California in the minds of every American who was privileged to know or hear him.

The people from redwood country and I will be eternally grateful for his valuable assistance to me during the long and arduous debate that led to the creation of the Redwood National Park.

Certainly, his memory will endure as long as the life of those redwoods he fought to save for posterity.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the death of EVERETT DIRKSEN has left a void that can never again be entirely filled; for Senator DIRKSEN was unique: in his parliamentary skills, his captivating personality, and his impact on our national life.

Overcoming debilitating illnesses that on numerous occasions would have forced lesser men to the sidelines, he continued to cut an enviable swath until the end.

With command of the language, his matchless eloquence, and his occasional flamboyance, he evoked an American past when the great orators whose words still ring through our history were also rugged individualists.

Although it was possible to disagree at times with Senator DIRKSEN, it was impossible to dislike him. I mourn his passing.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to the memory of EVERETT DIRKSEN. I was privileged to serve with him as a fellow member of the House Appropriations Committee for many years. I can testify at first hand about the great job he did as a member of the committee.

He was brilliant, dedicated, always considerate of friend or foe. His distinguished career in the Senate must not be permitted to obscure his distinguished record of service in the House.

It has been my privilege to be present at many meetings in recent years when EVERETT DIRKSEN in his position of leadership was charged with major responsibility. He always measured up to the highest standards. Regardless of who occupied the position of President he strove to be helpful. He never sold the country short. It is fitting that we should honor him today.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, my personal association with Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN was very limited. Like other Members of the House, I would have the opportunity to greet and visit with him briefly on social occasions and then, of course, very rarely during conferences on legislation passed by the two legislative bodies.

It was through one of his most able and long-time aides, Oliver J. Dompiere, a Michiganite from my old territory—the Upper Peninsula—that I have long felt a close tie and association.

In the 9 years that I have served in Congress, I do not believe that I have ever been more proud or more frightened than I was over 7 years ago when I was asked to "fill in" for Senator DIRKSEN in a speaking role. I was just in my second

year in Congress. It might have been said that I was just a sophomore. But I was smart enough to know that I would not be able to "fill in" for Senator DIRKSEN in a speaking role. I might be on the program; I might even deliver the main address; but I would never be able to fill in for him. I could not do that on March 30, 1962, in Chicago, Ill., at a fund-raising dinner for the Senator, nor will I or any one else reach that stature.

I would like at this time to repeat my opening comments at that dinner program over 7 years ago. My feelings have not changed over the years, as I got to know him better. My words were appropriate then and I feel they are now. I started by saying:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, it is a real privilege and honor for me to join with you tonight in tribute to Senator Everett Dirksen. You may not have previously considered it, but we Republicans in Michigan are almost as proud and happy as you in the State of Illinois to have Senator Dirksen representing you in Congress. In many ways, we have adopted Senator Dirksen as our voice in the Senate Chamber. We have a real attachment to your beloved Senator.

Actually, Senator Dirksen, during his 28 years as a Member of Congress, and now in his present role as Minority Leader in the Senate, has been warmly adopted by thousands of Americans throughout our land. When he speaks in the Senate Chamber, everyone listens. No greater respect or honor than that could be paid. Certainly, at no time in our nation's history has such leadership in the Senate been more sorely needed than now. You people rightly believe that the State of Illinois needs Everett Dirksen. I concur and quickly add that our nation needs him also.

Yes, it has been nearly 8 years since I uttered those words of praise. I repeat them now as all Americans bid farewell to one of the giants in our Nation's history. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN shall always remain a giant in our Nation, for he truly was a grand flag bearer. He served his country as greatly as he loved it.

No one—in any fashion—can or will ever be able to "fill in" for him.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN has come as a profound shock to all who knew him. Though our minds contained the fact that he had suffered from various illnesses over the past few years, they never grasped the implications of that fact. His tireless efforts as his party's leader in the Senate, his constant good humor, the "basso profundo" he brought to the support of those causes for which he crusaded—all combined to create a sense of indestructibility; to lull us with the impression that here was, not only a man for all seasons, but a man for all time.

I am deeply grieved at his untimely passing. I do not grieve for EVERETT DIRKSEN, for he has found surcease from the ills of the flesh and peace in the arms of the Creator he knew and loved so well. I grieve for all of us who still must cope with these troubled times without his wisdom, his insight, his strength, his sure sense of purpose and direction.

This Nation has produced its share of great statesmen and it has claimed many articulate and engaging personalities.

But very, very rarely has there passed across the pages of our history a more remarkable and beloved combination of political skill and flamboyance—of statesmanship and charisma—than was found combined in the personality and career of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

The Senate, the administration, the Republican Party, the State of Illinois—but most importantly, the Nation and its people—will miss his leadership and his zest for life. His record and his indomitable spirit are monuments to the qualities of leadership and character which he embodied and to which we all aspire.

I grieve for his wonderful wife and family who have lived in the joy of having this warm, strong, gentle and inspiring man as husband, father, and grandfather. His passing leaves a great empty space in a close family group, but a thousand cherished memories will help to ease the loss and fill the hollow in the heart his absence brings.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do not deem it selfish that I grieve for myself at the loss of a dear and beloved friend. Many are my recollections of happy experiences shared with Ev DIRKSEN. In years past, before his leadership responsibilities became so heavy, he was an indefatigable speaker on the political dinner circuit and he came to Oklahoma many times to lend his unique oratorical ability to my campaigns and to the party cause. Oklahomans loved him as much as if he were one of their own. And I was always proud and delighted to share his wonderful friendship.

Mrs. Belcher and I will miss him deeply, and we join in extending to his wife, Louella, and to his family our sincere sympathy and our prayers that they may know the fullest measure of God's strength and love in this time of sorrow.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN marks the end of an era. He was the last of a breed of giants who walked among us on Capitol Hill, combining showmanship and statesmanship, service with grandeur.

As a freshman, my contacts with Senator DIRKSEN were relatively few, but like most Americans I have many vivid memories of him. What I recall most is that, despite his importance he was accessible to all. I recall asking for appointments with lesser men and being put off 1 or 2 weeks. "Ev" DIRKSEN, despite his busy schedule and prominence as a national leader, was always available without such delays. Twice, I had occasion to seek an interview with this great man, and twice he received this freshman Congressman quickly and with genuine warmth.

The world will best remember his showmanship—the sonorous oratory, the silvery locks, the courtly, yet homely, manner. But we must also remember the statesmanship that lay beneath his grandness of manner. His leadership reached its peak during Democratic administrations. While he knew his role as leader of the loyal opposition was in partisan affairs to oppose—and oppose he did—he never lost sight of the re-

quirement to be loyal, as well. In those situations which called for a united front for the good of the country, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN could and did work with Democratic Presidents as closely as with those of his own party. Our country owes him much for the unity he preserved.

We Republicans were proud of EVERETT DIRKSEN as a great leader of our party; we of the Midwest were proud of him as a personification of the ethics and ideals we hold especially dear back home. But all America can be proud of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN as the embodiment of all that is great in American political life. He was a great Republican and Midwesterner, but he was first of all a great American.

Now the torch has been passed. Someone will assume the mantle of leadership laid down by this great warrior, and life will go on. I am confident that whoever becomes the Republican leader in the Senate will carry on well in the tradition set by EVERETT DIRKSEN. But no one, no matter how able or honorable, can ever really replace this singular man from Pekin, Ill., so beloved by all his countrymen.

I know I join all my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, and indeed all Americans in extending deepest sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Dirksen and the Senator's family.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Senator DIRKSEN from the political scene leaves a void which may never be filled. Someone, of course, will take his place in the legislative halls but it will be a difficult task to measure up to the accomplishments and talents of the departed minority leader.

His background is one that appears time and again in the lives of successful men. A humble beginning, hard work, and dedication to ideals tell the story of his rise to the top. In the midst of his legislative career were all the ingredients which the American public looks for and expects to find in its public servants. He was a family man and loved his home. He was kind and considerate and even though he rose to the heights he never lost the common touch or lost sight of the friendships he had made along the way.

All of these enduring qualities made up the framework around which his career was built.

Sometime ago I asked for his autographed picture. When I received it, the Senator had written on it this inscription for me. "To my old and steadfast friend," I shall always cherish this token of friendship from a great man. And as one of his friends, I am saddened at his death and extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and his family.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the tributes to the late beloved Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN continue to roll in and included in that flood tide of respect and affection is an editorial written by Mr. Ray McHugh of the Copley News Service. The editorial really captures the essence of the Senator's life and career and his impact on our national life for so many years. I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN
(By Ray McHugh)

"In God we trust."

The phrase was more than a motto to Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.

It was a way of life.

Since his death Sunday afternoon, there have been many eulogies and many reminiscences. Not a few have lamented the passing of the Senate's last great orator of the old eloquent tradition.

We shared the joy of Sen. Dirksen's resonant speeches, full with the quotations from the bible, Shakespeare, and the classics and spiced with Spoon River humor, all honed when he was a young man in Pekin kneading bread dough in his brother's bakery and reciting classics in the rolling rhythm of the breadboard.

We shared the wonder at that cathedral organ voice that could thunder like the artillery he heard in World War I or whisper like a lover.

But the senior Senator from Illinois must be remembered for more than a great oratorical style.

Here was a man who believed fiercely in the basic difference between right and wrong. His words often sent well-educated reporters scurrying to their dictionaries, but his principles were as uncomplicated as the Illinois prairies from which he rose.

Everett McKinley Dirksen's priorities were simple. He owed his first allegiance to God, his second to the United States of America, his third to his family, his fourth to the Republican Party.

No President he ever served quarreled with those priorities. His wife Luella would not have cared the way she did if they had been different.

Without Sen. Dirksen, President John F. Kennedy would not have had the nuclear test ban treaty which is regarded as his tallest monument.

Dirksen's reasoning was simple:

"I should not like to have written on my tombstone, 'He Knew What Happened at Hiroshima, But He Did Not Take The First Step.'"

Without Sen. Dirksen, President Lyndon B. Johnson would not have had the civil rights legislation that he considers his greatest contribution to the Nation.

Without Sen. Dirksen, President Dwight D. Eisenhower's programs would have been emasculated in his last two years in office by a high-riding, newly elected Democrat majority. Those were the years when a Dirksen-Johnson friendship born in the House in the late 1930s began to bear the fruit of national responsibility.

Without Sen. Dirksen, President Nixon would not have won Senate approval of the Safeguard Anti Ballistic Missile System.

Without Sen. Dirksen, Mr. Nixon now faces trying days on Capitol Hill. No one since Sen. Robert A. Taft better deserved the title of "Mr. Republican" and it's hard to recall any Senator who had the man from Pekin's ability to lead a small band to decisive victories.

It is hard to forget how in the early 1960s, faced with overwhelming odds, Sen. Dirksen successfully defended the rights of working men against compulsory unionism; how only a year ago he directed the strategy that blocked Abe Fortas' nomination as Chief Justice of the United States; how he stood staunchly alongside President Johnson in the trying ordeal of Vietnam, privately leaning toward a "victory" policy, but publicly supporting his old friend on what to Dirksen was the best of all grounds:

"Because he is my President . . ."

Sen. Dirksen was not without his critics. They had grown in recent years, particularly in the ranks of liberal Republicans who complained that the Senator was out of step with the times, that his ideas were old-fash-

ioned, that he did not understand the changing America.

Sen. Dirksen understood it. But he didn't like it.

It was only after grave soul-searching that he supported sweeping civil rights and educational changes.

"They are remaking America and you won't like it," he warned in the early stages of debate, but later in his final argument supporting President Johnson's proposals, he said:

"The time has come for equality in sharing government and education, and in employment. It will not be stayed or denied. It is here."

But the time had not come for other changes.

Sen. Dirksen died without realizing one of his fiercest convictions—the restoration of prayer to public schools.

Nothing shook the old lawmaker more than the Supreme Court ruling outlawing such prayers. In Dirksen's view, the Court had taken something basic away from America.

His memory could be served in no better way than to hasten passage of a constitutional amendment that puts prayer back in the classroom and reasserts the Nation's faith in the words Everett McKinley Dirksen lived by:

"In God we trust."

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the most outstanding and beloved figures of our time. Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN filled the hearts of an entire nation but his passing now touches these hearts with sorrow and a profound sense of loss. No longer will the Senate Chamber echo with his eloquence. No longer will his deep stores of wit and wisdom enrich the debate of our most urgent national issues.

Senator DIRKSEN's first allegiance was to the protection and preservation of our American heritage of freedom. He had devoted his life to strengthening and defending the principles of our Constitution. His efforts to permit prayer and Bible reading in the Nation's schools demonstrated his faith in God and his deep love for America.

EVERETT DIRKSEN was one of the greatest statesmen of this century. Every President since Roosevelt consulted him for insight and judgment in foreign and domestic affairs. He was a trusted adviser to our Presidents regardless of the party in office because he always put the national interest ahead of partisan consideration.

Senator DIRKSEN was a unique figure in American history whose place can never be filled or duplicated. His integrity, his faith in America and God, the magnificent achievements of his statesmanship, his legislative leadership, his eloquence, his humanity and compassion will never be forgotten.

My most sincere sympathy goes to his family in their sorrow and loss.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the many fine statements made with reference to the late Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. It was my privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives for a number of years. In fact, after serving under his chairmanship I succeeded him as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture.

During this period of time, his charm, never-ending humor, and his ability

made it always easy to deal with him, even on those occasions when our viewpoints were different. I will not attempt to surpass the glowing attributes which have been made, the fine descriptions which have been given, but I do want to say his has been a wonderful service and within his own lights has been constructive. Certainly he has created a big place for himself in the Congress and in the Nation and it will take much time for the void to be filled.

To his family and his loved ones we extend our deepest sympathy in their loss. We all have lost a fine friend and the country an outstanding citizen.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the Members of this Congress and the people of this Nation are losing more than a great leader, more than an outstanding Senator and national image to whom we pay our respect because of his noticeable accomplishments. After his 35 years of unparalleled service in the House and Senate, his death marks the loss of an inspiration and color for American public life unequalled since the days of Daniel Webster.

Senator DIRKSEN was a friendly, warm, compassionate pillar of a man. He was a man who not only enjoyed his work and responsibility, but enjoyed and lived for the institutions within which he was able to function so well. He was outstandingly effective not only by virtue of his extraordinary capabilities but also because of the pleasure and feeling for life that he expressed in what he was doing. He was effective because he was conscious of the values of our way of life that depended so greatly upon what he did and said. He was not afraid to introduce a little humor into a grave situation, or to take issue on matters of great consequence which he felt demanded the positions he took.

None could deny the powerful effect of the Senator's manner or the beauty of his conduct. Add to his humor his skill as an orator and you have one of the most memorable figures ever to grace the floors of the House and Senate. The quality of his performance as a Thespian, his flair for the dramatic, his deep resounding voice and the control which he had over it, as well as his manner of delivery and there was given to the Senate and to America the closest link between our time and that of Webster, Clay and Calhoun.

But the brightness of his personality and the uniqueness of his behavior should not overshadow his skill as a legislative leader and statesman. The excellence of his rhetoric was not by any means his only method of being effective. As the Senate minority leader and the single most influential member of his party during two Democratic administrations, he enjoyed a power and influence of great proportion. He used this position well, for the benefit of his party, and performed the function of leader of the "loyal opposition" well, for the betterment of his country.

Yet, on those issues which were of such great consequence to the welfare and security of our Nation, he was able to avoid partisanship and withstand pressures from both inside and outside

of his party. He held fast to his convictions and followed the course in which his judgment and good sense directed him.

In handling issues of the war in Vietnam, for example, the Senator cooperated closely with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson in response to his deep personal conviction that the essence of Government is the freedom of the people. He fought hard behind the scenes as well as in public to see that the freedom of which he spoke was preserved for all those who had become dependent upon the Government of the United States for that preservation.

His many accomplishments can only be looked upon with pride. He served during very troubled times in a capacity which required great leadership capabilities. Had his great knowledge of American politics and its legislative processes not been available to the Congress the consequences might have been immeasurably grave. He became to the Senate an entertaining leader, a man who looked to God and commonsense for his guidance and he gave direction to his colleagues as a master in his own right. We are grateful to him for his involvement, his conviction, his dedication and now his supreme sacrifice.

To paraphrase one of his favorite sayings, "There is only one debt greater than the Federal debt, and that is the debt that the Members of Congress and all Americans owe to EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sorrow over the loss to the Congress and to the Nation of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

The many facets of the Senator from Illinois have been seen by the Congress and the Nation over the past 35 years and those talents which he possessed will be truly missed.

He has left the Nation both legend and legacy.

Maybe most think of the legend, of the personality which was indeed unique. Unfortunately, I feel that this personality has in some part overshadowed the legislative achievements which he helped forge while in the House and the Senate.

Hardly any major legislation in the past three decades is void of his handiwork.

Senator DIRKSEN was counsel among Presidents. He was a leader and mentor among his peers in the Congress. But foremost, he was a servant of the American people.

My wife Becky and I offer our sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and Senator and Mrs. Baker.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray McHugh, of the Copley News Service, is the author of the superb tribute to the late Senator DIRKSEN. The Copley Newspapers include the Illinois State Journal and Illinois State Register, in Springfield, Ill., as well as the Aurora Beacon-News. These newspapers have been prominent in giving coverage and encouragement to Senator DIRKSEN throughout his political career. The remarks prepared by Mr. McHugh are therefore of special interest. Here is the text:

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN

(By Ray McHugh)

"In God we trust."

The phrase was more than a motto to Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen.

It was a way of life.

Since his death Sunday afternoon, there have been many eulogies and many reminiscences. Not a few have lamented the passing of the Senate's last great orator of the old eloquent tradition.

We shared the joy of Sen. Dirksen's resonant speeches, full with the quotations from the Bible, Shakespeare, and the classics and spiced with Spoon River humor, all honed when he was a young man in Pekin kneading bread dough in his brother's bakery and reciting classics in the rolling rhythm of the breadboard.

We shared the wonder at that cathedral organ voice that could thunder like the artillery he heard in World War I or whisper like a lover.

But the senior Senator from Illinois must be remembered for more than a great oratorical style.

Here was a man who believed fiercely in the basic difference between right and wrong. His words often sent well-educated reporters scurrying to their dictionaries, but his principles were as uncomplicated as the Illinois prairies from which he rose.

Everett McKinley Dirksen's priorities were simple. He owed his first allegiance to God, his second to the United States of America, his third to his family, his fourth to the Republican Party.

No President he ever served quarreled with those priorities. His wife Luella would not have cared the way she did if they had been different.

Without Sen. Dirksen, President John F. Kennedy would not have had the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which is regarded as his tallest monument.

Dirksen's reasoning was simple:

"I should not like to have written on my tombstone, 'He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take the first step.'"

Without Sen. Dirksen, President Lyndon B. Johnson would not have had the civil rights legislation that he considers his greatest contribution to the nation.

Without Sen. Dirksen, President Dwight D. Eisenhower's programs would have been emasculated in his last two years in office by a high-riding, newly-elected Democrat majority. Those were the years when a Dirksen-Johnson friendship born in the house in the late 1930s began to bear the fruit of national responsibility.

Without Sen. Dirksen, President Nixon would not have won Senate approval of the Safeguard anti ballistic missile system.

Without Sen. Dirksen, Mr. Nixon now faces trying days on Capitol Hill. No one since Sen. Robert A. Taft better deserved the title of "Mr. Republican" and it's hard to recall any Senator who had the man from Pekin's ability to lead a small band to decisive victories.

It is hard to forget how in the early 1960s, faced with overwhelming odds, Sen. Dirksen successfully defended the rights of working men against compulsory unionism; how only a year ago he directed the strategy that blocked Abe Fortas' nomination as Chief Justice of the United States; how he stood staunchly alongside President Johnson in the trying ordeal of Vietnam, privately leaning toward a "victory" policy, but publicly supporting his old friend on what to Dirksen was the best of all grounds:

"Because he is my President . . ."

Sen. Dirksen was not without his critics. They had grown in recent years, particularly in the ranks of liberal Republicans who complained that the Senator was out of step with the times, that his ideas were old-fashioned, that he did not understand the changing America.

Sen. Dirksen understood it. But he didn't like it.

It was only after grave soul-searching that he supported sweeping civil rights and educational changes.

"They are remaking America and you won't like it." He warned in the early stages of debate, but later in his final argument supporting President Johnson's proposals, he said:

"The time has come for equality in sharing Government and education, and in employment. It will not be stayed or denied. It is here."

But the time had not come for other changes.

Sen. Dirksen died without realizing one of his fiercest convictions—the restoration of prayer to public schools.

Nothing shook the old lawmaker more than the Supreme Court ruling outlawing such prayers. In Dirksen's view, the Court had taken something basic away from America.

His memory could be served in no better way than to hasten passage of a constitutional amendment that puts prayer back in the classroom and reasserts the Nation's faith in the words Everett McKinley Dirksen lived by:

"In God We Trust."

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans in expressing my personal sorrow over the loss of a great legislator and distinguished American, EVERETT DIRKSEN. On behalf of the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas, I express heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and their daughter. As the President ably pointed out in his eulogy yesterday, Senator DIRKSEN belonged to all the people. He was as highly regarded in Kansas as he was in Illinois.

He was indeed "one of a kind," and he will be sorely missed. He exercised great influence on much of the significant legislation of our times. He was a powerful spokesman for the Republican Party, and he loved the United States of America. But to EVERETT DIRKSEN, America always ranked above partisan politics.

We who knew him, who respected him, who worked with him, will never forget him. He was truly one of the great ones.

Mrs. Shriver joins with me in this expression of sorrow and sympathy on the loss of a good friend and a great patriot.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing sorrow over the loss of that great statesman, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. The Senator was truly a leader in every sense of the word. He was held in highest esteem by his constituents and his colleagues who looked to him as a source of pride and inspiration. His service in both the House and the Senate represent a lifetime of legislative achievement. His colorful life, dramatic career and oratorical style made him a striking, unique legend of our time.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and family.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN has left our midst in the Halls of Congress but he lives on in our hearts and minds. The pictures he has drawn on the pages of history will never fade but instead will become more vivid as each new genera-

tion brings them out and dusts them off in order to view the delicate art of leadership.

A leader is a trusted servant, and Senator DIRKSEN portrayed this so masterfully that future generations will have to do little if any retouching when they use his art as their example.

During his 36 years of service, he shared with his constituency, his party, and his Nation some of their highest and lowest points in history. Elected to the House of Representatives in 1933 with his party in power, he immediately experienced the depression and party change-over of the Presidency and the Congress which lasted through the war years of the 1940's. I feel it was during these years when others showed weakness that he gained the strength to carry on the business of his Nation and party which we saw him display to the very last moment of his life.

Senator DIRKSEN was an oratorical artist who could mold the thinking of both parties into a workable pattern from which a solution could be fashioned. He was a craftsman who never forced or pushed, but gently and firmly pressed the clay of the Nation's needs as he felt them into a statuesque presentation which all could look at and admire even though they might not agree with its message.

I personally am grateful to Senator DIRKSEN for showing me by his stalwart example how a dedicated leader of his party can also be a worthy and trusted servant of all the people of his Nation.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened at the passing of the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. The Nation has lost one of her most illustrious sons.

He was a great American, a great statesman, and a great leader.

The Nixon administration depended on him, as did other administrations for more than a quarter of a century. He was a Lincoln to his party and a dedicated champion for a better way of life for all Americans.

We must not let his passing discourage us, but rather provide an impetus for all Americans to strive even more diligently toward attaining the goals and ideals which were so precious to him. His inspiration to his party and to all Members of Congress lives on as a challenge for us.

EVERETT DIRKSEN was a rare individual. He may well be characterized as "a man for all seasons," for he served his State, his party, and his country equally diligently and well. His infectuous personality had two facets—wit and charm as well as logic and pragmatism. These served to influence the age in which he lived. His loyalty to the Republican Party was overshadowed only by his un-failing love of his family and loyalty to his country—no matter the season. He served his country unfalteringly—not only in the summers of his time—but also when the going got rough. He could be counted on to put forth the added effort, travel the extra mile, and meet any situation with a fixed determination to get the job done.

EVERETT DIRKSEN's views and ideas were perpetrated greatly through the in-

fluence of the news media. We were aware of his genius on a personal basis; however, the public depended on the news media to form its judgment.

The following editorial was broadcast on WCYB, a television station in Bristol, Tenn., in my district. I feel it merits repetition since it reflects the views of so many of my fellow Tennesseans and Americans. It is entitled "Dirksen Influence Was Tremendous":

DIRKSEN INFLUENCE WAS TREMENDOUS

America admires a winner and leader, especially if he has the ability and adroitness to create an aura of color around himself.

Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois captured their admiration and fancy. So millions of Americans who knew Senator Dirksen only through television, radio and the printed word, regret his passing from life and the political scene.

Senator Dirksen was the most powerful figure in Congress for the past decade. He was by far the most colorful, with his rare skill for oratory and debate, and unusual personal appearance.

Politically, he generally mirrored the evolution of the American economy and thought.

He went to Congress in 1932 as an arch conservative. Within the past decade he gave vital support to civil rights legislation, a bond issue for the United Nations, and a treaty banning above-ground nuclear testing. From isolationist he became an internationalist.

Yet he retained his conservatism to the extent that he has sought a constitutional amendment to override the Supreme Court decision that population be the sole basis for apportioning seats in State legislatures.

Mr. Dirksen served either in the House or Senate for 35 years. He was highly intelligent.

During that more than a third of a century hundreds of people went to him for help. When he felt the justness of their positions he helped many hundreds. He also helped scores of other Members of Congress with their legislation.

Senator Dirksen had the ability to make use of those whom he had helped. That probably was the secret of his rare Congressional power in the final decade of his life.

It was the Dirksen off the floor of Congress that we liked best. He could put on a flamboyant show for newsmen. He could be bitingly satirical . . . he was a past-master as a conversationalist.

The Senator's daughter married a Tennessean and he was a close friend of the late Rep. B. Carroll Reece of Johnson City. He developed rare familiarity with State politics in the South.

On one occasion he sympathized with our stateline problem of covering five States. He did it with a half-hour word-picture of the political situations in those States and some prophecies that became truth. We marveled at his detail.

We also marveled at his physical endurance. For years before his last illness Senator Dirksen suffered from a bleeding ulcer, a pinched nerve in his back and emphysema.

The Congress and the Nation have lost a rare figure. His death will have some deep visible effects on the Washington scene.

This editorial was picked at random. There were many other glowing tributes—tributes that will linger forever in the hearts and minds of Americans.

My wife joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his wife and members of his family.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, many people from my district have written and called expressing their feeling of profound loss due to the death of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. One constituent called

at 1 a.m. Monday morning, after hearing of the tragedy on the late news, to inquire as to the address of Mrs. Dirksen so that he might send her a telegram of sympathy. People all across the Nation felt a personal loss when this great man passed away. I would be remiss if I did not take advantage of the opportunity afforded me as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for history some of the thoughts of my constituents and my own concerning this outstanding American.

Senator DIRKSEN was a very important and extremely busy public official. Yet he was kind and generous with his time and wise counsel, especially to new Members of the Congress. Many of my constituents had written to me asking that I support the Dirksen amendment to the Constitution which would permit prayer in public schools and buildings. I approved of the amendment but felt a need to do more than pay lip service. So I called Senator DIRKSEN about his amendment. He said, "Come on over. We'll talk about it." When I arrived his waiting room was full of people. But because of his intense interest in his resolution, he wanted to give it first priority. He suggested that I introduce a similar resolution in the House, which I did. Most say that the possibility of such an amendment died with the Senator. I think it would be a fitting, lasting tribute to him if the Members of Congress would now adopt a resolution which would submit such an amendment to the people of the States for approval.

Yes, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN has now passed into the pages of history but the contributions of this great statesman will never die. His memory will serve as an inspiration to all who follow. As many great Americans, Senator DIRKSEN began life as a smalltown boy and rose to the pinnacle of American politics. He has been termed by President Nixon "a giant in the history of Congress," an adviser and confidant to Presidents, a colorful and sparkling orator, a skilled parliamentarian, a loyal Republican, and—above all—a patriot and great American.

He possessed the courage of his conviction and his integrity, along with his many other qualities, endeared him to the Nation and created a legend in his own time.

All of us in this House can profit from his example as a dedicated public servant and as a kind and generous man. One of my constituents suggested we take his wise counsel regarding his prayer amendment. I would like to associate myself with the idea. While we are considering another amendment to the Constitution, relating to the selection of the President and Vice President, we should consider the possibility of a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools. Such an amendment would be an appropriate lasting monument to this great God-fearing man.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal loss that I join in paying tribute the memory of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

I was privileged to know and work with him as a Member of this body. His kindness and encouragements when I first came here will never be forgotten. During the years of his service in the Senate, when I was privileged to work closely with him on policy matters affecting our party and on legislation in which we were both involved, my respect for him, and my friendship with him, grew daily.

Senator DIRKSEN was a leader of men. He knew the demands of the legislative process in a representative government. While the Nation came to know him for his colorful personality and his inimitable gifts of humor and oratory, those of us who worked with him knew his other side—his grasp of the issues, his firmness in standing for what he believed right, his ability to achieve the kind of compromises necessary if a diverse society is to function.

Of EVERETT DIRKSEN, we can truly say that the Halls of Congress will not be the same now that he has been taken from us. He made his mark here and upon the Nation. He will be sorely missed. Mrs. Byrnes joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and his family in their time of sorrow.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in marking the passing of the distinguished Minority Leader of the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

A wise and eloquent man once said:

Whom the gods love die young no matter how long they live.

At 73, Senator DIRKSEN died youthful, a favorite of the common people as well as the gods. He was, as President Nixon said, a politician in the finest sense and an extremely likeable man.

As in the case of other great men, he was personally a paradox.

He cultivated a public reputation for eloquence, affability, and as a champion of good-natured causes. His television appearances, his writing, and his speaking, his devotion to gardening and his quick wit gave vitality and substance to that image.

Yet, there was much more. The foundations of his life were laced with earnest determination, studious hard work, and a remarkable professionalism in achieving the goals he pursued. Despite an outward casualness, he was a man meticulously aware of history, fact, and the nuances of political life.

A clergyman and acquaintance recalled the other day that as a young man, the Senator became interested in the Bible, studied it with increasing intensity and finally committed whole passages to memory.

That same single-minded intensity and devotion to hard work were hallmarks of his work in this body.

He worked long hours in the House often taking home a bulging briefcase. He immersed himself in the issues that were his primary responsibility and became a respected and recognized authority. The price was failing eyesight which eventually forced him to withdraw for a time from public life.

When he returned a few years later, he brought to his work in the Senate the same energy and determination linked

with that uniquely likable public personality.

The combination produced a distinguished and colorful career. In recent years, virtually every major piece of legislation passed by the Senate bore his personal mark, a fact which alone testifies to the importance of his life.

His impact often was equal to that of the Presidents of his time and he wielded power with wisdom and precision.

Like other great men, his life was a product of circumstance and timing more than an accurate reflection of his immense talents.

He was a man who very well might have been a President had time and circumstance been kinder. Yet, whatever personal slight fortune may have dealt him was propitious for his country and his party.

In a period in which his party was a distinct minority in Congress, his resonant eloquence was the single Republican voice uniformly recognized in every corner of the Nation.

It was a time when he wielded great influence but was denied many of the satisfactions that usually go with the formal mantle of authority.

Death came at a time when the party he had helped nurture through difficult years was again vital, in power and able to provide him some of those rewards.

As much as his wisdom, experience and leadership will be missed, we are fortunate to have had those colorfully packaged qualities as a vibrant bridge over difficult times.

The inflections of his life, like those in his voice, reassured and sustained us through a period when that is what his party and his country needed most.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN is a great loss to all of us. The late senior Senator from Illinois was a respected leader not only in his party and the U.S. Senate, but throughout the Nation.

He was a politician in the best sense of the concept. His life style, if not closely followed, should at least be carefully studied by all who seek influence and the wise use of it, who feel compassion for their fellow man, and who want to improve the entire world community.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the death of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN marks the end of an era. It will be a long time before the American political scene sees the likes of Senator DIRKSEN. The combination of his oratorical eloquence and his imprint on the laws of this Nation make him a unique American leader.

While it was not my privilege to know the Senator well, he stands out in my remembrances from the time of his 1952 speech to the Republican National Convention in Chicago. I am saddened by his passing personally, but more importantly the Nation loses when a man like Senator DIRKSEN leaves the governmental scene. There are few men who serve in public office who can truly be called giants, but in my judgment Senator DIRKSEN is one of them.

Mrs. Steiger joins in extending sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen, Senator and Mrs.

Baker, and to the rest of the Dirksen family.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as others have noted, after Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN was made, God threw away the mold—for he was, truly unique.

His loss is a national loss, and at the same time a personal loss to each and every one of us, for this fierce patriot, this courtly personage, this great orator who was, perhaps, the last of his kind, and this skilled legislator who left his personal mark on nearly every major piece of legislation that has passed from Capitol Hill to the White House during his long years of service, simply cannot be replaced.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN was the very epitome of a U.S. Senator. He looked like one; he acted like one—and enjoyed every dramatic moment of it—he spoke like one, loving words as much as he did the flowers he grew, cherishing the proper placement of each and nourishing both with the same tender, loving care; but, most of all, he served his Nation and his people in that effective, dedicated, and always-faithful manner that typifies the height of legislative service in which we believe to be the greatest legislative body in the world.

His wit, his patience, and his unflinching good humor in the midst of adversity, have become well known; but his uncanny ability to bring ideas and attitudes together without sacrifice of principle in that spirit of compromise which is the genesis of all legislative progress will be remembered longer—for it was in this latter fashion that he served both his calling and his beloved Nation.

Some have said he should have been a Shakespearean actor. I think, perhaps, he was—in a modern sense—much of the time. But, if so, it was an effective role, and one he enjoyed as well. Whatever the event, I have searched Shakespeare's works for the most appropriate lines to use in this tribute to our departed friend and colleague.

Though others with the same idea in mind may well already have used them, these lines from, first, "King Richard II" and, then, from "Julius Caesar" seem to me to best sum up the life of this most-estimable of all public servants:

"The purest treasure mortal times afford
Is spotless reputation. . . .

Mine honour is my life; both grow in one;
Take honour from me, and my life is done."

And then:

"His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, 'This was a man!'"

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: We have suffered a grievous loss, and one that will be almighty hard to overcome.

Mrs. Robison joins me in expressing our regrets to Mrs. Dirksen, to Senator and Mrs. Howard Baker, Jr., and to the people of the State of Illinois.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late minority leader of the Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN. The senior Senator from Illinois was a powerful influence on three and one-half decades of national legislative history. During his 16 years in the House and 18 years in the

Senate, EVERETT DIRKSEN became the "politician's politician." He understood the art of compromise but knew well enough when he had to stand firm. When he was under intense pressure he was able to bring to his side, those who opposed him.

He was a leader. He made opinion, shaped it, molded it, gave it form and substance. He rallied about him men of diverse philosophy and brought them to a common cause. He did not require that all of his followers come together under a single banner; those whose support he sought came with their honor intact and with the knowledge that their own principles had not been compromised.

He asked no more of others than he was prepared to give of himself. He fell to tasks for which lesser men might not have had the stomach for no other reason than it was required of him. He understood the demands of leadership when he said of himself:

I am of the stuff which cries "Chief, hand me the red-hot poker."

Unlike too many "little statesmen" for whom foolish consistency is a hobgoblin which diverts them from the truth, DIRKSEN saw himself in the course of history and understood the need to revise his own attitudes to fit the prevailing needs of the Nation. On issues of foreign policy, civil rights, and economics he was attacked because, according to his detractors, he had changed his mind. Undoubtedly he had. But he did so, not capriciously, but after much agonizing and only after he had convinced himself that national requisites had indeed changed. He understood Victor Hugo's immortal line:

Stronger than all the armies is an idea
whose time has come.

After three and one-half decades, even though EVERETT DIRKSEN's time had come, his life stands as a monument to political leadership, a life which disavowed foolish consistency for dynamic change.

Mrs. Daniels joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dirksen and to Senator and Mrs. Howard Baker, Jr., on their great loss.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has lost one of its great legislators in the death of Senator DIRKSEN.

The Senator from Illinois, who began his illustrious career in this body, was undoubtedly one of the Nation's best known political leaders. He was a master of the legislative processes and one of the most influential men in our Government.

Always considerate and courteous in his dealings with others, the Senator was one of the few in this Capitol whom visiting constituents always recognized and generally wanted to meet. He was invariably generous and warm in his visits with the people from any State who wished to greet him, and was willing to discuss any public issue.

I deeply appreciated his kindness to Oklahomans on the several occasions when he met with constituents from the Second District, and know that many Americans share a sense of loss in his passing.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected and untimely death of Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN shocks and saddens us all.

He was a great man and a great political leader. His wisdom, wit, and personality will be sorely missed in the Congress of the United States, but what will be missed most is his legislative skill and statesmanship. Without the untiring efforts of Senator DIRKSEN, many of the most important legislation in recent years would not have become law.

EVERETT DIRKSEN was more than a political craftsman of the first order; he was a political personality which had no equal since the days of Daniel Webster. His colorful personality, his engaging air, and his bombastic colloquies delivered in a rich baritone, set a style in the Senate that may never be recaptured.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the voices of the Senate, or more correctly one of the voices of our time, has been stilled. The passing of the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, distinguished minority leader of the other body and a longtime friend, has saddened us all, for his voice was an almost irreplaceable one. I had the privilege of knowing, working with, and being a friend of EVERETT DIRKSEN for many years. He served as a fellow member of the House Committee on Appropriations and later was a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. EVERETT DIRKSEN was known the length and breadth of the land as his mellifluous tones and flowing mane graced thousands of television programs and news pictures. But he was known the length and breadth of Congress, too, not for these caricatures but as a hard working, professional politician and warm, generous friend. He was a professional in every sense of the word and his word was professional in that it was never a thing given lightly. Mr. Speaker, the people of Illinois and the U.S. Congress will miss EVERETT DIRKSEN as will his many friends. To his dear wife and family I extend the Rooney's deepest sympathy and prayers.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, the former senior Senator from the State of Illinois.

Senator DIRKSEN will long be remembered for his dedicated and diligent service to his party, his State and to the Nation. The public knew EVERETT DIRKSEN as a colorful personality and an eloquent orator. In Congress, however, this skilled legislator was admired for his sound grasp of the role of the legislative process in a democratic government. Senator DIRKSEN was firmly partisan when partisanship was appropriate, but could be thoroughly statesmanlike when the best interests of the Nation demanded it.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in expressing our regrets and extending our prayers to Mrs. Dirksen and to the family in their bereavement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life, character, and service of the late Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

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

There was no objection.

INVITATION TO ATTEND MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution from the Senate of the United States, which was read:

S. RES. 254

Resolved, That the Secretary invite the Members of the House of Representatives to attend memorial services for the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen in the rotunda of the Capitol on Tuesday, September 9, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon; and be it further

Resolved, That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard to attend the memorial services in the rotunda of the Capitol.

ACCEPTANCE OF INVITATION TO ATTEND MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 531

Resolved, That the House of Representatives accepts the invitation of the Senate to attend memorial services for the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen in the rotunda of the Capitol on Tuesday, September 9, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11:45 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS SEPTEMBER 16 FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS, AND VACATION OF PREVIOUS AUTHORITY FOR SEPTEMBER 10

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the authority for the Speaker to declare a recess on September 10 be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time on September 16 for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the Apollo 11 astronauts.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE HAROLD A. PATTEN

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the House has heard this morning a series of deserved tributes to a great and incomparable American, the late Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN, and I join in those tributes.

However, I have the sad and unfortunate duty to officially inform the Members of the House of the death last Saturday of one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Harold A. "Porque" Patten of Arizona.

Mr. Patten died at the age of 61 after a long and extremely painful and difficult illness in the Veterans' Hospital in Tucson, Ariz.

"Porque" Patten, as we called him, served with distinction in the 81st, 82d, and 83d Congresses, and with particular distinction on the Committee on Armed Services. Although he was virtually assured of reelection in 1954, he declined to seek the Democratic nomination for the 84th Congress.

He was an extremely popular and congenial Member of this House. I think no one could ever meet "Porque" Patten and forget him. He had a unique zest for life which made him more friends than almost anyone I ever knew.

"Porque" was born in Husted, Colo., in 1907 and moved with his family to Tucson in 1916. He attended the Tucson public schools and graduated from Tucson High School. At the University of Arizona, where he earned a degree in 1930, he was an outstanding athlete. His first job was as a coach and teacher of physical education at Tucson High School.

I might add that the athletic programs at the University of Arizona never had a better friend than "Porque" Patten. He was constantly on the lookout for budding athletes who could add their talents to the university's athletic programs.

In 1933 Mr. Patten was named director of recreation for the city of Tucson and the Tucson public schools. In 1939 he stepped up to the position of State recreation director.

Looking back on those years, I would say that Harold A. Patten was one of the most successful and best-liked persons ever to work in the field of public recreation. Through his efforts thousands of young people from poor neighborhoods

found activities that were interesting and exciting to them. Through his success in these activities he made good citizens out of an awful lot of youngsters who needed his kind of infectious leadership and guidance.

During World War II Mr. Patten gave truly outstanding service as a combat observer with the Air Corps, earning a proud list of decorations in 31 months of foreign service in the European theater.

He entered military service with the Seventh Cavalry Regiment as a first lieutenant in August 1940. He transferred to the Air Corps the following year. As a combat observer he served in Africa and Italy, earning the Air Medal, 10 battle stars, an invasion arrowhead, and the coveted Wings-Aviation Francaise d'Afrique. He was discharged as a major in 1945 and retired from the Air Force Reserve in 1960 as a lieutenant colonel.

This man of great public service and warm, friendly personality will be sorely missed by his fine family, his wife Mary and his two sons, Mike and Tom, by his host of personal friends, many of whom still serve and work in the Congress, and by the State and Nation that he served so devotedly.

Mr. Speaker, last year when Mr. Patten was first confined to the hospital and it became known he would never recover, the Arizona Daily Star published an editorial about your old colleague which brought back happy memories of his youth. Without objection I would like to conclude my brief remarks today by inserting the text of that editorial at this point in the RECORD:

A TUCSON SAGA

Occasionally one looks around and sees something so strikingly in Tucson character that it seems to deserve comment. The career of Harold A. (Porque) Patten, former First District Congressman, former Commander of the Arizona American Legion, and one-time Tucson High School and University of Arizona athlete, is a good example.

The "Porque," by the way, comes from Patten's propensity as a boy to use that word, which in Spanish means "Why?"

Porque's father was a railroad engineer and at one time a professional baseball player. Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Patten lived for some years on East Ninth Street, from where Porque and his sister, Helena (now Mrs. Harley Cox of Tucson), went to school. The parental aspirations for education of the children was fulfilled in both Porque's and Pat's (that's Helena's nickname) case.

Porque's father had hoped that Porque would be an athlete. And Porque was a good one on the football field, in high school and at the University. He remains one of the University's most loyal fans.

In the group Porque played with as a boy were a number of people who have attained prominence, though not by going to Congress, as Porque did. One of that old Ninth Street gang was Ted Bland, who likewise was a football player, and who was killed in World War II action of August, 1944.

As Tucson grows, it is good sometimes to remember some of the folks out of its past. Tucson once was a small desert town, largely dominated on east and south sides by Southern Pacific's and at one time El Paso and Southwestern Railroaders. Carl Hayden Community Hospital is in a building on the spacious and beautifully landscaped grounds of the old EP&SW.

The city has grown tremendously. Newcomers have arrived in droves. Perhaps there are only a handful still around who knew

Porque as a boy. Fortunately, the city's character has not changed, and it still possesses the warmth and opportunity that encouraged Porque to achieve football fame and a congressional seat.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Arizona. I was not aware of the death of our good friend and former colleague, Harold A. "Porque" Patten. His wife, Mary Rierdon, came from my district in Madill, Okla. Both she and "Porque" were good friends of mine while "Porque" was serving in Congress. We had neighboring offices on the fourth floor of the Cannon Building and visited frequently. He was a wonderful man, a fine Congressman, and highly respected by all of his colleagues.

Mrs. Albert and I join in extending to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to come to the Congress with "Porque" Patten following the election of 1948. His wife and my wife and "Porque" and myself became very close personal friends.

Mr. Speaker, every kind word that has been said about "Porque" Patten was exactly accurate and totally true. He was a warm and friendly person. He worked at his job. People liked him on both sides of the aisle. Many of us regretted that he left the House of Representatives.

I am shocked to hear that "Porque" died. I did not think he was as old as the gentleman from Arizona has said because he never created that impression. He was a great and good friend of mine. I am saddened as my wife, Betty, will be by the news of his passing.

I extend to his wife and to his family our deepest condolences.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that the gentleman from Arizona has made and to add my own expression of condolence and my sense of personal loss on the passing of my dear and good friend "Porque" Patten.

I served with "Porque" for 2 years as a Member of the House of Representatives. My district is the first district which at that time comprised only Maricopa County. There were only two Members from Arizona at that time, and the gentleman from Arizona from the second district, Mr. Patten, represented the rest of the State. He used to say laughingly that he represented the doughnut and I represented the hole, because of the fact that his district surrounded mine completely.

He was a man who had the capacity of being a friend beyond the usual definition of the term. He was generous to a fault. He was generous with his time. He was generous with his money. He was particularly pleasant and courteous to people from our State who might happen to be in Washington, D.C. In fact, Mary Patten really never knew how

many people would be at the house for dinner and she never knew how many people would be there to sleep because "Porque" could not stand anybody from Arizona having a meal at a strange place in Washington or sleeping in a bed that that was not in the home of an Arizonan.

He was a man who contributed greatly to the work of the House of Representatives. His work as a Member of the House of Representatives at the time the Central Arizona project first came up was done diligently and effectively.

He was a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a member of the Committee on Armed Services. As such he was a most effective man.

He was also a very active member of the Air Force Reserve, who went on active duty every year. He was very proud of his commission and of his connection with the Air Force.

Most of all, he was a good father, a good husband, a good friend and a good American.

To our dear friend, Mary Patten, and to Mike and Tom Patten, Mrs. Rhodes and I extend our deepest sympathies and our assurance that their sense of loss in the passing of "Porque" is shared by us.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the life and career of our former colleague.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CONSTRUCTION CUT IS UNBELIEVABLE

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to cut Federal construction by 75 percent is unbelievable. It can scarcely be held to be a curb against inflation. It does not involve sufficient funds to have an appreciable influence. If inflation is to be curbed in a realistic way, it will have to be by stronger measures. The proposal is one which leaves completely up in the air the committees of Congress which deal with all levels of construction. Authorization and funding of new construction projects presumably will simply add to the pool of projects awaiting construction. There is also the very unsatisfactory situation of Presidential veto of line item projects which administrative agencies have already justified to the Congress as fully required for necessary training of the military forces and the proper operation of Government agencies. The question of politics will certainly be charged in connection with the manner in which decisions are reached on those projects which are to be built and those to be further delayed.

Among the paramount items in this discussion is housing for military families and for bachelor officers and enlisted men who live on base. They are among

those who have greatest need for improved accommodations and they could be among those most adversely affected.

The entire question is one which requires much more careful thought than is apparent from the early communiques. It presents a distressing picture which will work serious hardship in many areas and almost certainly fail to accomplish the stated objectives. In the meantime, prices will continue to go up and if past history is repeated, an additional 5 to 10 percent per year in cost will have to be reckoned with when the projects are finally built.

The proposal is an unfortunate one which is certain to do more harm than good.

HO CHI MINH NEVER PRAISED

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, any man may criticize another man's statement in this well in the manner in which he sees it, except that he may not properly make a scurrilous misrepresentation of another's words. I do not know how the caption preceding the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATSON), found its way into the RECORD on page 24372—certainly not by his intention, I am sure, because he is a gentleman. But it is indeed such a scurrilous misrepresentation that it should be stricken from the permanent RECORD. The caption which, to the ordinary voter, appears to be the impartial characterization of a statement previously made on the floor is, and I quote, "Response to the Praise of Ho Chi Minh." Immediately thereafter the gentleman from South Carolina identified the Member whose name he connected with such alleged praise.

No one has ever praised Ho Chi Minh on this floor, to my knowledge. Certainly that Member did not do so. The gentleman from South Carolina should, I think, ask that his remarks at this point be expunged from the permanent RECORD, but if he does not choose to do so, his own statement is at least qualified as being his understanding of the previous speaker's statement, an understanding which the RECORD shows to be egregiously incorrect.

But the caption is not so qualified. It points unequivocally to "praise" which was not made and it appears to be an editorial caption, not necessarily merely the sadly inaccurate opinion or understanding of the gentleman from South Carolina. If the gentleman from South Carolina is the author of the caption, he should ask that it be expunged from the permanent RECORD. If he is not, he should advise the gentleman from Texas that it is not, so he may ask unanimous consent that it be expunged.

SAFE RETURN OF AMBASSADOR ELBRICK

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of this House received

the news with a great deal of pleasure and a sense of great relief when Ambassador Elbrick was returned safely by his captors yesterday in Rio de Janeiro, after the assurance that the Brazilian Government had met the ransom demands.

Ambassador Elbrick is not only a constituent of mine but also a friend of mine. When I first heard news of his capture, I got in touch with the Secretary of State and urged that everything be done which could possibly contribute to the Ambassador's speedy and safe release.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to extend my thanks and appreciation and praise now to Secretary of State Rogers and to the Department of State for the outstanding job which they have done in winning the release of Ambassador Elbrick.

Also I take this opportunity as one Member of this House to express my appreciation to the Brazilian Government. These certainly were very onerous and difficult ransom demands which they were obliged to meet, a little bit like having somebody kidnap your baby and then have the kidnapers ask the fellow next door to pay the ransom. However, the Brazilian Government met those terms—not without some opposition, I might—and there may be some serious repercussions in the future.

But we as Americans should be grateful that the Brazilian Government put the safety of our Ambassador above everything else, and he has now been returned to his embassy and his wife.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

NEIL ARMSTRONG HONORED BY WAPAKONETA, OHIO

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, Mr. Neil Armstrong, commander of Apollo 11, the first man on the moon, was welcomed home by thousands of Wapakoneta, Auglaize County, Ohio, people, and by countless other friends and admirers, conservatively estimated to be more than 80,000 people.

A sage of old observed long, long ago:

A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country.

And Rudyard Kipling once said:

Prophets have honour all over the Earth, Except in the village where they were born.

The reception for and the homage paid to Comdr. Neil Armstrong and his family, in his own home town last Saturday, conclusively proved that neither sage, nor muse nor poet could see as far into the future as Neil Armstrong could see into space.

THE LATE HONORABLE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a still sadness hanging over us today for this Nation has suffered deep sorrow in the passing of a distinguished American, the Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN.

Though we have tried in words to express our sympathy to the widow; daughter, Mrs. Howard H. Baker, Jr.; and family members, we at best fall short of the tribute due Senator DIRKSEN. The world has shared his wisdom, his great talent of expression, his humility, his great dignity, his hard work, his efforts for the betterment of man.

He was looked up to by men in all walks of life and was a great friend to all of us, regardless of politics, race, or religion. There is not a single man around who can replace this great statesman; he was, as a newsman said this morning, a "living legend." He enjoyed life, and tried to make others happy too. He left behind many rich deeds from which we can benefit and he helped to write many pages of history through which posterity can gain inspiration, courage, and wisdom. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN was a very wise man, a great man.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MADDEN. 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. 159]

Abblitt	Clausen,	Frey
Addabbo	Don H.	Gaydos
Ashbrook	Clay	Glalmo
Ashley	Cleveland	Gilbert
Beall, Md.	Colmer	Green, Oreg.
Bevill	Conyers	Green, Pa.
Blaggi	Corman	Griffiths
Blester	Coughlin	Grover
Bingham	Cowger	Gubser
Blanton	Cunningham	Halpern
Brademas	Daddario	Hansen, Wash.
Brasco	Daniels, N.J.	Hébert
Brock	Davis, Ga.	Helstoski
Brooks	Dawson	Henderson
Burke, Fla.	Dennis	Hungate
Burleson, Tex.	Dent	Huntson, Calif.
Burlison, Mo.	Diggs	Karth
Burton, Calif.	Donohue	Keith
Burton, Utah	Dorn	Kirwan
Bush	Dulski	Landgrebe
Cabell	Dwyer	Leggett
Cahill	Edwards, Calif.	Lipscomb
Carey	Esch	Long, La.
Carter	Fallon	Lukens
Casey	Fish	McEwen
Celler	Fisher	McFall
Clancy	Flowers	MacGregor
Clark	Foley	Mann

Mathias	Quie	Shriver
Mikva	Quillen	Sikes
Mollohan	Railsback	Sisk
Monagan	Reifel	Smith, Calif.
Moorhead	Reuss	Smith, Iowa
Moss	Rooney, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Nichols	Rooney, Pa.	Stuckey
Nix	Rosenthal	Teague, Tex.
O'Hara	Rostenkowski	Tierman
O'Konski	Roudebush	Watkins
Ottinger	Ruppe	Watson
Patten	St Germain	Whalley
Pepper	Sandman	Wilson,
Philbin	Scheuer	Charles H.
Powell	Sebelius	Wylder
Pucinski	Shipley	Zion

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 300 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 527 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 527

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments there-to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 527 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 11039 to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

H.R. 11039 authorizes \$101.1 million, the amount requested by the Executive, to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during fiscal year 1970. This is \$900,000 less than the fiscal year 1969 appropriation.

In addition, a minor amendment is made to the act to authorize the Comptroller General and the Peace Corps, within prescribed limits, to waive claims of not more than \$500 arising out of erroneous payments to volunteers or volunteer leaders of the allowances provided under the Peace Corps Act—mainly readjustment and subsistence allowances.

The Comptroller General would be required to waive claims only when collecting them would be against equity and good conscience and not in the best interest of the United States. They cannot

be waived if there is an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee.

The purpose is to avoid unnecessary expense involved in trying to collect from returned volunteers small sums resulting from erroneous overpayments.

It is anticipated that as of June 30, 1970, the number of volunteers overseas will be 2,525 in Africa; 1,800 in North Africa-Near East-South Asia; 2,100 in East Asia-Pacific; and 2,825 in Latin America.

The new Director of the Peace Corps intends to give greater emphasis to the selection of volunteers possessing skills which would permit them to render the most effective service in the countries where they are located. For this reason it is expected that a somewhat smaller number of better qualified volunteers will be provided in the future. The Peace Corps has made a remarkable record of building good will between our country and the nations where the Peace workers have been assigned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 527 in order that H.R. 11039 may be considered by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 527 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 11039, the Peace Corps Act Amendments of 1969.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Peace Corps Act to extend for 1 year the authority in the act. The bill as reported authorizes \$101.1 million to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during fiscal year 1970, the amount requested by the Executive. In addition, it makes a minor amendment to the Peace Corps Act to authorize the Comptroller General and the Peace Corps, within prescribed limits, to waive claims arising out of erroneous payments of allowances to volunteers or volunteer leaders.

The bill would authorize \$900,000 less than the fiscal 1969 appropriation of \$102 million. This reflects the desire of the Peace Corps both to abide by this year's budgetary restraints, and more importantly, as the gentleman mentioned, to put more emphasis on quality rather than quantity in fielding volunteers. Consequently, while there will be a slight reduction in the number of volunteers in the field this year, there will be an increase in the number of skilled volunteers brought into the Peace Corps.

Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN), brought this bill to the Rules Committee, he spoke in glowing terms of the new directions being charted for the Peace Corps by its new Director, Mr. Joseph Blatchford. He said he was particularly pleased with Mr. Blatchford's intentions to give greater attention to the third goal of the Peace Corps—to contribute to the trained manpower needs of other countries.

Since its inception in 1961, the Peace Corps has grown from a fledgling agency of 120 volunteers in three countries to

what it is today, an agency having 12,400 volunteers in 59 countries.

When he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 24, the new Peace Corps Director, Mr. Blatchford, pointed out that in his recent overseas tour, host country officials expressed appreciation for what the Peace Corps was doing, but at the same time, expressed a need for more skilled volunteers to assist them in their development.

In Mr. Blatchford's words:

The fact is we have said goodbye to the days when African countries hungered for help of any kind. The euphoria of independence with its companion promise of outside aid has given way to a "go it alone" spirit and development budgets straining to get the most out of limited natural or human resources. Requests for outside aid, particularly those bringing people instead of money, today reflect higher priorities and call for higher skills both because the problems are increasingly sophisticated and because of the almost universal yearning to be free of outside dependence.

Mr. Speaker, as the times and conditions change, so must our approaches to meeting the challenges of the changing times. The world of the seventies will not be the same as the world of the sixties. Likewise, the Peace Corps of the seventies will not be the same as the Peace Corps of the sixties. The Peace Corps has done an outstanding job for America and the world over the past decade and it will continue to render a valuable service so long as it is able to adapt to the changing times. I think the new Peace Corps Director is to be commended for recognizing this fact and for taking steps to insure that the Peace Corps is as modern as today and is making a substantial contribution to third world development.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 527 in order that H.R. 11039 may be considered.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN. 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. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended.

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

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. 11039, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair at this time recognizes the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11039 authorizes \$101,100,000 to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during fiscal year 1970. This is \$900,000 less than the \$102 million appropriated for fiscal year 1969.

The bill also includes a minor amendment to existing law to authorize the waiver of claims not exceeding \$500, arising from overpayments to Peace Corps volunteers in accordance with legislation already in effect with respect to other Government agencies.

The bill makes no other changes in existing law relating to the Peace Corps.

All of us are aware that, since its beginning in 1961, the Peace Corps has come to occupy an important place, not only in the foreign countries where the volunteers serve but also in the United States.

It is hard for us to realize that since the Peace Corps began 30,000 volunteers have returned to the United States after serving overseas.

If the necessary funds are made available, the Peace Corps plans to take on 7,500 new recruits during fiscal year 1970, and these people will come from communities all over this country.

Although the Peace Corps is a large and important operation, it is not increasing in size or in cost. The new Director of the Peace Corps has announced his intention to give greater emphasis to sending out volunteers who are technicians and somewhat less emphasis to recruiting recent college graduates. He wants to find volunteers who have had experience as carpenters, mechanics, farmers and accountants.

It will be difficult to find people with these qualifications who are willing to work for \$75 a month and a very modest living allowance. The Peace Corps believes that it is better to send out fewer volunteers but those who can supply the skills which the less developed countries need the most than to send out people who are easier to locate but are not as able to render the most essential services.

This does not mean that the Peace Corps can or should be transformed overnight. At the present time, over half the volunteers in service are teachers and the school systems in many countries cannot find local people who are qualified to teach. Any drastic curtailment of Peace Corps operations in the immediate future would create serious problems for the countries that are counting on the services of volunteers in their schools and in other programs.

The authorization in this bill will finance an average overseas strength of 9,432 volunteers during fiscal year 1970. Peace Corps volunteers are now serving in 59 countries. Full details as to the number of volunteers in every country are set forth in the tables in the committee report.

There are over 500 volunteers each in the Philippines, Malaysia and India. There are over 400 volunteers in Brazil. The presence of these young people from the United States in these countries is important to them, and it is important to our people that they be able to carry

out their plans to serve in these countries.

The record of the Peace Corps overseas is remarkably good. At infrequent intervals there are press reports of incidents involving the Peace Corps. In most cases it turns out that charges against Peace Corps volunteers have been brought by leftist groups in the country who are trying to embarrass their governments by charging that the volunteers are spies or that their presence is evidence of American imperialism.

There are eight countries where Peace Corps operations have been terminated. In two of these the Peace Corps has gone back at the request of the government. In no case was such action the result of any incident or incidents involving volunteers. In some cases the governments did not want the Peace Corps to continue because they wanted to indicate their dissatisfaction with U.S. foreign policy.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania in Africa ordered the Peace Corps out on 48 hours' notice in June 1967, when they broke off diplomatic relations with the United States following the Israel-Arab war.

Back in 1966, Guinea ordered the Peace Corps out of the country because when a Pan American airplane stopped in Ghana, the Ghana authorities seized a delegation of officials from Guinea and held them hostage. Guinea blamed the United States because Pan American was a U.S. airline, and kicked out the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps has now gone back at their request.

Although Pakistan encouraged the Peace Corps to close out operations in 1967, it did not expel the Peace Corps and explained their attitude on the grounds that the volunteers did not have the right technical qualifications. Many of us suspected that Pakistan turned against the Peace Corps because the United States did not take their side in their war with India.

The Peace Corps also closed out in Indonesia, Gabon, Tanzania, and Ceylon, but in Ceylon they have gone back after a new government took over.

There have been a number of cases where Peace Corps volunteers have been attacked because they were teachers in schools where there were riots and demonstrations. Apparently they were not attacked because they belonged to the Peace Corps, and such attacks did not reflect any underlying hostility toward Americans. Being a teacher may be a hazardous occupation in any country.

I want to say a word about the provisions of the bill relating to the settlement of claims. There is a law on the books, the citation appears in the bill, which authorizes the waiver of any claim of less than \$500 for erroneous payment to any employee of an executive agency.

The bill merely extends the same authority which already applies to other Government agencies to Peace Corps volunteers.

This does not mean that all claims under \$500 will be waived. The Comptroller General is required to waive claims only when collecting them would be against equity and good conscience

and not in the best interest of the United States.

Claims cannot be waived if there is an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee.

The purpose is to avoid unnecessary expense involved in trying to collect from returned volunteers small sums resulting from erroneous overpayments.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has a good thing going in the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps has a new Director who apparently is not an empire builder. He is trying to improve and adapt rather than to expand. I believe the direction he is taking deserves the support of the Congress, and I hope that this bill will be approved by a substantial majority.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the Peace Corps authorization bill. Chairman MORGAN has already reviewed many of the details, but I would like to emphasize that the bill we consider today is an authorization request of \$101,100,000 which is less than the amount appropriated a year ago.

I commend the new Director of the Peace Corps for recognizing the need for fiscal restraint. I am pleased that under the leadership of Mr. Joseph H. Blatchford, the Peace Corps is taking positive steps to tighten up its administration, reduce its costs, and improve its efficiency.

It should be noted that the Peace Corps is moving toward a new emphasis on quality rather than quantity, which will enable the United States to serve more effectively the countries that are hosts to our Peace Corps volunteers. There will be greater emphasis on recruiting volunteers with practical skills in agriculture, carpentry, and the various trades—skills which are urgently needed in many of the developing countries.

As Members of the House know, while I have supported the Peace Corps in the past, I have also been a frequent critic of its administration. So, it is a particular pleasure for me today to offer my strong support for this authorization bill, confident that the Peace Corps is taking the steps necessary to assist developing countries more effectively.

For the information of Members, I include the following explanatory material relative to countries in which the Peace Corps is no longer present:

COUNTRIES FROM WHICH THE PEACE CORPS HAS WITHDRAWN AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF WITHDRAWAL

CEYLON

The Peace Corps suspended its operations in Ceylon in June, 1964, when the only group of Volunteers to serve in Ceylon completed its two years of service. The Volunteers had served as science, home economics and physical education teachers. The Government of Ceylon, under the Prime Ministership of Mrs. Bandaranaike, did not ask for replacements for these Volunteers nor for additional groups. It is noteworthy that the Government of Ceylon-Peace Corps agreement was not cancelled, allowing Ceylon to invite the Peace Corps to reopen its program at a future date without the necessity of negotiating a new agreement. In early 1967, under the Prime Ministership of Dudley Senanayake, the Government of

Ceylon, under this original agreement, requested new Peace Corps Volunteers to work in food production and rural community development. These Volunteers arrived in Ceylon on December 12, 1967.

CYPRUS

When hostilities broke out in Cyprus, it proved impossible for the Peace Corps Volunteers to continue their work during those hostilities. Accordingly they were pulled out in February, 1964, a few months before their normal termination. By the time hostilities stopped, their tour was up, and therefore, they never went back.

GUINEA

On Tuesday, November 8, 1966, President Sekou Toure of Guinea ordered expulsion of the Peace Corps Volunteers by November 15, 1966. At the same time, he complimented the Peace Corps for its contribution and sacrifice. This act of expulsion was the culmination of a series of incidents which created strained relations between Ghana and Guinea and in which the United States was accused of complicity. A Pan American plane en route to Addis Ababa made a stopover in Accra. Ghanaians boarded the plane and ordered the Guinean delegation to disembark, and members of the delegation were held as hostages. Blaming the incident on the United States because Pan Am is an American company, the Embassy residence was ransacked, Pan Am World Airways personnel were expelled, and eventually, other official United States personnel and the Peace Corps were also expelled. In September of 1968 the Government of Guinea requested the re-establishment of a Peace Corps program in that country, and the Peace Corps responded affirmatively. The first program to be mounted involves Volunteer Mechanics.

INDONESIA

In May, 1965, the Peace Corps program consisting primarily of sport coaches was terminated as a result of a mutual decision by the Peace Corps and Indonesian authorities. The Peace Corps initiated the action because it had become apparent that the Volunteers were no longer able to operate effectively in the face of a calculated campaign on the part of the PKI (Indonesian Communist Party) to harass and embarrass the Peace Corps, and if possible, force its withdrawal. By April, 1965, it had become apparent that the Indonesian Government could no longer guarantee the safety of the Volunteers. In the May withdrawal, there was a mutual agreement on the part of the Peace Corps and the Government of Indonesia that we would look forward to the time when Peace Corps Volunteers could resume their service. The withdrawal of the Volunteers was carried out effectively and without incident. Relations between the Peace Corps and the Government of Indonesia continued on a friendly basis throughout the withdrawal.

MAURITANIA

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, in order to show its solidarity with other Arab states during the war with Israel, broke diplomatic relations with the United States on June 7, 1967. The Peace Corps with other United States personnel was given 48 hours in which to leave the country.

PAKISTAN

The Peace Corps closed out its operations in Pakistan in June, 1967, when the first group of Volunteers completed its full tour of service. The first group of Volunteers arrived in Pakistan in the autumn of 1961. They and subsequent groups of Volunteers served in rural public works, agriculture and education programs. The Government of Pakistan decided not to request additional Volunteers because it determined that its needs were for technicians and specialists of

a more sophisticated level than the Peace Corps generally provides, and we were not willing to concentrate such a high percentage of those we have in just one country.

GABON

On December 21, 1967, American Embassy in Libreville, Gabon, received a note from the Government of Gabon requesting the termination of the Peace Corps program there and the withdrawal of its personnel from Gabon by January 1, 1968. Although the note expressed the appreciation of the Government of Gabon for the services rendered by the Volunteers, no reason for the program's termination was given. The American Embassy responded on December 24 with a request for more time to effectuate the termination and withdrawal. That request was denied in a second note from the Government of Gabon which was received on January 4, 1968, after the Volunteers had departed pursuant to the original request of the Government of Gabon. The second note explained that the termination was required by budgetary deficiencies which had made it impossible for the Government of Gabon to continue its contribution to the program.

TANZANIA

The last group of Volunteers—seven soil scientists—will complete its two years of work in Tanzania at the end of the year, at which time the Peace Corps shall close its office. The Government of Tanzania has never stated publicly its reasons not to request more volunteers; nor have we felt that it was our place to demand an explanation. The Tanzanian decision no doubt rests upon factors regarded as bearing on Tanzanian national interests. We may at least presume that one factor in Tanzania's decision is its oft-stated policy of encouraging self-reliance at all levels of Tanzanian society.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to express myself as being in support of this legislation, and in support of the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana.

I have been particularly interested, as the gentleman knows, in the program which originally was called the school-to-school program, and now is known as the school partnership program, which is administered by the Peace Corps employing primarily private funds contributed by American school groups and service organizations for the purposes of constructing schools in foreign countries.

It is my understanding that this program, which has been so tremendously successful and has resulted in the establishment of hundreds of schools in foreign lands, will be continued and will continue to be administered by the Peace Corps. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct, and I would join in the gentleman's praise of this program.

It is true that most of the funding, most of the financing for the program, does come from private sources, many times nickels, dimes, and quarters which have been contributed by children in the American school system. However, there is a sum of money—although it is not identified as a separate item in the bill before us—but there is in this bill a sum

of money to be used for the purpose of continuing that program. It will be used mostly as it has been in the past several years. For example, in each of the last 3 years the amount of money earmarked for the administration of this program has been less.

Speaking in round numbers, in fiscal year 1968, \$171,000 was budgeted; in fiscal year 1969 the amount was \$150,000, and for the next fiscal year it will be about \$100,000. This, as I say, will be used generally for administrative and operating expenses.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank my colleague. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to comment that I had occasion to visit the pilot project of the school-to-school program, a facility in Colombia. When I was in Colombia a little over a year ago I was able to witness first hand the great benefits that flow from this program through the erection of a school and to see the opportunity for education that is being provided for these young children in Colombia, an opportunity that they would not otherwise have except for the contributions voluntarily made by American schoolchildren in this tremendous program promoting international understanding.

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman further, it is my understanding that this program makes it possible to obtain books and other learning materials for the schools. So it is a very worthwhile program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR) has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the pending legislation.

As the chairman of our committee has pointed out, the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1970 is below the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1969. Since a question is always raised with respect to the funding of our programs, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues specifically to page 3 of the report which shows that there has been a careful pruning of the program since it reached its high point in 1966, and that it has continually gone downward to the level proposed for the fiscal year 1970, which is the executive request.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to any organization or any appropriation the question can always be raised—"can we not do it for less money?" Or can we not spend less money? Why should we not authorize less money?

I think the answer is inherent in the review of three factors.

One, is that we are well aware that all in all the Peace Corps has done an outstanding job.

Two, is that the program has been scaled down on a reasonable basis over a period of years.

Third, you can cut down if you want to beyond the administration request, but you do so in terms of the number of volunteers we can send overseas.

We have already made cuts in the administrative personnel overseas and for

every million dollars that you cut the administration request you must reduce the program about 118 people. So you can use your own judgment and make your own program if you will. But I respectfully submit to you that the present request should be supported because there has been careful consideration by this administration; and because over a period of time under the previous administration the request and appropriation have been scaled downward; and there was a tightening in the administration; and because the program has been successful in areas and on matters that are fundamental to the kind of social, educational and health development programs that we would all like to see in developing countries.

I invite your attention to page 5 of the report showing the emphasis of our personnel in agriculture, community development, education, and health. The present reduced program has been requested by the administration in light of the administration's national priorities and overall budget view. I would also call to your attention that the effectiveness of the Peace Corps is reduced proportionally to the reduction in funds available to send volunteers overseas. For every \$10 million cut approximately 1,180 volunteers will have to be dropped. Such an amendment will be offered and I oppose it as too drastic a reduction which will substantially reduce the possible accomplishments of one of our most effective international programs.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in strong support of this extension of the authorization for the Peace Corps. All of us are reasonably familiar with the programs that have been underway over a period of years now and those of us who have traveled in countries where there are Peace Corps volunteers have talked to many of these men and women. The general impression is that they have been doing a good job.

I remember very well a trip we took a few years ago to Malaysia. There was one volunteer in a leprosarium, working alone there. There were no other Americans there. More recently, a number of us last March met many volunteers working in Korea.

It goes without saying that there is an understanding and a pretty broad acceptance of the ideals and objectives of the Peace Corps. The fact is that the Peace Corps is in the interest of our country.

I rise primarily to support the plea which has just been made by the gentleman from Florida with regard to the funding level. It would be most unwise if we should accept the idea that we could get along for less than is advocated in this authorization bill.

There has already been a reduction, a voluntary reduction, in the number of volunteers planned for the program. There will be approximately 1,000 fewer volunteers in the fiscal year 1970 than there were overseas in fiscal year 1969. It would be most unwise for us to force the agency to prune more drastically,

which would be necessary if we should not provide adequate funds.

The new Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Blatchford, testified in some detail about the aims of the Peace Corps as he sees them. He emphasized the importance of quality in the selection of volunteers. He said also that idealism is not the exclusive domain of the young, and that an additional effort would be made to get middle-aged and older people in the program. Furthermore, on an experimental basis, individuals with families may be sent overseas as volunteers.

Mr. Blatchford also said that the Peace Corps must demand what he calls a multiplier effect on all that it does. A project, he said, which does not have an end in sight, which will not be taken over by local people in a few years' time, should not be started. The Peace Corps should be mobile and flexible. It seems to me that all those principles are desirable ones, Mr. Chairman, and I do hope that we pass this authorization with provision for sufficient funds so that a reasonable job can be done.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to rise in strong support of this Peace Corps authorization for the year 1970. The U.S. Peace Corps has been one of the outstanding bipartisan successes in our foreign policy.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has studied carefully the program for the coming year, reviewed the Peace Corps history, discussed policy changes with with the new head, the Director of the Peace Corps.

It is our committee opinion who reported this Peace Corps bill favorably by 30 members to none opposed with one voting present, that this authorization should be passed. We believe this is a satisfactory and well-run program, and, therefore, the Peace Corps should be funded at this amount of authorization.

My suggestion has been that the name of the Peace Corps is not broad enough. This agency is simply not a corps for peace but also really a corps for progress. It could really be called a teach corps, because it is teaching people at a certain level of living how they can best progress in their own countries and in their own villages and at the level at which they live.

I therefore believe that the Peace Corps has been a success, and I am glad to join with the others in recommending passage promptly of this authorization for adequate funds for fiscal year 1970.

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey whatever time he may consume.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise, as do my colleagues, in support of the legislation. I think the great tribute to the Peace Corps is the one being made here today, where both sides, and the administrations of both parties have recognized the outstanding job the Corps has done. I think it is that tribute which calls for the passage, in full measure, of the bill.

It is without hesitation that I speak in behalf of this legislation. Nearly 10 years ago, our late President John F.

Kennedy launched this Nation toward the moon. At the same time, he launched our country of an earthly journey of, at least, equal significance. While the trip to the moon would capture the imaginations of men, the earth-bound journey would capture the hearts of men by slicing through the ravages of war, poverty, ignorance, and disease. President Kennedy embarked upon this latter journey with the creation of a Peace Corps.

Mr. Chairman, today we have reached the moon; the flight, the landing, the walk on that satellite of earth provided untold drama for mankind and the drama for mankind and the chance for further interplanetary exploration. In less dramatic form, perhaps, the Peace Corps has reached millions of men in underdeveloped areas throughout the world. For those it has assisted, there is no finer ambassador from the United States than the volunteer Peace Corpsman.

I recall now that when the Peace Corps plan was originally proposed—and I had the honor to introduce the initial legislation in the House—resistance formed around the notion of entrusting the responsibility of representing America to thousands of young people. Youngsters, many contended, would probably "turn off" more people about the United States than they ever "turned on." Time has proved the folly in this contention. For everywhere a young Peace Corpsman has walked, he has made a friend for the United States. Everywhere a young Corpsman has worked, he has demonstrated the rich reality of the American dream.

I have had the opportunity to meet with many of our Peace Corps volunteers. The chance to do so has been an inspiration. These young men and women perform their tasks not because somebody else is doing it, nor because it is materially rewarding to do it, but, in the words of President Kennedy, because it is right to do it.

And if we in Congress are to do what is right, we will pass the Peace Corps bill before us, pass it without reservation, but with the knowledge that we are funding a corps for whom the pursuit of peace is a full-time job.

Thank you.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of sharing with this House an experience I had in Senegal, Africa, in conversation with a Peace Corps representative working in a very small village out in the jungle of that country.

He was one white in a village of 6,000 blacks. I sat with him that evening in the dusk. He was in his little quarters, a small tent, with room just for his bed, a field desk, a box to contain his books, a chair, with the only light from oil lanterns strung on a cord above his bed.

This man was very enthused over his opportunity to work with these people. He said his period of service was nearly over and he was faced with a very impor-

tant decision. He said he was engaged and wished to return to the States to be married.

However, he was disturbed about the work being carried on if he were to leave. He had begun courses of instruction for these native people in the fields of sanitation and community health, and some elementary work in reading and writing. He said:

I do not know what is going to happen if I go at this time, unless someone comes to take my place who will work closely with these people. I feel I have gained their confidence and their enthusiastic support. I am wondering if I am doing the right thing to think of my life in terms of what I want to do when I ought to be thinking of it in terms of what I should do.

I think it is all the more remarkable when we know this young man came from Richmond, Va.

I admired this young man as he was struggling with his decision. I found him somewhat typical of the Peace Corps representatives we have in many of these countries, where they have a chance to work with those who need help in the rudiments of living. I have supported the Peace Corps and I certainly approve this extension of the authorization, because I believe it does represent an opportunity for improving mankind and understanding of people.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the figures show the number of warm bodies shipped into Senegal has tripled since the initiation of the so-called Peace Corps. Is there some reason why the French cannot take care of the people in their territories and former territories? Why must we take up the burden for the French?

Mr. PIRNIE. I cannot respond to the gentleman as to why the French could not do more in this area, but I can answer his question as to why there has been an expansion.

At first, this was an experiment and they were attempting to see how this effort would be received and what could be accomplished. When it was well received, and when the areas of service were more clearly explored, it was thought that under the same overhead and supervision the contact could be expanded in the interest of the program.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree with me that we have more than a few problems here in this country that need attention?

Mr. PIRNIE. I certainly would, but I also feel, in response to the gentleman from Iowa, that perhaps this is a way to promote understanding throughout the world, through people to people in a way such as is illustrated by the case I cited. Certainly there was a better feeling among those people as they followed that young man through the village. It was very impressive to see the admiration and respect which he had earned.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, in light of the President's recently announced proposal to cut back Federal construction, I have a few thoughts on this Peace Corps Act.

First, the President's alleged purpose in cutting back Federal construction is to improve the fiscal situation; that is, to alleviate inflation.

Second, I feel that our sense of priorities has somewhere gone awry. The President wants to curtail the production of fixed assets—the only tangible results most American taxpayers see for all the money that is hauled off to Washington.

Third, if cuts have to be made—and they do—then let us first make them in our overseas spending programs, then on our domestic social experimentation programs, and lastly in construction of fixed asset benefits for the taxpayer.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the President's priorities may be confused, but mine are not. I will not vote to authorize \$101.1 million for a dubious foreign assistance program when the President deems it necessary to cut back the most important and most visible domestic Federal endeavor.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, this authorization to finance Peace Corps activities in fiscal 1970 has wide support. This attests to what has been achieved by Peace Corps volunteers in the past and to what we expect of them in the future.

The act of volunteering for Peace Corps service represents the highest form of activism. The younger volunteers are students who choose a most constructive method to change the world for the better. As their representatives in Washington, let us recognize that these college-age volunteers are a highly motivated group and that they may not always agree with our world view. To be effective, however, these volunteers must continue to have freedom to express their own views even when they are not our views. This, after all, is the hallmark and the strength of the American system.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Forty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 160]

Addabbo	Clay	Giaino
Ashbrook	Cleveland	Gilbert
Ashley	Colmer	Green, Oreg.
Bevill	Conyers	Green, Pa.
Bieber	Corman	Griffiths
Bingham	Coughlin	Grover
Blanton	Cowger	Gubser
Brasco	Cunningham	Halpern
Brock	Daniels, N.J.	Hamilton
Brooks	Davis, Ga.	Hansen, Wash.
Burke, Fla.	Dawson	Hébert
Burleson, Tex.	Diggs	Henderson
Burton, Calif.	Donohue	Horton
Burton, Utah	Dorn	Hungate
Bush	Dulski	Johnson, Calif.
Cabell	Dwyer	Keith
Cahill	Edwards, Calif.	Kirwan
Carey	Esch	Landgrebe
Carter	Fallon	Leggett
Casey	Fish	Lipscomb
Celler	Fisher	Long, La.
Clancy	Flowers	Lukens
Clark	Foley	McEwen
Clausen,	Frey	McFall
Don H.	Gaydos	McMillan

MacGregor	Powell	Sebelius
Mann	Quillen	Shipley
Mathias	Railsback	Shriver
Michal	Reid, N.Y.	Sikes
Mikva	Reifel	Smith, Iowa
Mollohan	Reuss	Steiger, Wis.
Monagan	Riegle	Stuckey
Moss	Rooney, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Murphy, N.Y.	Rooney, Pa.	Tiernan
Nichols	Rosenthal	Watkins
Nix	Rostenkowski	Whalley
O'Konski	Roudebush	Widnall
Ottinger	Ruppe	Willson,
Patten	St Germain	Charles H.
Pepper	Sandman	Zion
Philbin	Scheuer	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 11039, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 310 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1969" and "\$112,800,000" and substituting "1970" and "\$101,100,000", respectively.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: On the first page, line 5, insert "(1)" immediately after "is amended" and, in line 7, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'None of the funds authorized to carry out the purposes of this Act shall be used to carry out the Volunteers to America Program conducted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), or any similar program involving the service or training of foreign nationals in the United States.'"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, although this amendment sounds complicated, it is very simple. What it does is bar the use of any funds in this act for the so-called reverse Peace Corps.

An amendment was offered in the committee for the authorization to have a reverse Peace Corps, and it was defeated 18 to 4. The Peace Corps people are going ahead anyway. I at one time had said I had no objection if they confined the program to teachers, but they are going ahead, as I understand it, without authorization by Congress, but with an executive permission, and promoting what they called a reverse Peace Corps.

They are proposing to bring in volunteers from the underdeveloped countries to work in our low-income areas and presumably to teach somebody there something they ought to know.

I talked with one of the very great

liberals in this House who knew something about the Berkeley confrontation, and he said he was very much opposed to this reverse Peace Corps because at Berkeley some of the ringleaders of the agitation there were African nationals who were there at school. He said he had no objection to them. Certainly I do not, as I will tell in a moment. But they were the only people among the radical group one could not talk to, because there was no way to relate to them, no way to talk to them about America, about what it meant, about what it could do and about what it would do and how we were an amalgamation of many minorities. They were just radicals, period.

I am the coauthor of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, sometimes called the Fulbright-Hays Act. They are bringing in certain selected people to this country on cultural exchanges. They are bringing in teachers. They are bringing in all sorts of people who are selected by our embassies under the charge of the Ambassador.

I know that this administration has appointed a gentleman as Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary—I am not sure of his title—one or the other, for cultural affairs, who has a fine program laid out under the exchange program.

All my amendment would do is to keep the Peace Corps in the Peace Corps business and out of the cultural exchange business in America.

I am for the Peace Corps. I have supported it every year. I will support it this year. I do support it. But I would like to see this amendment passed.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is aware that on July 3, 1969, the volunteers to America program, which has been carried on under the Hays-Fulbright program, was transferred to the Peace Corps from the State Department by Executive order under delegation of authority No. 105A, signed by Elliot Richardson, Under Secretary of State who was then Acting Secretary. This transferred the authority to the Peace Corps of an operation previously carried on under the Hays-Fulbright Act.

I understand there was a grapevine rumor around here indicating that the Subcommittee on Appropriations does not look with enthusiasm on this program. I fear that the gentleman from Ohio, who is the coauthor of the cultural exchange program is going to fix it so that the Volunteers to America program is without any funds in either bill.

Mr. HAYS. Let me say to the gentleman, I am not a bit worried about that, because I believe there will be plenty of funds put in over in the other body for the cultural exchange program.

I am glad the gentleman brought out about Mr. Richardson signing that Executive order, because he invited me down to the swearing in of the man in charge of the program in the State Department, another fellow by the name of Richardson, coincidentally from the same State and the same city. I believe we ought to keep the program where it is.

I am against this divided authority. I am against it furthermore because Mr. Elliot Richardson transferred it without in any way, shape, or form consulting Congress, a committee of Congress, or a subcommittee of Congress.

I can tell the gentleman that in the other body there is plenty of sentiment against this kind of transfer.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield further.

Mr. MORGAN. I have a copy of the hearings here. On page 13 of the hearings there is a colloquy with the Director of the Peace Corps.

Mr. HAYS. In which I said I had no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman permit me to finish?

There is a colloquy between the Director of the Peace Corps and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) where the gentleman from Ohio stated that he had no objection if only teachers were involved.

Mr. HAYS. That is correct.

Mr. MORGAN. The report issued by the committee states clearly that the program should be limited to teachers. I cannot understand why there has been such a change in the thinking of the gentleman from Ohio between the date of the hearings, and today, when he comes here with this amendment.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, as a great admirer of the great Senator from Illinois, Senator DIRKSEN, I find it frequently advantageous to change my mind, and I want to say to you that I have changed my mind not because basically I am objecting to the idea of bringing in teachers, as I said in the committee, but I find that their plan is to use teachers as the first step and to expand this program without legislation and without permission to bring in anybody. They bring in anybody they want to and do anything that they want to. So I am against this foot-in-the-door kind of approach, and since I have been brought into it—and I have talked to the people in the Department of State—I want to say that I am against having two programs to bring in teachers, because the Department of State is still operating a program for the selection of teachers.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not very enthusiastic for a reverse Peace Corps. Is that right?

Mr. MORGAN. I am not very enthusiastic about the whole cultural exchange program. I must say.

Mr. HAYS. Then what is the big argument about? You ought to be up here supporting me.

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

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the position of the gentleman from Ohio is the correct one. I served on the subcommittee that the gentleman referred to, the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles the cultural exchange program.

We are not opposed to the program. If you will look at the RECORD this year, you will see that we gave them probably within \$1 million of what they asked for in the budget. I do not recall exactly what the amount was in the budget, but we did give them very close to it. We have concern though, with some of the cultural presentations that go on.

Mr. HAYS. I understand that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Some of those things are what we are concerned about and not the exchange program. We are all for that.

Mr. HAYS. And some of the language in some of the plays.

Mr. CEDERBERG. They are some of the things that concern us. You should keep this program where you can take a good look at it. I support the gentleman from Ohio 100 percent.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had nothing to do with putting this into the Peace Corps. This was done by Executive order under the authority of the President.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I understand that.

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

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HAYS. What the gentleman from Michigan is saying and what my good friend, the chairman of my committee, is saying is this: He knows I have the utmost regard for him not only as chairman of the committee but as a friend. He is making the good fight for something that the committee has done which has come from the administration, but his heart is really not in it. He knows that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not very impressed with these Executive orders, and I do not care whose administration they come from.

Mr. HAYS. I do not, either.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Most of the time they are just a device to get around the intentions of the Congress.

Mr. HAYS. They tried to bring them up last year in Mr. Johnson's administration, and we killed it deadlier than a dodo bird without having it brought to the floor and told them not to do it again. Some of the bureaucrats down there went ahead anyway and came in with it. So this just writes it into the language that they cannot do it.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The gentleman from Michigan who just spoke made the point that by keeping this provision under the Cultural Exchange Act it would receive much closer scrutiny. I would have to differ with the gentleman on that point. One reason advanced for putting it in the Peace Corps bill is that this legislation comes before the House each year both for authorization and appropriation and therefore it would receive a closer scrutiny than under a continuing authorization.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is a friend of mine and I hate to find myself in disagreement with him at any time. More frequently, as he knows, we are in agreement. But the gentleman and I both know that the Peace Corps Act gets a very cursory examination in our committee. Everybody is for the Peace Corps. Nobody is against it. You are for it and I am for it. Nobody questions it very much. We have maybe 1 or 2 days of hearings at the outside, and we bring in a bill. We have a hour of debate on it and we have had it. And, I just cannot agree with you. I cannot agree with my friend from Indiana that it gets a very close scrutiny.

Mr. ADAIR. Well, I would have to say to the gentleman that I differ with him. I feel that we do give the Peace Corps careful scrutiny, not only in special hearings but in the private investigations that many of us carry on.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thought the original intent of the Peace Corps was to send people from the United States to other countries to assist in those areas. When you get involved with the exchange of persons, which was the original intent of the Fulbright-Hays Act; that comes under the cultural exchange program and that in my opinion is where it ought to stay. You can call it a "reverse" Peace Corps if you want to. I do not care what name you put on it. However, it is more difficult to scrutinize a \$100 million budget. Therefore, I think it ought to stay where it is.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, we are arguing here about the Volunteers for America program which is a part of the Hays-Fulbright program which went into effect in 1967 and only 103 people have been admitted under this program. So, you are not talking about any great number of people. It will be 68 for this year. So, it is not a big volume or mass of people. This is only a pilot program and has been a pilot program under the cultural exchange program. Very few people are involved. So, you are dealing here with a small program. There is no mass transfer of authority out of the Hays-Fulbright Cultural Exchange Act.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, let me point out again, as has previously been indicated here, that there is no additional language in the proposed act. The gentleman's amendment would simply make it very clear that no funds could be used for this purpose. The committee did decline to put language in the bill which we are bringing before you today. In the report we simply suggest that we do not object if the Director of the Peace Corps elects to use not more than \$100,000 from the existing funds for the exchange Peace Corps.

This I should point out would in no way increase the authorization by \$100,000. The Director would have to find the money in the existing funds or the funds

which we authorize now for fiscal year 1970. The chairman makes a very good point and that is this: If this restricting language should remain in the bill, there is a possibility that the continuation of this program might not be funded any place at all and, thus, it would die.

The gentleman from Ohio will recall that we both advocated and supported the Hays-Fulbright Act when it was before this House. The exchange Peace Corps is a program which has some merit. It needs to be approached with a great deal of caution as has been done and will continue to be done. I think we ought not to deny the Director of the Peace Corps this small bit of flexibility.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. The thing I object to is the "foot-in-the-door" thing as I said earlier, and the fact that the State Department has a bureau set up, trained and operating. The Peace Corps is a totally different field altogether sending people to foreign countries. I just do not think they are competent to select and process and bring in people from those countries here to do the job that they say they want them to do. Therefore, I do not see why we should have two agencies doing the same thing.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ADAIR was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman from Indiana comment upon this point: As I understood the statement by the gentleman from Ohio, an Executive order has already been issued transferring the cultural exchange functions to the Peace Corps. Further, if this amendment prevails, then in effect, the House at least is eliminating that potential for either the cultural exchange program as it has been operating or this reverse Peace Corps as it is proposed; is that an accurate statement?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not believe the gentleman from Michigan is correct in that part of the cultural exchange program referred to as Volunteers of America has been transferred by Executive order to the Peace Corps. I do not understand that the whole program has been.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Just that portion.

Mr. HAYS. The Volunteers of America.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The Volunteers of America.

Mr. HAYS. What happened was that the Director has since signed a delegation of authority, and my amendment says that he cannot delegate that authority; it will have to stay in the State Department.

You earlier heard the gentleman from Michigan say that they had appropriated what they asked for, or nearly what they asked for in the budget.

This is a pilot program, and I want it to stay in the cultural affairs division of

the State Department, and not be put over into the Peace Corps where it can grow like Topsy, and wind up God Almighty knows what.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, who serves on the Subcommittee on Appropriations, as to whether he is speaking for the entire cultural program, or whether he is just speaking for the part involved in this amendment, the Volunteers of America?

Mr. CEDERBERG. What I am speaking about as the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated, that the subcommittee did not look with favor upon the cultural and mutual exchange programs, and that is not correct. The correct assumption is that there are some parts of it we believe that need tightening up. I happen to believe that we send far too many professors from the United States to other areas, but that we are not opposing this at all. In my opinion if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is not adopted, then 5 years from now you will come in here and you will have more money in the reverse Peace Corps than you will have in the whole cultural exchange program.

Mr. MORGAN. That will never happen as long as I am the chairman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman may not always be the chairman. We hope he will be for many years, because he is a very distinguished chairman, but times change, so I do not want to take that risk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think it is a mistake to change it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is not known whether or not the program that the Secretary has instituted, the so-called reverse Peace Corps, is any good or not. I will leave that to the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and their recommendations. It seems to me that the fundamental issue here is whether or not the legislative branch of Government is going to have something to say about these programs.

I was one of the early supporters of the Peace Corps. I remember making many, many speeches in its behalf when it was not necessarily popular. I remember when the Peace Corps was first proposed, and there were very many opposed to it, and then they saw that it did work out. But it seems to me that the question here is whether or not the executive branch of the Government is going to bypass the legislative branch. The popular parlor game seems to be maligning and criticizing the legislative branch of Government. It seems to me that the amendment has merit only in that it will compel the State Department to come before the House in an orderly manner and make their recommendations, and the House will have an opportunity to work its will. I do not believe that these people ought to be permitted to go ahead and sign an Executive order, and change

the program substantially, and then come in here and expect the House to support its action.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is exactly right. There is a question of jurisdiction involved here. In fact, there is another question involved which I have not brought up, where the Peace Corps is supposed to be sending volunteers to train underdeveloped countries to do things that they do not have the people to do themselves.

Now, the fact is that they were talking about Senegal, and I thought if Senegal needs four times as many Peace Corps people as it did formerly, how is it going to spare people to come here to teach? This is the question I asked:

What are you going to bring somebody from some African country for?

He said:

Well, maybe to teach Swahili.

There does not seem to be a burning need in this country for Swahili teachers.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As I say, I do not want to get into the merits of this. Perhaps we need these people—I do not know. But the fact of the matter is that we have seen within the last 10 years or so this constant move toward Government by guidelines. Now we are seeing Government by Executive order.

Some of our friends in these agencies should be reminded that this Government is a government made up of three co-equal branches and that this legislative branch has is responsibility.

Now these things happen and somebody comes here under this Executive order and creates some situation which creates a great deal of criticism in the press and the press does not say that this person is here by an Executive order, but that he is here by an act of Congress, and that his acts are under the delegation of power from the Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment deserves our support if for no other reason than to make clear to the executive branch of Government that if they want the changes in this program, there is a prescribed and orderly method of getting those changes.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman has been a friend of the Peace Corps. I remember in 1961 when the original bill was on the floor that he was a cosponsor and I remember seeing him at the White House at the signing of the bill. The gentleman has been a friend of the Peace Corps for many years. The gentleman knows that the Peace Corps started in 1960 by Executive order and everybody thought it was a good idea.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, by an Executive order when it was experimental. Then the President realized the virtues of this program and came before the Congress and said, "Make this a permanent program." The President in his good judgment and to his everlasting credit did come before the legislative branch of the Government and he said:

Gentlemen, this is a good program and I recommend it and here is my proposal. Now you as the legislative branch of the government, please go ahead and vote this bill out.

And the Congress had a chance to work its will.

The question here on the Hays amendment is not relative to the merits or demerits of the proposal. The question is whether the House of Representatives is to write legislation or whether we are going to surrender and yield our responsibility to an Executive order when they cannot do it in another way. That is the issue.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. I think that is exactly what we are trying to do. As the chairman pointed out, the whole program can be done by Executive order and later then enacted into legislation. This has been begun by Executive order and by this wording in the committee report, we are taking a small step in the direction of enacting it into legislation. So we are doing practically just what the gentleman advocates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that as chairman of the committee that I have no strong feelings about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HAYS.

But I think the real facts ought to be laid before the House. This is a very small pilot program. As I have said, it started under the Hays-Fulbright Act in 1967 and, over the years, a total of 105 people have been brought in. What is proposed for this year is another 60.

This program is not a program to bring college students here to go to college. It is not to bring in the type of person who is going to be an exchange student at the University of California at Berkeley.

This is really a cultural program. The person involved may be a young man or woman of the age of 25 or so who can speak both English and Spanish, for example. This is the sort of person who could go to your local high school and help to teach languages and is paid enough to cover board and room by the local school board.

This is not the type of student who comes under the cultural exchange program. They come here to teach a language and make themselves useful. It is a very limited and small program. If you want to keep it small, let us keep it in the Peace Corps.

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

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I would just like to point out that what the chairman says about teachers is true. But they have been coming in under the cultural exchange program. That is exactly what we want to promote. Let me say this to you, the gentleman from Indiana makes the argument that we are trying to legitimize an Executive order. Now the facts of the matter are that the gentleman from In-

diana tried to legitimize it with an amendment saying—Yes, you can do this—and it was defeated in committee by a vote of 18 to 4.

So really, if we try to legitimize it, it is a sort of back-door approach to legitimacy.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say in the few moments I have left that I have no strong feelings of opposition to the amendment. I think the House has spent about a half hour in wasted time discussing a matter of limited importance.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. In order to cooperate with the chairman, since I agree we have been spending more time on this amendment than we should, I shall be brief. I merely wish to emphasize that the gentleman from Ohio is completely correct when he points out that a small pilot program in Government has a tendency to become a huge permanent program.

Do not fool yourself for one minute that the "small pilot program," as it has been described, will remain so.

May I point out to the friends or constructive critics of the Peace Corps, that there are certainly enough problems in administering the present responsibilities of the Peace Corps. We have complaints from dozens of foreign countries that we send over Americans who are not equipped to meet the peculiar needs of the country.

We have a new administration. Let them straighten out what they have inherited. Let them get their feet on the ground in the Peace Corps program itself, without launching into something new.

If for one moment anyone would think the gentleman from Ohio was not accurate when he said that our committee gives the Peace Corps merely a perfunctory review, I would like to reemphasize that we do not study the Peace Corps too thoroughly. After all, it is one of the "holy of holies" of the Government.

I would suggest the expeditious thing for the House to do, especially since the chairman has said that he does not have very strong feelings about it, and I detect the gentleman from Indiana, the senior member, does not really have strong feelings about it—his heart is not in this provision—let us accept the Hays amendment and go on to passing the bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. When we first started talking about the Peace Corps in this House, there was a great deal of opposition to the program. At that time, if any Member would have suggested that the money we were going to appropriate for the program was going to be used in a reverse manner, or that any part of it was going to be so used, I am sure the House would never have passed the original bill.

It has been said that the language which is the subject of the amendment is only part of the program. It is merely \$100,000.

Let us read what the report says. If I read correctly, the report states:

The Director of the Peace Corps announced his desire to use funds in the neighborhood

of \$100,000 to finance an Exchange Peace Corps.

The money that was put up by the American people was put up to help these countries, thinking that we had some skills that would be beneficial to the nations in need.

There is no restriction in the bill whatsoever about where these Exchange Peace Corps volunteers could come from. They could come from the richest nations in the world. As stated in the report, they could come "for one year with schools, voluntary agencies, or other organizations needing their services," and we will pay the freight. We would not limit the amount of money. We would not limit it by percentage. We do not say a word about how long the program is to endure. Yet they could, and in all probability we will in a few short years find that the bulk of this money will be spent to send the friends of those in our overseas embassies to the United States for a vacation.

Mr. Chairman, I have been home. I was home for a great deal of the time during the House vacation, and I have learned that many of my people are discouraged about many things. They are more discouraged than ever. I come from the kind of district that needs roadbuilding, and it needs it badly. It is part of our economy. The need for the road is not only part of our economy but also the money used for the building of roads provides jobs. Men in our district live entirely on the money received for road construction. The President has asked for a 75-percent reduction in road construction, plus home construction, plus an appeal to free enterprise to cut down to the same extent.

Melvin Laird, our former colleague in Congress, has said that no military contracts will be let until he finds how much less than the 75 percent will be cut.

If we are going to go ahead ourselves in the belief that we can sit around here and spend money in foreign countries without getting condemned by our people, we will find we are just barking up the wrong tree. People are getting a little bit tired because they do not understand—and after 30 years of believing we were right in most instances, I am coming to the same point. I have been legislating for a long while, but I never knew we could have the administration legislating this country into a depression and having the President saying it is a great thing to do.

We are going to have to fight inflation, but we are going to fight inflation by cutting down 75 percent of construction? Inflation never hurts a man who works for a living—and put that down in the book. The man who receives a wage for working usually spends his salary at that time because it takes him his salary to live on.

The recent action by the President would result in preserving the rich man's dollar at the expense of the workingman's penny. The American workingman never has anything left over. If he buys a suit for \$60, he is working to get that money for the suit. I remember when my father could not pay for a suit when a suit cost only \$5. Today a worker buys good suits, has a home, in most cases

has a car, TV and even takes a short vacation. Is this the inflation the President is fighting?

Fighting inflation now is in the plans of those who have other things in mind. If this Congress sits by and votes for this kind of thing, we are going to open up a new avenue of appropriation, because we will be in a position of appropriating directly rather than going through the Fulbright-Hays agency in the State Department.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we will not be opening up a new avenue of spending. This program has been operating for a couple years under the Fulbright-Hays Act.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I understood from the chairman's remarks that there would be a probability there would not be any funds under that appropriation, but this is opening up a new avenue, because we are appropriating for it here. I came here to vote for the Peace Corps. I did not come over here to appropriate, at the desire of the Director of the Peace Corps, to spend somewhere in the neighborhood of \$100,000 for a reverse Peace Corps. My memory in this Congress is that in the neighborhood of \$100,000 can be a big neighborhood all the way to a billion.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

I was impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan. From my service on the Subcommittee for the Department of State of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to say that at least one member on the majority side of that subcommittee concurs with what the gentleman said.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman just give assurance to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) that this \$100,000 is going to be in the State Department appropriation and is going to be spent anyway, whether it is in the Peace Corps or under the Cultural Exchange Act, and that \$100,000 is going to be appropriated by the gentleman's committee? Is that correct?

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I wish I could say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that what he says is so. I wish I could give that assurance, but from what I see going on in the State Department, I cannot give the gentleman any assurance of what will be done with any of the funds.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) referred to some of the obscene material which was sent overseas under the cultural exchange program, but as far as I am able to determine, the State Department itself and those charged with the administration of the cultural exchange program within the State Department were not aware of

what they were sending overseas until our committee found out about it and asked the Department to come before us to explain it.

Mr. Chairman, some of the most obscene and filthy pornographic material I have ever seen was sent to foreign countries under this cultural exchange program.

What is needed is to tighten up on this program rather than expand it and compound its mistakes.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, in all fairness—and everybody knows I am fairly partisan—but in all fairness to the administration, let me say this was not done under the new administration, under the administration of the new Under Secretary for Cultural Affairs. I am a supporter of the previous President and I believe in him, but I can say the two Cultural Affairs Under Secretaries, the last two we had in that administration, I do not think were picked by the President, neither one of them, but they were disastrous. I can tell the Members those two probably did not know what was going on and probably they did not care about what was going on.

I believe in fair play. I hope we will give this new gentleman a chance. He impresses me as a sincere fellow who will try to do the best he can to see this program works.

I want to keep it down there where we have some people with skill and dedication, and not turned over to somebody in the Peace Corps, to a country director out in Africa or down in Latin America, or wherever the case may be. It ought to be run carefully. These people ought to be screened. They ought to be competent. They ought to know what they are coming here for.

I believe that can best be achieved under the cultural affairs program of the Department of State.

Mr. FLYNT. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio. He is eminently correct.

If the Congress permits the executive branch of the Government to make the delegation or transfer of authority which has been undertaken in the departmental order referred to then we have no alternative but to expect that they will increase it by the same method as long as and as much as they can.

If there is any merit to this proposal—and I doubt seriously if there is any merit in it—for a reverse Peace Corps, then let the State Department come before Congress in an orderly fashion and ask the Foreign Affairs Committee to specifically authorize it with authorizing legislation.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. They did exactly that last year. It was referred to my subcommittee. I polled the subcommittee and could not find three votes for it. That is why it was not written into law under the previous administration.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I hope

it will be adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

My good friend, the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dr. MORGAN, says he has no strong feelings one way or the other on this bill. I suggest that we get to a vote on it and help him make up his mind.

Mr. MORGAN. I was not referring to the bill, Mr. Gross, but to the amendment. I have strong feelings about the bill.

Mr. GROSS. On the amendment, I should have said.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 1, line 6, delete "\$101,100,000" and substitute therefor "\$90,000,000."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there must be economy throughout the entire Government in the matter of authorizations and appropriations in this session of Congress. The fiscal situation of this Government and country is approaching a crisis.

This is an amendment to provide that the Peace Corps take its place in the line of those who are subject to economy.

The amendment would cut \$11,000,000 from the present figure of \$101.1 million. It would also eliminate the \$100,000 that was to have been earmarked for purposes of the exchange program. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio has eliminated the necessity for the \$100,000. So the amendment would reduce the cost of this bill from \$101.1 million to \$90 million, a cut of \$11.1 million.

I suggest, in the light of the President's call for a cutback of 75 percent in public construction, this is not a serious cut; that it can easily be absorbed.

The spending for this purpose could well be cut more. But, being a realist, I would not have tried to cut more deeply. We have heard from the proponents that the Peace Corps has done an outstanding job. Yet no one seems to be able to point to the outstanding jobs that have been done around the world. I was here when the first appropriation was made for this organization, and I believe it was in terms of \$10 million. Now it is up to \$100 million plus. And where is the outstanding job? Is it in Nigeria where we sent in 200 or 300 Peace Corpsites? It was to be one of the showcases of American aid and one of the showcases of what the Peace Corps could do. What happened in Nigeria? Where are all those Peace Corps people today? They are down to 50 or less there. If they are there at all, they are witnessing genocide and the next thing to cannibalism. What about Pakistan, where we also had a large array of members of the Peace Corps? They are out and gone. They have

been asked to leave the country. And in this morning's paper it reported that the ruling political party of Malawi has told the Peace Corps to get out of their country. They said in a resolution adopted at their annual convention that there were many complaints from the Malawi people about the influence the Peace Corps volunteers have over their children, and the bad conduct, bad behavior, and slovenliness of Peace Corps members.

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

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. The Peace Corps was not asked to leave Pakistan. To be fair about it, Pakistan said they did not want any more educators or teachers. They said they needed technicians, mechanics, and so forth. However, let us be fair and say they were not asked to leave Pakistan.

Mr. GROSS. But we are out of there, are we not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. We have been out of there since 1967.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. We are out of there because they did not want us in there. They did not want our teachers in Pakistan.

Mr. MORGAN. They wanted us from 1961 to 1967.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. But they suddenly decided—or perhaps not so suddenly—that they did not want U.S. teachers in Pakistan. That is why we are out. If it was not by invitation, it is the same thing.

So it goes around the world. I believe the Chairman himself said that we have been booted out in eight or more different countries. I do not know what additional countries will tell us to get out tomorrow, but I believe this program ought to be cut down. It ought to be reduced progressively every year in the interests of fiscal sanity in this country. This is added to the foreign aid bill, which in all its ramifications is costing some \$10 billion a year. The cost of foreign aid is too much for the people of this country to endure. Just as was the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), I, too, was home a couple of weeks ago, and you believe me when I tell you that the people are rebelling against the taxes that are being inflicted upon them, Federal, State, and local taxes. It is time to cut down. The least we can do is cut \$11.1 million off this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. In his opening statements the gentleman offered an amendment to cut \$11.1 million, and I understand him to say that now that the Hays amendment was approved we would not need the \$100,000 any more. Does the gentleman know that he is going to have to offer an amendment to the appropriation bill dealing with the cultural exchange program when it comes in here if he wants to save the \$100,000, because it will be in there.

Mr. GROSS. I will be happy to do just that if that is what is required. I am not sure it will be, for it seems to me that it will take an authorization.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of fiscal sanity I urge the adoption of my amendment.

At any rate, if it cannot get the \$100,000, the Peace Corps will not be

getting into this program. That is the point. That was the point which was made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think the gentleman from Iowa was correct about the complaints and the committee has studied them and they have been studied also by various Members who have investigated such complaints on their own with reference to the activities of the Peace Corps. And, they have found complaints. However, by and large, there has been a great acceptance of the Peace Corps. There are additional countries which are requesting our volunteers and feel that they can perform a useful service and, in fact, are performing a very useful service in many of the countries where they are now stationed. And, there are additional countries which have not had Peace Corps volunteers before but which have now requested Peace Corps volunteers. So the reputation of the Peace Corps continues to grow and it continues to be held in great esteem throughout the world.

The point I think that should be made, is that a 10-percent reduction is already for all practical purposes in effect. The administration in the President's request has already reflected a 10-percent reduction in the request for the Peace Corps this year. The request this year is below last year's appropriation. What the gentleman's amendment, in effect, would do would be to reduce by approximately 1,000 the number of volunteers that could be sent abroad this year by the Peace Corps. It is true that the Peace Corps has not solved a lot of the world's problems but, certainly, it has performed a good job under difficult conditions in many places throughout the world.

I think if we are going to superimpose an additional 10-percent cut on the Peace Corps it would be unfair. It would be unfair to the new administration, unfair to the new Peace Corps Director, Mr. Blatchford, and it would be unfair to the Peace Corps especially in light of what it is accomplishing. The President has sent up a message which demonstrates confidence in the Peace Corps and that message reflects a 10-percent cut. That reduction is part of this bill. The committee in its deliberations and wisdom, felt that we should support the administration request and the Peace Corps. To superimpose another 10-percent reduction would be wielding the meat ax.

I might say further that there has been a general decrease in accord with the wishes of the gentleman from Iowa down through the years. There will be less volunteers this year than there were last year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman cannot be serious when he says that my amendment would represent another 10-percent cut. The cut in the bill is only about \$900,000. If you call that fiscal restraint on a \$100 million bill, then I do not know the meaning of the word "restraint."

Mr. GALLAGHER. Well, I did not use that word. What I did say was that the administration and the President has already included a 10-percent reduction in the Peace Corps in his message and this committee accepted this and voted accordingly. What we are now asked to do is to reduce it another 10 percent.

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) and others interested would consult the table near the bottom of page 2 of the report, it will be observed that the original authorization budget request was \$109.8 million. The amended budget was \$101.1 million, which is the amount that we are recommending here and which in my opinion bears out the point made by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER) as to the magnitude of the reduction from the original budget request.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. I wonder if the gentleman could answer a question as to the number of countries that have asked our Peace Corps volunteers to leave? Has it not been true that primarily those countries have been countries which have come under Communist influence where our Peace Corps volunteers have been requested to leave?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WOLFF. Was that not true in Tanzania, for example?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, and similarly with other countries where the Communist influence has taken over but once that influence has been removed, there has been a request for the return of our Peace Corps volunteers such as in Indonesia. The gentleman from New York makes a very valid point. Obviously, they want the benefit of the expertise, teaching and technological know-how of our Peace Corps volunteers.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is not often that I find myself in opposition to the gentleman from Iowa, especially on matters relating to the reduction of authorizations or appropriations, but in this case I believe that the figure recommended in the revised budget is a reasonable one.

Again referring to the table at the bottom of page 2 in the Foreign Affairs Committee report, it will be observed that through the years the authorization and the appropriation for this program have diminished. For example, last year we authorized \$112,800,000. There was appropriated \$102 million. So it is clear that the authorization request for this year is \$900,000 below the appropriation figure for last year, and is almost \$12 million below what we authorized last year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I would ask if it is not true that the gentleman from Indiana

who is now addressing the House, voted last year for a cut of approximately \$15 million?

Mr. ADAIR. That is true, because I believed that there was that much excess in last year's bill, but I do not find that in this year's bill.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman would yield further, he does not think the fiscal condition of this Government is any better now than it was a year ago, does he?

Mr. ADAIR. I regret to say that I do not, and that is why I approved the substantially lower figure requested in the authorization bill for fiscal year 1970.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made several times here today as to the number of countries in which the Peace Corps is operating. I do not think there is any magic in finding a large number of countries in which we operate. In fact, the Director of the Peace Corps has made it very clear that he will scrutinize each new request with the utmost care so that we will not overexpand. But I would also invite the attention of the members of the committee to the figures set forth again on page 2 of the report, where it is shown that in 1968 the Peace Corps had volunteers in 57 countries. In fiscal 1969 we were in 59 countries and for fiscal year 1970 it is estimated that we will be in 63 countries.

So, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the argument that nations generally are turning against this program I would cite these figures as evidence that, on the contrary, we are going into more nations, hopefully with more carefully selected personnel to fit the particular needs of each of the countries into which we go.

Mr. Chairman, reference also was made to Malawi, and I want to be certain that the situation in that country is understood.

As the gentleman stated, but perhaps did not emphasize quite as much as I would, there has not been a request up to this moment from the government of that country for our withdrawal. I understand that a political party has passed a resolution asking the government to make such a request, but the latest information available is that such a governmental request has not yet been made.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, on the point of the character and the dress of some of our Peace Corps volunteers, I can say to the committee that the Director is aware of such criticism, and has assured me that where he finds any evidence whatsoever of improper dress or improper behavior, those individuals will be immediately recalled home.

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, like my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, in reverse, he says he seldom finds himself in disagreement with the gentleman from Iowa—and I seldom find myself in agreement with him, especially not twice in 1 day—but I am today.

Normally I would not support an amendment to cut Peace Corps funds but I am supporting it today for the same reason that I intend, when the foreign aid bill comes up, to offer an amendment

to each section of the foreign aid bill that authorizes money—an amendment to cut it by 75 percent.

If it is such a good thing for Americans, then it ought to be just as good for foreigners. If it is a good thing for your constituents, then it ought to be a good thing for people who are not your constituents.

They say, oh, but this 75 percent cut that the President has ordered is to fight inflation. Well, I am just as anxious to fight inflation as he is.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, my good friend, the chairman, has made speech after speech, as have I, imploring you to vote for the foreign aid bill on the grounds that 90 percent of the money is spent in the United States. It is inflationary.

So if we are going to fight inflation and if we are seriously going to fight inflation by cutting down, then let us not just cut hospitals and highways and all other public works by 75 percent, but let us pass it on a little bit.

So I find myself compelled to support the gentleman's cut which is a modest cut of about 11 percent in the Peace Corps. I will promise you that if they trim off the frills and the travel and the other luxuries that they have in there, that they will never miss it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the inception of the Peace Corps, I have supported it. I believe we get a greater return for our foreign aid dollars from this program than we do from any other foreign aid program under the sponsorship of the U.S. Government.

I have traditionally supported the foreign aid program, although not on every occasion have I supported every dollar requested by the President of the United States. In this case I think because we do get a better return for the dollar invested that the committee ought to be supported in the action that it is recommending to this body today.

We have seen since 1962 a gradual buildup in the expenditures for the Peace Corps. It started with an original authorization request of \$40 million and it rose to a height of \$125.2 million several years ago. The trend is now downward.

This request for fiscal year 1970 by the outgoing administration was \$112.8 million. It was subsequently reduced by the present administration. The trend is downward and I think it is going to be at the proper level for the authorization by the committee action today. A reduction further, as recommended by the gentleman from Iowa, in my opinion will be harmful in the overall effect.

I, therefore, urge that the amendment be defeated.

Let me point out, as the committee report does, that back in fiscal year 1968 there were 13,192 volunteers, both volunteers and trainees in the Peace Corps. This has been reduced under the present figure of the committee, to a figure of about 12,000—a downward trend in total numbers.

The number of nations to be serviced by the Peace Corps on the other hand has gone up from 57 in fiscal year 1968 to some 63 in fiscal year 1970. When you look at the number of people being re-

duced in the program and the number of nations that are involved, I think the program is at a proper level.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust that the committee's recommendation will be approved.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. This justification has been pitched on the basis of what the administration wants. The administration has come in with a request for nearly \$1 billion more for foreign aid this year—not the \$1,700,000,000 actually appropriated last year, but nearly \$1 billion more. Where, in all conscience, and when are we going to start saving a little money? Are we going to continue to pitch it out to foreign lands? For what purpose? We have heard the claim today of "outstanding jobs" by the Peace Corps. Where are the outstanding jobs that have been accomplished by this organization? Where are they?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me point out in this case that the Peace Corps trend is downward. As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out, the administration wants more for the overall foreign aid program. The circumstances are different in the two situations. Therefore, I think we ought to support the committee and the administration where the trend is downward and pass judgment later on the dollar requirements of the overall foreign aid program.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think the distinguished minority leader is absolutely correct in his analysis. I might say that as to foreign aid, we are presently marking the bill up, so the House will have an opportunity to work its will. I do not think we should so disrupt the Peace Corps because we want to cut foreign aid today. We shall have an opportunity in the committee and the House will have an opportunity to work its will on that bill in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman, this is a reasonable bill, and I believe the distinguished minority leader has well stated the case for the Peace Corps.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. No one in this House has been closer to the Peace Corps and Peace Corps authorizations than I have since 1961. This year the original budget request was for \$109,800,000. The amended budget request came in for \$101,100,000 after the executive took a second look at the program. Last year the appropriation was \$102 million. In the history of the Peace Corps this House has always stood behind the Committee on Foreign Affairs and approved the authorization recommended by the committee. I am sure if there are any corrections to be made in the actual dollar amounts, Mr. PASSMAN's subcommittee will be taking a good hard look at the amount authorized, and there may be some reductions, as there have been in past years.

Last year we authorized \$112,800,000. Only \$102 million was appropriated. I urge that we stand behind the commit-

tee's request of \$101,100,000. We have a new Director of the Peace Corps. He is young. He is dynamic. In a few sessions I have had with him I have noted these qualities. I have heard him speak of his plans for the future how he wants to change the emphasis of the Peace Corps. He wants to cut down on the young college graduates who are serving as teachers overseas, and to try to pick up more mechanics, carpenters, bricklayers, and other skilled people who have a missionary spirit and who are willing to devote 2 years of their lives to serving overseas in foreign countries who want and need their skills.

I think the number of volunteers who will want to serve will be substantial, and a cut of \$11,100,000 in the authorization is much too deep.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a sad situation that the more we spend overseas on enterprises of this kind, the more trouble and the deeper into trouble we get?

Mr. MORGAN. I would not want the gentleman to go to sleep tonight and find that tomorrow when he wakes up he would have to live in a world in which we had since 1940 never spent a dime for foreign aid. I wonder what kind of world he thinks we would be living in this September 9, 1969, if there had never been any foreign aid. Would Western Europe be under Communist domination? Would the less developed countries be ruled by Moscow or Peking? Would any of the free world still be free?

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I do not want to go to sleep tonight and have to wake up in the morning and tell my constituents that they cannot get a hospital bed or a hospital built because we are fighting inflation, but I voted for every dime for the Peace Corps and every dime for foreign aid.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think that is any comparison at all. I think that a lot of the gentleman's constituents are substantial citizens who are interested in what happens in the less developed countries and are good church members, who believe in the sort of missionary work the Peace Corps is doing.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 53, noes 51.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GROSS and Mr. GALLAGHER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 61, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (h), immediately after "(31 U.S.C. 492a)", add "the Act of October 21, 1968 (5 U.S.C. 5584) for purposes of erroneous payments of allowances provided under the Peace Corps Act."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 527, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11039 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On the first page, line 6, strike out "\$101,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$90,000,000."

The SPEAKER. With objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GROSS. 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—ayes 144, noes 186, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—144

Abbutt	Berry	Broyhill, Va.
Abernethy	Betts	Buchanan
Alexander	Bevill	Caffery
Anderson,	Biaggi	Camp
Tenn.	Blackburn	Cederberg
Andrews, Ala.	Bray	Chappell
Baring	Brinkley	Clawson, Del
Belcher	Broomfield	Collins
Bennett	Brown, Ohio	Cowger

Cramer	Johnson, Pa.	Rarick
Daniel, Va.	Jonas	Reid, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
de la Garza	Jones, N.C.	Rivers
Denney	Jones, Tenn.	Roberts
Dennis	King	Rogers, Colo.
Dent	Kleppe	Roth
Derwinski	Kuykendall	Ruth
Devine	Kyl	Satterfield
Dickinson	Landrum	Saylor
Dowdy	Langen	Scherle
Duncan	Lennon	Scott
Edwards, Ala.	Lloyd	Sikes
Edwards, La.	Lujan	Skubitz
Eshleman	McClure	Slack
Evans, Colo.	McDonald,	Smith, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	Mich.	Snyder
Flynt	McMillan	Steed
Foreman	Marsh	Steiger, Ariz.
Fountain	Mayne	Stubblefield
Fuqua	Meskill	Stuckey
Galifianakis	Michel	Talcott
Goldwater	Miller, Ohio	Teague, Calif.
Goodling	Mills	Teague, Tex.
Gray	Mizell	Thompson, Ga.
Gross	Myers	Utt
Hagan	Natcher	Waggonner
Haley	Nichols	Wampler
Hall	O'Neal, Ga.	Watson
Hammer-	Passman	Watts
schmidt	Pelly	White
Harsha	Perkins	Whitehurst
Hastings	Pettis	Whitten
Hays	Pickle	Williams
Hogan	Poage	Williams
Hull	Poff	Winn
Hunt	Pollock	Wold
Hutchinson	Price, Tex.	Wyllie
Ichord	Purcell	Wyman
Jarman	Randall	Zwach

NAYS—186

Adair	Friedel	Obey
Adams	Fulton, Pa.	O'Hara
Anderson,	Fulton, Tenn.	Olsen
Calif.	Gallagher	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Ill.	Garmatz	Ottinger
Andrews,	Gibbons	Patman
N. Dak.	Gonzalez	Patten
Annunzio	Gude	Pepper
Arends	Hamilton	Pike
Ashley	Hanley	Pirnie
Aspinall	Hansen, Idaho	Podell
Ayres	Harvey	Preyer, N.C.
Bartlett	Hathaway	Price, Ill.
Beall, Md.	Hawkins	Pryor, Ark.
Bell, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.	Pucinski
Blester	Heckler, Mass.	Quie
Blatnik	Helstoski	Rallsback
Boggs	Hicks	Rees
Boland	Holifield	Reid, N.Y.
Bolling	Horton	Riegle
Bow	Hosmer	Robison
Brademas	Howard	Roybal
Brotzman	Jacobs	Ruppe
Brown, Calif.	Karth	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	Kastenmeier	St. Onge
Broyhill, N.C.	Kazen	Schadeberg
Burke, Mass.	Kee	Schneebell
Burlison, Mo.	Kluczynski	Schwengel
Burton, Calif.	Koch	Sisk
Button	Kyros	Smith, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Latta	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Leggett	Stafford
Celler	Long, Md.	Stagers
Chamberlain	Lowenstein	Stanton
Chisholm	McCarthy	Stokes
Clark	McClory	Stratton
Clay	McCloskey	Sullivan
Cohelan	McCulloch	Symington
Collier	McDade	Taft
Conable	McKneally	Taylor
Conte	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Corbett	Mass.	Thomson, Wis.
Coughlin	Madden	Tunney
Culver	Mahon	Udall
Daddario	Mailliard	Ullman
Daniels, N.J.	Martin	Van Deerin
Delaney	Mathias	Vander Jagt
Dellenback	Matsunaga	Vank
Dingell	May	Vigorito
Eckhardt	Meeds	Waldie
Edmondson	Meicher	Weicker
Eilberg	Mikva	Whalen
Erlenborn	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Farbstein	Minish	Wilson, Bob
Fascell	Mink	Wolf
Feighan	Minshall	Wright
Findley	Moorhead	Wyatt
Flood	Morgan	Wydler
Foley	Morton	Yates
Ford, Gerald R.	Mosher	Yatron
Ford,	Murphy, Ill.	Young
William D.	Murphy, N.Y.	Zablocki
Fraser	Nedzi	
Frelinghuysen	Nelsen	

NOT VOTING—100

Addabbo	Esch	Mollohan
Albert	Fallon	Monagan
Ashbrook	Fish	Montgomery
Bingham	Fisher	Morse
Blanton	Flowers	Moss
Brasco	Frey	Nix
Brock	Gaydos	O'Konski
Brooks	Gettys	Philbin
Burke, Fla.	Gialmo	Powell
Burleson, Tex.	Gilbert	Quillen
Burton, Utah	Green, Oreg.	Reifel
Bush	Green, Pa.	Reuss
Cabell	Griffin	Rodino
Cahill	Griffiths	Rogers, Fla.
Carey	Grover	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Gubser	Rooney, Pa.
Casey	Halpern	Rosenthal
Clancy	Hanna	Rostenkowski
Clausen,	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Don H.	Hébert	St Germain
Cleveland	Henderson	Sandman
Colmer	Hungate	Scheuer
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Sebellus
Corman	Keith	Shipley
Cunningham	Kirwan	Shriver
Davis, Ga.	Landgrebe	Smith, Iowa
Dawson	Lipscomb	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Long, La.	Stephens
Donohue	Lukens	Tiernan
Dorn	McEwen	Watkins
Downing	McFall	Whalley
Dulski	MacGregor	Wilson,
Dwyer	Mann	Charles H.
Edwards, Calif.	Mize	Zion

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Brasco against.
 Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.
 Mr. Montgomery for, with Mr. Addabbo against.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Gilbert against.
 Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. Morse against.
 Mr. Cleveland for, with Mr. McFall against.
 Mr. Lukens for, with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin against.
 Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. McEwen against.
 Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Grover against.
 Mr. Frey for, with Mr. Shriver against.
 Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Fish against.
 Mr. Henderson for, with Mr. Gialmo against.
 Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Zion.
 Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Bush.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cunningham.
 Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Landgrebe.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Sebellus.
 Mr. Rosenthal with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. Gaydos.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Downing.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Mann with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Albert.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Rogers of Florida.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Stephens.
 Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.

Mrs. CHISHOLM changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 282, nays 52, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]
YEAS—282

Adair	Dingell	Lloyd
Adams	Eckhardt	Long, Md.
Albert	Edmondson	Lowenstein
Alexander	Edwards, Ala.	McCarthy
Anderson,	Elberg	McClory
Calif.	Erlenborn	McCloskey
Anderson, Ill.	Eshleman	McClure
Anderson,	Evans, Colo.	McCulloch
Tenn.	Evens, Tenn.	McDade
Andrews,	Farbstein	McDonald,
N. Dak.	Fascell	Mich.
Annunzio	Feighan	McKneally
Arends	Findley	Macdonald,
Ashley	Flood	Mass.
Aspinall	Foley	Madden
Ayres	Ford, Gerald R.	Mahon
Barrett	Ford,	Mailliard
Beall, Md.	William D.	Marsh
Belcher	Foreman	Martin
Bell, Calif.	Fountain	Mathias
Bennett	Frelinghuysen	Matsunaga
Berry	Friedel	May
Betts	Fulton, Pa.	Mayne
Biaggi	Fulton, Tenn.	Meeds
Biester	Fuqua	Meskill
Blackburn	Gallfanakis	Mikva
Blatnik	Gallagher	Miller, Calif.
Boggs	Garmatz	Minish
Boland	Gettys	Mink
Bolling	Gibbons	Minshall
Bow	Goldwater	Mizell
Brademas	Gonzalez	Moorhead
Bray	Gray	Morgan
Broomfield	Guide	Morton
Brotzman	Hamilton	Mosher
Brown, Calif.	Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.
Brown, Mich.	schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.
Brown, Ohio	Hanley	Myers
Broyhill, N.C.	Hanna	Natcher
Broyhill, Va.	Hansen, Idaho	Nezdi
Buchanan	Harsha	Nelsen
Burke, Mass.	Harvey	Obey
Burlison, Mo.	Hastings	O'Hara
Burton, Calif.	Hathaway	Olsen
Button	Hawkins	O'Neill, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Otinger
Byrnes, Wis.	Hechler, W. Va.	Patman
Cederberg	Heckler, Mass.	Patten
Celler	Helstoski	Pelly
Chamberlain	Hicks	Pepper
Chisholm	Hogan	Perkins
Clark	Hollifield	Pettis
Clawson, Del.	Horton	Pickle
Clay	Hosmer	Pike
Cleveland	Howard	Pirnie
Cohelan	Hunt	Podell
Collier	Hutchinson	Poff
Collins	Jacobs	Pollock
Conable	Jarman	Preyer, N.C.
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Price, Ill.
Corbett	Jonas	Pryor, Ark.
Coughlin	Jones, Tenn.	Pucinski
Cowger	Karh	Purcell
Cramer	Kastenmeyer	Railsback
Culver	Kazen	Randall
Daddario	Kee	Rees
Daniels, N.J.	Kleppe	Reid, N.Y.
Davis, Wis.	Kluczynski	Rhodes
de la Garza	Koch	Riegle
Delaney	Kuykendall	Robison
Dellenback	Kyl	Rodino
Denney	Kyros	Rogers, Colo.
Dennis	Landrum	Rogers, Fla.
Dent	Langen	Roth
Derwinski	Latta	Roybal
Dickinson	Leggett	Ruppe

Ruth	Stuckey	Whalen
Ryan	Sullivan	White
St. Onge	Symington	Whitehurst
Schadberg	Taft	Widnall
Schneebeli	Talcott	Wiggins
Schwengel	Taylor	Williams
Scott	Teague, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Sikes	Thompson, Ga.	Winn
Sisk	Thompson, N.J.	Wold
Skubitz	Thomson, Wis.	Wolf
Slack	Tunney	Wright
Smith, Calif.	Udall	Wyatt
Smith, N.Y.	Ullman	Wyder
Springer	Van Deerlin	Wyman
Stafford	Vander Jagt	Yates
Stanton	Vanik	Yatron
Steed	Vigorito	Young
Stephens	Waldie	Zablocki
Stokes	Wampler	Zwach
Stratton	Watts	
Stubblefield	Weicker	

NAYS—52

Abbitt	Haley	Price, Tex.
Abernethy	Hall	Rarick
Andrews, Ala.	Hull	Reid, Ill.
Baring	Ichord	Rivers
Bevill	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Brinkley	Jones, N.C.	Satterfield
Caffery	King	Saylor
Camp	Lennon	Scherle
Chappell	Lujan	Snyder
Daniel, Va.	Lukens	Steiger, Ariz.
Devine	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Michel	Utt
Duncan	Miller, Ohio	Waggonner
Edwards, La.	Mills	Watson
Flynt	Nichols	Whitten
Gooding	O'Neal, Ga.	Wylie
Gross	Passman	
Hagan	Poage	

NOT VOTING—96

Addabbo	Fallon	Monagan
Ashbrook	Fish	Montgomery
Bingham	Fisher	Morse
Blanton	Flowers	Moss
Brasco	Fraser	Nix
Brock	Frey	O'Konski
Brooks	Gaydos	Philbin
Burke, Fla.	Gialmo	Powell
Burleson, Tex.	Gilbert	Quie
Burton, Utah	Green, Oreg.	Quillen
Bush	Green, Pa.	Reifel
Cabell	Griffin	Reuss
Cahill	Griffiths	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey	Grover	Rooney, Pa.
Carter	Gubser	Rosenthal
Clancy	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Clausen,	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Don H.	Hébert	St Germain
Colmer	Henderson	Sandman
Conyers	Hungate	Scheuer
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Sebellus
Cunningham	Keith	Shipley
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Shriver
Dawson	Landgrebe	Smith, Iowa
Diggs	Lipscomb	Staggers
Donohue	Long, La.	Steiger, Wis.
Dorn	McEwen	Tiernan
Downing	McFall	Watkins
Dulski	MacGregor	Whalley
Dwyer	Mann	Wilson,
Edwards, Calif.	Melcher	Charles H.
Esch	Mize	Zion
	Mollohan	

So the bill was passed.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
 Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Griffin against.
 Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Montgomery against.
 Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.
 Mr. Melcher for, with Mr. Henderson against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Until further notice:
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Zion.
 Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Burke of Florida.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Mize.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Bush.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Cunningham.
 Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Landgrebe.
 Mr. Monagan with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Sebelius.
 Mr. Rosenenthal with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. Gaydos.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Blanton with Mr. Downing.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Mann with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Rooney of New York.
 Mr. Moss with Mr. Staggers.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Fraser.
 Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Gialmo.
 Mr. McFall with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Carter with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Frey with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Morse with Mr. Quie.
 Mr. McEwen with Mr. Quillen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER STOPPING PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION SHOULD BE CANCELED

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to halt construction on public works projects is indeed regrettable.

The net effect of this decision will be to increase costs, create unemployment, and to delay needed public facilities.

Construction costs are increasing at the rate of 8 to 10 percent annually in various parts of the country and any delays will simply add increased costs to each project.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations indicates that delays on projects will result in millions of dollars in increased costs.

The Chief of Engineers in his testimony before our committee indicated that construction slowdowns, delays and stretchouts have already resulted in \$130 million in increased costs. This is due to disruption of normal, regulated construction schedules and the escalat-

ing costs of construction. I am advised that further delays will cost hundreds of millions.

A study by the Bureau of Reclamation of 23 major projects already delayed indicated the increased costs of the slowdown will total \$182 million in this area alone—and that another \$98 million in delayed benefits will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, we are already lagging in receiving the benefits which these projects bring—flood control, power production, highways and transportation, navigation, new water supplies, and recreation, among others.

This is not the first slowdown this year. In April another Presidential order delayed work on 116 projects involving \$143 million. Although the statement is made that the latest order does not affect current contracts, the order certainly applies to new contracts on going projects. In other words, many projects will be halted at all stages of completion—bleak monuments to this regrettable and shortsighted decision.

Any short-term advantages that might be gained by the curtailment of public works projects will be offset by the long range impact of this drastic slowdown of progress.

There has already been too long a delay in completion of our Interstate Highway System. Safety and the public need and interest more than justify proceeding with Corps of Engineers-Bureau of Reclamation projects, our interstate highway construction program, the Appalachian highway program, and other public construction projects without interruption.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I sent a telegram to the President calling for the cancellation or modification of his order on stopping public works construction.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 38 Representatives have joined me in signing the attached statement regarding the treatment of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I intend to forward copies of this statement to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense urging that they bring it forcefully to the attention of the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris.

Last month Senator CRANSTON and Senator GOODELL sponsored an identical statement, which 38 of their colleagues signed. The statement was delivered to the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris on August 21.

We have an obligation to American prisoners of war to do everything possible to expedite their release—and to see that they are treated justly.

Mr. Speaker, I include the statement in the RECORD:

FULL TEXT OF STATEMENT

Along with Americans everywhere, we too rejoiced with the families of the three servicemen freed from North Vietnamese captivity.

These gallant men emerged from their

ordeal physically weakened, but unwavering in their courage and loyalty.

Yet even as we share the joy of their release, our happiness is clouded by the knowledge that 1,365 other American families are still waiting—some for the release of a husband or son, some even for definite word whether a loved one is dead or alive.

For many of these families, the North Vietnamese could devise no subtler cruelty than their persistent refusal even to provide a list of names of the prisoners in their custody. Each of us regularly receives poignant letters from parents and wives of the more than 1,000 men who are missing and thought to be prisoners of the North Vietnamese and the more than 300 known to be in custody.

When, they ask, will our men be able to come home?

And, all too often, how can we find out if they are still alive?

It is hard for us to understand how Hanoi can maintain so callous a position. By our own standards, this kind of cruelty imposed on innocent bystanders is both repugnant and virtually unthinkable.

Yet it may be that North Vietnam hopes through such cruel pressure to influence the policy of the United States toward the Vietnam conflict.

If this is their intention, they are doomed to failure. Neither we in Congress, nor the Administration, nor the American people as a whole, nor indeed the families directly affected, will be swayed by this crude attempt.

Though we may differ in our views on the future course of American policy in Vietnam, we are firmly united in support of the position on our prisoners made clear both by the present Administration and by its predecessor.

In 1967, for example, the United States formally protested mistreatment of American prisoners and urged North Vietnam to observe the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Equally important, our government asked Hanoi to permit impartial observers to verify its claims that our men were being treated humanely—claims contradicted by a growing body of evidence that prisoners were being subjected to emotional and physical duress.

Indeed, Hanoi had threatened a year earlier to put American prisoners on trial as "war criminals," a clear violation of the Geneva Convention. Fortunately, they were dissuaded from their plans by worldwide protests against this extreme form of inhumane treatment.

Efforts to help our servicemen held by North Vietnam have been pursued with equal vigor by the present Administration. Secretary of State Rogers, Secretary of Defense Laird, and Ambassador Lodge in Paris have all pressed North Vietnam in recent months for compliance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention. In particular, they have urged such basic steps as repatriation of sick and wounded prisoners and the furnishing of a list of men actually in North Vietnamese hands.

This latter, most basic, request was brutally rebuffed by North Vietnamese representative Xuan Thuy in Paris, who flatly refused even to identify the American prisoners held in his country so long as the United States "continued its aggressive war in Vietnam."

This obvious attempt by Hanoi to capitalize on our deep concern for these men, and to turn it to their propaganda or political advantage, is inhumane and inexcusable.

We urge Hanoi not to be misled by our divergences on policy into believing that we are not united on this issue of simple humanity. Cruelty of the kind being practiced in this instance by North Vietnam can serve only to increase our determination and, in the words of Ambassador Lodge, "cannot have a favorable effect on our negotiations."

We therefore pledge our full support to the Administration in its efforts on behalf

of the American servicemen held captive in North Vietnam.

With the Administration, we too ask Hanoi to prove the "humane and generous" policy it claims to follow in treatment of prisoners by naming the men in captivity, by immediately repatriating the sick and wounded, by permitting impartial inspection of prison facilities, by assuring proper treatment of all prisoners, by making possible a regular flow of mail, and by undertaking serious negotiations for the prompt release of all American prisoners in their custody.

And, finally, we urge the governments, the statesmen, and the ordinary men and women around the world who spoke out against "war crimes trials" in 1966 to make their voices heard once more. Then, as now, the issue was not political but humanitarian—and Hanoi responded to the force of world public opinion. If that force can again be mobilized, this too may contribute to inducing from Hanoi greater respect for human decency and for the rule of law.

SIGNERS

Adair, E. Ross.
Anderson, Glenn M.
Annunzio, Frank.
Ashley, Thomas L.
Blanton, Ray.
Boland, Edward P.
Brasco, Frank J.
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland, James C.
Conte, Silvio O.
Coughlin, R. Lawrence.
Cowger, William O.
Daniel, W. C. "Dan".
Dent, John H.
Derwinski, Edward.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr.
Donohue, Harold D.
Dulski, Thaddeus J.
Duncan, John J.
Edwards, Edwin W.
Ellberg, Joshua.
Findley, Paul.
Flood, Daniel J.
Friedel, Samuel.
Fulton, James G. (Pa.).
Gallagher, Cornelius E.
Giaino, Robert N.
Griffin, Charles H.
Hanna, Richard T.
Hansen, Julia Butler.
Hastings, James F.
Hechler, Ken.
Horton, Frank.
Howard, James J.
Hunt, John E.
Ichord, Richard H.
Johnson, Harold T.
Karth, Joseph E.
Keith, Hastings.
King, Carleton J.
Kluczynski, John C.
Koch, Edward I.
Long, Clarence D.
McClure, James A.
McDade, Joseph M.
Mailliard, William S.
Mann, James R.
Matsunaga, Spark M.
Mikva, Abner J.
Miller, Clarence E.
Minish, Joseph G.
Moorhead, William S.
Murphy, John M. (N.Y.).
Murphy, William T. (Ill.).
Myers, John T.
Nedzi, Lucien N.
Patten, Edward J.
Pelly, Thomas M.
Pettis, Jerry L.
Poage, W. R.
Podell, Bertram L.
Pucinski, Roman C.
Rarick, John.
Rees, Thomas M.
Reuss, Henry S.
Rhodes, John J.
Riegle, Donald W., Jr.

Roberts, Ray.
Ruppe, Philip E.
St Germain, Fernand J.
Sandman, Charles W., Jr.
Schadeberg, Henry C.
Scott, William Lloyd.
Sikes, Robert L. F.
Steiger, William A.
Talcott, Burt L.
Teague, Olin E.
Thompson, Frank Jr. (N.J.).
Vigoro, Joseph P.
Waggonner, John D., Jr.
Waldie, Jerome R.
Watkins, G. Robert.
Weicker, Lowell P.
White, Richard C.
Whitehurst, G. William.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler, John W.
Wyman, Louis C.
Yatron, Gus.

LABELING OF SAUSAGE PRODUCTS AND HOT DOGS

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

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, a grave injustice has been imposed on a major American industry and on the consuming public by an agency of our Federal Government. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has decided to limit the amount of chicken that can be used in cooked sausage products to only 15 percent. Discriminatory labeling is required if the percentage is over this amount.

Now, what makes this doubly outrageous is that the Agriculture Department is also proposing to allow the red meat industry to stuff hot dogs with up to 33 percent fat.

As we all know, poultry meat is very low in fat content. It would, therefore, seem much more nutritious to offer the public hot dogs and other sausages with high percentages of good protein than almost flammable products.

There is not even a taste difference that can be fairly used to account for the discrimination against poultry meat in hot dogs.

As other Members know, I have always supported strongly the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. I am pleased that by next November this act will extend to even intrastate operations. And I am proud of the fact that the broiler industry in my State has had an excellent record in producing quality products for Federal inspection.

My concern now is to get more of this good meat into franks—and to eliminate some of the fat. I believe that this is the best way to serve the American people.

An excellent background statement analyzing the history of the present situation has been issued by the National Broiler Council and I am pleased to include this with these remarks for my colleagues in the Congress to read and consider.

In 1964 a new machine came on the market which for the first time made it practical and economical to debone chickens. Thus, a new meat component for hot dogs and other sausage products became available.

Soon after this machine was introduced, the U.S. Department of Agriculture imposed labeling requirements so misleading to consumers that they served as an effective blockade against the use of the federally

inspected deboned chicken meat in franks moving in interstate commerce. Official rule making procedures were ignored by those imposing these restrictions. No opportunity was granted for those adversely affected to express views at a hearing, or for that matter, file statements of protest for the public record.

On the other hand, intra-state manufacturers of hot dogs were not subject to the federal restrictions. When they learned about this new chicken product and began to use it, demand increased as its merits became more widely known. However, the intra-state market was limited, and although nationally recognized authorities in food technology said the new deboned chicken product was one of the finest meat components available for hot dogs, it became necessary for the U.S. chicken industry to look abroad to expand the market. Actions of the federal government therefore had the practical paradoxical effect of forcing the export of high quality chicken product at a time USDA was permitting hundreds of millions of pounds of low grade red meat to be imported for use in hot dogs and other sausage products.

Time after time over the past four years USDA officials acknowledged the inequity of this situation and promised corrective action. But nothing happened.

Then nearly two years ago Congress passed the Wholesome Meat Act which by next November will make it necessary for intra-state hot dog manufacturers to meet federal standards, including the discriminatory labeling standards which so effectively blocked the use of chicken in franks moving between states. Faced with a loss of markets, many chicken deboning operations would be forced to close, unless this inequity were corrected.

In response to the chicken industry's appeal for relief from this injustice, the U.S. Department of Agriculture published a proposed regulation authorizing the use of chicken in hot dogs, which imposed certain crippling restrictions. One of these reduced the bone residue tolerance to .5 percent, a level far below the technical capability of existing deboning machines. This level was also two-thirds less than the Department had earlier claimed as being appropriate to provide maximum safeguards to public health. Its effect would not only have been to continue to deny the use of the new federally inspected chicken product in hot dogs moving across state lines, but to also force chicken out of the intra-state sausage market where the new product enjoyed excellent acceptance from consumers, retailers, and manufacturers. Again, the industry registered a strong protest. USDA responded by changing these requirements to a less unreasonable level. This change appeared in the new regulations governing the use of chicken in hot dogs and other sausage products published in the Federal Register September 3. Authorization was also given to include chicken in the regular frank with skin in natural proportion to the part. Both changes represent improvements over earlier interpretations of the proposed regulation.

Unlike earlier moves the latest action by the U.S. Department of Agriculture would not put those with chicken deboning operations out of business. But some claim it offers a decided competitive advantage to red meats.

Under such regulations they require beef hot dogs to be made of beef, pork hot dogs from pork, but USDA authorized up to 85% of other meats in chicken hot dogs! Is a federal label therefore being used to disguise the truth and to mislead the consumer. If USDA permits up to 85 percent other meats in chicken franks, can we now expect labels to be approved authorizing up to 85 percent other meats in chicken rolls, chicken pies or chicken soup?

Interestingly, the 85 percent amount can include the least desirable red meat components. These could have the effect of down

grading chicken hot dogs offered consumers because the amount of the high quality chicken would be so small.

Quite the opposite situation prevails when chicken is used in the "all meat" hot dog. By official definition the chicken used must be lean muscle meat . . . a product with less than 10 percent fat. USDA employs a far more lenient "meat" definition for the red meats, and therefore it becomes possible to blend the lean, low fat chicken product with certain low priced red meat items having as much as 70 percent fat. Consequently if USDA places a limit on the amount of fat permitted in hot dogs, the effect of the new regulation would appear to enable red meats to enjoy a competitive advantage from the use of chicken in "all meat" franks.

Many from the broiler industry have voiced concern that the new chicken in sausage regulation seems to offer strong competitive advantages to red meats. If such apprehensions are validated by actual experience, then those affected can be expected to take the steps necessary to overcome unjust discrimination.

FREE WORLD FLAG SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

1969 FREE WORLD SHIP ARRIVALS IN NORTH VIETNAM

	British	Somali	Cyprus	Singapore	Japanese	Maltese	Total
January.....	8	2	1				11
February.....	6		1	2	1		10
March.....	6	1					7
April.....	7	1			1		9
May.....	9	1	1			1	12
June.....	6	2	2	1			11
July.....	6	1					7
August.....	4		2				6
Total.....	52	8	7	3	2	1	73

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., August 5, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in further response to your July 7 letter requesting a report on this Administration's current efforts to reduce the number of free world ships carrying supplies to North Vietnam.

I wish to assure you that this Administration shares your concern with this problem and is continuing its efforts to reduce this trade. Over the past several months this Administration has worked closely with some of the governments whose vessels are in this trade. In some cases these efforts have been successful and the governments either have prohibited calls of their flag vessels to North Vietnam or in other ways have taken measures to prevent such calls. For example, the Small Republic in April banned calls at North Vietnamese, North Korean and Cuban ports. Singapore-flag vessels are no longer in the trade. The call of a Singapore-flag vessel in June, which you mentioned in your letter, is viewed as an illegal act by the Government of Singapore because that ship's registration has been cancelled.

The cooperation of the Government of Cyprus has been sought repeatedly and at all levels, but its vessels continue to call at North Vietnam. As a consequence, aid programs to Cyprus were discontinued in 1966. Requests for resumption of some aid programs in recent months have been denied. Section 620(n) of the Foreign Assistance Act was also recently applied to Malta because of that government's apparent inability to prevent voyages by its flag vessels to North Vietnam. This action was precipitated by

during August a total of six free world flag ships arrived in North Vietnam, according to Department of Defense information. This brings the total so far this year to 73 arrivals and represents a 25-percent reduction from the 98 arrivals during the same period in 1968.

This is good news and the administration is to be commended for its continuing efforts to achieve full cooperation in ending the use of such vessels by Communist interests for what can only be the aid and comfort of the Hanoi regime and its pursuit of the war in the south.

In August, this traffic consisted of four ships flying the British flag and two the flag of Cyprus. This constitutes one of the lowest monthly totals in many months, but while I am encouraged, I am not satisfied and do not believe our fighting men in South Vietnam or the great majority of Americans here at home are satisfied either. For that reason I shall continue to urge greater action to eliminate free world flags trading with the enemy.

At this point, I insert a chart covering free world shipping to North Vietnam during 1969 and the text of a letter I have received in response to my request for action by the new administration.

the call of a Maltese-flag vessel to North Vietnam in May.

With regard to British-flag vessels, the Administration shares your concern over the number of these vessels that continue to carry goods to North Vietnam each month. This subject has been discussed several times with the British Government. That Government maintains that it cannot take effective action because of the implication which such action might have for Britain's position in Hong Kong. The ships in question are all owned by Hong Kong firms believed to be under the control of Communist Chinese interests.

I can assure you that this Administration will continue to give careful attention to the problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

NEED FOR PASSAGE OF THE PROGRAM INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the last day of legislative business, I rose to begin a short series of remarks stressing the need for passage of the Program Information Act. By including in the body of the RECORD comments from officials across the country, I hope to illustrate that the people back home, the people who must deal with the maze of

Federal aid programs, believe very strongly that the Government should publish an annual catalog of all Federal aid programs, should update the catalog monthly, and should distribute the catalog widely. An information crisis now exists in States, cities, towns, and universities. Officials find that they apply for funds under a certain program only to learn that application deadlines are passed, that funds no longer exist, that they have been misled as to program requirements. They may find, in a nutshell, that all the obligations they must meet have not been carefully outlined by the Government—and they learn, in a nutshell, that they have wasted countless dollars and countless man-hours on a project that will yield no results. This is not to say that the type of catalog mandated by the Program Information Act will solve all problems and answer all questions, but it will go more than one giant step further than any other existing publication.

Listen to what some of our constituents say:

From a State college administrator in the East:

We can't afford to keep track of federal aid. Several of us devote many extra hours in a losing effort to keep abreast.

A State welfare official in Illinois:

Existing catalogs are just not specific enough to be useful. They get out of date very quickly and one never knows if funds are available.

A housing official in Texas:

One-third of all administrative costs can be accounted for by trying to find out what you are supposed to do, how you are supposed to do it, and by trying to keep track of the procedural changes which are constantly being made.

A county planner in Georgia:

We need a single source of federal program information. I now have six federal aid catalogs on my desk and dozens of offers from private agencies who sell a service of trying to locate federal assistance information.

A private consultant in Arizona:

Approximately 30 percent of our fees are expended in consultation and correspondence over the procedures and requirements of federally assisted programs versus 5 to 10 percent for private development. Two men out of an office of 32 devote almost 100 percent of their time in learning, explaining, and fulfilling application requirements of federally aided programs.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES URBAN PROPERTY PROTECTION AND REINSURANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1969

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation, the Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance Amendments of 1969, designed to make extensive changes in the national insurance development program, enacted into law last year as part of the 1968 Housing Act Amendments.

This legislation deals with the problem areas that have cropped up in connection

with last year's legislation and will enable homeowners and businessmen to obtain insurance at reasonable costs.

My bill contains most of the amendments that I offered last year in connection with the national insurance development program. Unfortunately, these amendments were not adopted because the insurance industry argued that they were not necessary. However, it has been shown that these amendments were necessary and, therefore, it is vital that the amendments now be enacted.

Last March and April, the Housing Subcommittee held hearings in Washington, D.C., and Chicago on the operation of the Federal insurance program. The record of these hearings clearly indicates that the program, as now enacted, is simply not reflecting the intent of those of us who supported it. We thought we were passing a law which would give the insurance industry some relief against the tremendously high losses which resulted from riots and civil disorders. More importantly, we felt that we were establishing a program to be run by the industry and the States which would afford all inner-city property owners essential property insurance at reasonable rates. These are the so-called FAIR plans.

Under these plans, inner-city property owners who could not get insurance through private sources would be afforded policies through a voluntary pool established by the industry under the supervision of the State commissioner. These FAIR plans were supposed to eliminate two problems.

First was a hideous insurance industry practice of red-lining or blacking-out inner-city areas. Second, making property insurance available to property owners in these areas was supposed to eliminate blight and encourage the improvement of properties, because the lack of insurance makes it virtually impossible to obtain financing for improvement and repairs.

The theory of the act, while still valid, has not worked out. For example, in Chicago, we found that many companies were still refusing to write in inner-city areas; that after the law was signed, many companies arbitrarily canceled policies and "dumped" those policies into the FAIR plans; that the FAIR plan rates were double and sometimes quadruple the normal manual rates for such policies; that inner-city property owners had no knowledge of the availability of FAIR plan insurance; that brokers and agents were reluctant to put policies in the FAIR plan because the commissions for such policies were much lower than the commissions paid by private industry and the inner-city property owners in most cases, was left to the so-called high-risk writers.

My bill meets many of these problems head on. Its dominant provision calls for the direct Federal writing of essential property insurance, including crime lines, if the rates for such insurance in the private market exceed 175 percent of the manual rate. The premium for such policies will be 175 percent of the manual rate. No policy will be written if the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines that the property

is uninsurable, or if the State commissioner can justify the excessive rate.

The FAIR plans are continued. However, we include, in addition to fire and extended coverage, vandalism and malicious mischief, and burglary and theft in the FAIR plan. As you can imagine, these lines of insurance are most important to inner-city property owners.

Other much-needed reforms contained in the bill are:

First. Eliminates discrimination in brokers' and agents' commissions. This will encourage brokers and agents to sell the FAIR plan insurance.

Second. Provides Federal guaranties for performance bonds for small business construction contractors and subcontractors. For over a year, black contractors have complained about their inability to engage in so-called black entrepreneurship programs because they cannot get performance bonds.

Third. Provides for reinsurance of losses which occur during the construction or rehabilitation of habitational property. We are amazed to learn that homes and apartments being constructed or rehabilitated even under our Federal programs are uninsured during the building or remodeling period. By offering the same kind of insurance against such losses that is now provided for riot losses, these properties will be insured during the crucial construction stage.

Fourth. Eliminates State sharing in riot loss payments. Present law provides that the States must pay up to 5 percent of the total property premiums written in the State toward riot losses. Many States have been very reluctant to assume this obligation since they do not have the money. Yet, unless the State enacts legislation providing for this State share, the insurance companies in that State are ineligible for riot reinsurance. One of the purposes of this State share was to encourage the States to take measures to eliminate riots and civil disorders. Experience has taught us the expense of such endeavors far outweighs the advantage to be gained.

Fifth. Provides for an Office of Review and Compliance in HUD to be operated under the supervision of the Office of the Federal Insurance Administrator. At present, the Federal Insurance Administrator has virtually no policing powers over the operation of the program. The only way he hears about complaints or inadequacies comes through letters from Congressmen or the inner-city property owners. The Insurance Administrator should have the authority to check on the operation of these programs and take such steps as may be necessary to make them more effective.

These are the more salient substantive provisions of the bill. It does not provide for any new financing. The direct Federal insurance program will hopefully be paid for through the premiums collected. In the event losses exceed premiums, then the bill authorizes the Secretary to draw on the same funds which have already been made available for the payment of riot losses.

The Federal urban insurance program was passed last year. Based on the Chicago and Washington, D.C., hearings, and complaints received by many of us,

this program has been a failure. Many of the provisions in my bill were first offered by me as amendments to the original legislation. These amendments were defeated in committee and on the floor—based on assurances by the insurance industry and the Department of Housing and Urban Development that they were unnecessary. After 1 year's experience, I have become convinced that this legislation is the only way to afford viable insurance programs for our inner-city residents and property owners.

The bill has been constructed to keep Federal incursion in the insurance industry at an absolute minimum. It also provides that where Federal assistance no longer becomes necessary, the situation is turned back to the industry.

The bill follows:

H.R. 13666

A bill to amend title XII of the National Housing Act to provide, under the urban property protection and reinsurance program, for direct Federal insurance against losses to habitational property for which insurance is not otherwise available or is available only at excessively surcharged rates, to make crime insurance mandatory under such program, to provide assistance to homeowners to aid in reducing the causes of excessive surcharges, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Property Protection and Reinsurance Amendments of 1969".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1102(b) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "and" immediately before "(2)", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and (3) provide direct insurance through the facilities of the Federal Government in the case of properties for which such statewide programs and the Federal reinsurance program do not make property insurance available or do not offer such insurance to the property owners at reasonable rates as defined herein."

(b) (1) Section 1201 of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"PROGRAM AUTHORITY

"Sec. 1201. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish and carry out the programs provided for in parts A, B, C, and D of this title.

"(b) (1) The powers of the Secretary under this title shall terminate on April 30, 1984, except to the extent necessary—

"(A) to continue reinsurance and direct insurance in accordance with the provisions of sections 1223(b) and 1231(c) until April 30, 1987;

"(B) to process, verify, and pay claims for reinsured losses and directly insured losses and perform other necessary functions in connection therewith; and

"(C) to complete the liquidation and termination of the reinsurance and direct insurance programs.

"(2) On April 30, 1987, or as soon thereafter as possible, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress, for its approval, a plan for the liquidation and termination of the reinsurance and direct insurance programs."

(2) (A) Section 1203(a) of such Act is amended by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (13) as paragraphs (2) through (14), respectively, and by inserting immediately after and below "the term—" the following new paragraph:

"(1) 'directly insured losses' means losses on direct insurance claims and all direct expenses incurred in connection therewith including, but not limited to, expenses for

processing, verifying, and paying such losses;".

(B) Section 1203(a) of such Act (as amended by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (13) and (14) as paragraphs (14) and (15), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) 'manual rate' means the lowest approved or advisory rate filed by the principal rating organization for the same classification of risk and territory, excluding all surcharges and condition charges;".

(C) Section 1221(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 1203(a)(10)" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1203(a)(11)".

(c) (1) Title XII of such Act (as amended by the provisions of this Act other than this subsection) is amended by redesignating part C and sections 1231 through 1241 as part D and sections 1241 and 1251, respectively, and by inserting after part B the following new part:

"PART C—DIRECT FEDERAL INSURANCE

"DIRECT INSURANCE OF LOSSES TO PROPERTY WHERE INSURANCE IS OTHERWISE UNAVAILABLE OR AVAILABLE ONLY AT EXCESSIVELY SURCHARGED RATES

"SEC. 1231. (a) If at any time the Secretary determines that any of the standard lines of property insurance enumerated under subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 1203(a)(11) is not available (through the applicable plan under part A or otherwise) to any property, or is available to such property but only at an unreasonable rate, he shall make such standard line of property insurance available to such property directly through the facilities of the Federal Government, on such terms and conditions as he may determine to be appropriate, at a rate equal to 175 per centum of the applicable manual rate: *Provided*, that no such insurance shall be made available to a property which the Secretary determines to be uninsurable.

"(b) In carrying out his responsibilities under subsection (a), the Secretary may utilize—

"(1) insurance companies and other insurers, insurance agents and brokers, and insurance adjustment organizations, as fiscal agents of the United States,

"(2) officers and employees of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and such other officers and employees of any executive agency (as defined in section 105 of title 5 of the United States Code) as the Secretary and the head of any such agency may from time to time agree upon, on a reimbursement or other basis, or

"(3) both the alternatives specified in paragraphs (1) and (2), or any combination thereof.

"(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this title, direct insurance may be continued for the term of the policies written prior to the date of termination of the Secretary's direct insurance authority under this part, for as long as the insured pays the required direct insurance premiums; except that direct insurance under this part for any risk shall be terminated after notice whenever the Secretary determines that the standard lines of property insurance enumerated under subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 1203(a)(11) have become available to such property at a reasonable rate.

"(d) For the purposes of this part, a rate within a State shall be presumed to be unreasonable if the Secretary finds that the total premium (including all surcharges and condition charges) charged to each of 50 or more properties in that State in any 12 month period exceeds 175 per centum of the applicable manual rate. The Secretary shall notify the appropriate State insurance authority within 15 days of making any such finding. The presumption of unreasonableness may thereafter be rebutted only if (1)

the appropriate State insurance authority, within 30 days after the date of mailing of such notification, files with the Secretary a certification that such authority has independently determined that there is demonstrably an objective justification for the imposition of the premiums charged, stating sufficiently the basis for such justification, and (2) the Secretary concurs in such determination.

"(e) The amount of insurance provided by the Secretary with respect to any property shall not exceed such limits as he may determine to be appropriate: *Provided*, That no coverage shall be written on any single family residential structure in excess of \$25,000 or on any manufacturing or commercial structure in excess of \$1,000,000.

"(f) The Secretary shall include in his reports to the Congress on the program under this title full and complete information on his operations and activities under this part, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem appropriate."

Sec. 1232. The Secretary may, whenever he deems such action to be necessary or desirable and upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, guarantee any bid, payment, or performance bond under an agreement entered into by a small business concern which is a construction contractor or subcontractor to enable such concern to obtain such bond. Any such guarantee may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with any qualified surety company or other qualified company through a participation agreement with such company."

(2) (A) Section 1222(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 1233" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1243".

(B) Section 1234(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 1232" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1242".

(d) (1) (A) Section 1231(a) of such Act is amended by inserting "or direct insurance" after "reinsurance", and by inserting "or property owners" after "insurers".

(B) Section 1231(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "or direct insurance" after "reinsurance".

(2) (A) Section 1232(a) of such Act is amended—

(i) by striking out "the reinsurance program" and inserting in lieu thereof "the reinsurance and direct insurance programs";

(ii) by inserting "or direct insurance" after "reinsurance" in paragraphs (1), (2), and (4);

(iii) by inserting "or property owner" after "any insurer" where it first appears in paragraph (4); and

(iv) by inserting "or directly insured" after "reinsured" in paragraph (4).

(3) Section 1233 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "and direct insurance" after "reinsurance" in subsection (a) (1) and each place it appears in subsection (b) (1); and

(B) by striking out "part B" in subsection (b) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "parts B and C".

(4) (A) Section 1234(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Any insurer or poor acquiring reinsurance" and inserting in lieu thereof "Any insurer, pool, or property owner acquiring reinsurance or direct insurance".

(B) Section 1234(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "or direct insurance" after "reinsurance".

(e) Clause (2) in the first sentence of section 520(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "and directly insured" after "reinsured" wherever it appears.

Sec. 3. Section 1203(a)(3) of the National Housing Act (as amended by section 2(b)(2) of this Act) is amended by striking out "and insurance for such types, classes, and locations of property against the perils of vandalism, malicious mischief, burglary, or theft, as the Secretary by rule shall designate" and inserting in lieu thereof "and

insurance against the perils of vandalism, malicious mischief, burglary, and theft".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 1203(a)(3) of the National Housing Act (as amended by section 2(b)(2) and section 3 of this Act) is amended by striking out "Such insurance" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such insurance shall include insurance against direct losses to property (as defined and limited by the Secretary) which occur during the construction or rehabilitation of such property. Such insurance".

(b) Part B of title XII of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"REINSURANCE OF LOSSES DURING CONSTRUCTION OR REHABILITATION

"SEC. 1225. The Secretary is authorized to offer to any insurer or pool reinsurance against losses to habitational property which occur during the construction or rehabilitation of such property. Except as otherwise provided by such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, all of the provisions, terms, and conditions of this title relating to reinsurance of losses from riots or civil disorders shall apply with respect to the reinsurance of losses which occur during the construction or rehabilitation of habitational property."

Sec. 5. Section 1211(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) commissions paid to agents, brokers, and producers for or with respect to policies written under the plan shall not be less than the prevailing rate being paid in the same territory for or with respect to other policies of the same type which are not written under the plan, as determined and certified to the Secretary by the State insurance authority."

Sec. 6. (a) Section 1214 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Each report and other document submitted to the Secretary by a State insurance authority with respect to experience under the applicable plan under this part shall set forth and describe any losses sustained on habitational property separately from the losses sustained on business, commercial, and other nonhabitational property."

(b) Section 1234 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Each report and other document submitted to the Secretary by an insurer or other person under this section with respect to reinsurance under this title shall set forth and describe any losses sustained on habitational property separately from the losses sustained on business, commercial, and other nonhabitational property."

Sec. 7. Section 1214 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof (after the new subsection added by section 6(a) of this Act) the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary, through an Office of Review and Compliance under the Federal Insurance Administrator, shall periodically review each plan under this part and the methods and practices by which such plan is being actually carried out in the areas and communities where it is intended to operate, in order to assure that such plan is effectively making essential property insurance readily available in such areas and communities and is otherwise carrying out the purposes of this title, and in order to identify any aspects of the operation or administration of such plan which may require revision, modification, or other action to carry out such purposes."

Sec. 8. (a) Section 1223(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out par-

agraph (1), and by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (4), respectively.

(b) Section 1240 of such Act is amended by striking out "(a)", and by striking out subsection (b).

(c) Section 1211 of the District of Columbia Insurance Placement Act is repealed.

Sec. 9. (a) Section 115(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

(1) by striking out "(payable from any grant funds provided under section 103(b))";

(2) by inserting after "real property which has been determined to be uninsurable" the following: ", or which has been determined to be insurable only at an unreasonable rate,";

(3) by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: "or to eliminate the conditions necessitating the unreasonable rate"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "For purposes of this subsection a rate is unreasonable if it is sufficiently high to justify direct Federal insurance of the property involved under part C of title XII of the National Housing Act. Grants under this subsection shall be payable from grant funds provided under section 103(b) of this Act; except that to the extent it is determined by the Secretary that funds made available for payments of directly insured losses under such title XII pursuant to section 520(b) of such Act are not needed for payments of such losses, such funds shall be used (before any funds provided under section 103(b) of this Act) for grants under this subsection with respect to property determined to be insurable only upon payment of an unreasonable rate."

(b) Section 312(a)(1)(C) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended—

(A) by inserting after "the property has been determined to be uninsurable" the following: ", or has been determined to be insurable only upon payment of an unreasonable rate,"; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "or to eliminate the conditions necessitating the unreasonable rate".

(2) Section 312(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of paragraph (1)(C), a rate is unreasonable if it is sufficiently high to justify direct Federal insurance of the property involved under part C of title XII of the National Housing Act."

(3) Section 312(d) of such Act is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) To the extent it is determined by the Secretary that funds made available for payments of directly insured losses under title XII of the National Housing Act pursuant to section 520(b) of such Act are not needed for payments of such losses, such funds shall be placed in the revolving fund and used by the Secretary (before any funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection) for loans described in subsection (a)(1)(C) with respect to property determined to be insurable only upon payment of an unreasonable rate."

BRAZIL—A GESTURE OF FRIENDSHIP AND MATURITY

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are most fortunate that the leadership of Brazil values human life, and desires friendly relations with the United States. Because of this our Ambassador to Brazil, C. Burke Elbrick, is a free man this morning. His freedom was

ransomed at the cost of further international humiliation to the United States and the loss of 15 Communist agents provocateur to the Brazilian Government.

The event makes one wonder what is the result we would have received similar cooperation had the decisionmaking in Brazil had been under a Communist government.

With hundreds of American captives in North Korea and in North Vietnam being treated without regard to the provisions of the Geneva Convention, may we not assume they are actually detained as political prisoners rather than military prisoners of war. This administration must obtain the early release of our "living casualties" languishing in Communist prisons. If our Government fails to secure the return of these Americans, I feel that an aroused American citizenry may soon learn a lesson from the Communists on how to force release of prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my personal thanks to the Brazilian Government for their cooperation and humanitarian consideration of our representative, and I would caution the Communist gangsters to beware of their fad of kidnaping American diplomats to be exploited as hostages for barter—reminding the Reds that there are numerous representatives of the Communist bloc countries walking the streets of the United States.

I insert a news clipping from this morning's Washington Post at this point in my remarks:

ENVOY RELEASED IN BRAZIL—ELBRICK FREED AFTER PRISONERS REACH MEXICO

(By John Goshko)

RIO DE JANEIRO, September 7.—C. Burke Elbrick, the U.S. ambassador kidnapped by leftist terrorists four days ago, was released by his captors tonight—his forehead gashed by a pistol blow but otherwise in good health and spirits.

Elbrick, 61, was picked up by a cab driver as he wandered along a street in a residential district where the kidnapers put him out of a car.

His release came 78 hours after he was taken from his car at gunpoint Thursday, and five hours after 15 Brazilian political prisoners, whose freedom had been demanded as ransom for the Ambassador's life, reached sanctuary in Mexico City.

Upon arriving at the embassy residence, Elbrick made this brief statement:

"To coin an understatement of the year, I'm glad to be back. I'm glad the kidnapers lived up to their word and let me go, and I'm very grateful to the Brazilian government for taking the action necessary to bring about my liberation."

Within moments after his return, Elbrick was on the phone talking to President Nixon at the summer White House in San Clemente, Calif. The content of their talk was not immediately made known.

The ambassador also was visited by Brazilian Foreign Minister Jose Magalhaes Pinto, who rushed to the residence immediately after being informed of Elbrick's return. During the past three days, Magalhaes Pinto has acted as spokesman for the Brazilian government in the negotiations that brought the successful exchange of the ambassador for the political prisoners.

Elbrick gave Magalhaes Pinto a letter from Secretary of State William P. Rogers thanking the Brazilian government for its actions in "putting the ambassador's life above all other considerations". The letter had been relayed from Washington for delivery to the Brazilian Government as soon as Elbrick was released. He has been ambassador since July 8.

Although Elbrick told reporters thronging around the front gates of the embassy residence that he was unable to talk fully at the moment, embassy spokesman later quoted him as giving these brief details about his captivity:

Referring to a bandage on the right side of his forehead, Elbrick said he had been struck with a pistol butt at the time of the kidnaping.

"They had no intention of harming me at any time," he said, "but I did not know this so I resisted when they told me to close my eyes as they transferred me from one car to another. I was not about to close my eyes for anyone at that moment."

The ambassador said that otherwise he was treated well by his captors, who brought him cigars and even washed his shirt. During his captivity, he was kept in a bare, 9-by-12-foot room in what appeared to be a house, although Elbrick added he had no idea of its location.

At the time of his release tonight, he said, he was put in a car wearing darkened glasses through which he was unable to see and, after some driving around, was put out on a side street in a residential area in the northern part of the city.

After dropping him off on the street today, Elbrick said, his captors told him to wait 15 minutes before moving. However, he immediately began walking in search of help.

As he reached a nearby intersection, a cab pulled up beside him, and he was recognized by the driver, who said: "You are the American ambassador—poor fellow." The driver then took him to the embassy residence.

Elbrick's return climaxed a tense cat-and-mouse game that began with his kidnaping Thursday as he was returning to his office after lunch at the residence.

A note left in his car identified his abductors as members of two groups active in a mounting campaign of urban terrorism against Brazil's military-dominated, right-wing government.

They are the National Liberation Action which is reputedly led by a former Communist deputy, Carlos Marighela, and the October Revolutionary Movement (MR-8), which takes its name from the 1967 date when Communist guerrilla Che Guevara, was killed in Bolivia.

In exchange for Elbrick, the kidnapers demanded the release and safe conduct to Mexico of 14 men and a woman, mostly leftist student leaders, imprisoned by the government for alleged subversive activities.

On Friday, the government agreed to meet the kidnapers' terms, and yesterday, after considerable confusion and delay, a Brazilian air force plane took off for Mexico with the 15 prisoners.

In their various communications to the government the kidnapers made clear that they would not release Elbrick until they were satisfied the 15 were safe in Mexico. This made today, which ironically is Brazilian independence day, a time of tense waiting.

Shortly after the plane landed, photos of the prisoners on Mexican soil were relayed to Rio by radio and immediately displayed over local television stations as proof that the Brazilian government had kept its end of the bargain.

AGENCIES REPORTED THE FOLLOWING FROM MEXICO CITY

The 15 prisoners, haggard and some still wearing blue denim prison uniforms with crude identification numbers, said in Mexico City that they did not know until airborne that they were serving as the ransom for the ambassador.

Under terms of Mexico's agreement on their political asylum, they were free to go after leaving the airport.

After an almost 20-hour flight aboard a Brazilian C-130 Hercules transport plane, the group was not allowed off the plane for 35 minutes because of diplomatic problems.

They claimed they were handcuffed and not allowed to smoke during the flight, although they were given a meal aboard.

The plane's pilot, Brazilian Maj. Edon Reinisch, told newsmen the delay came because he could not release the prisoners until they received entry clearance from the Brazilian Embassy and from Mexican officials.

One of the prisoners, Flavio Tavares, a columnist for a left-wing Rio newspaper before his jailing, had said he was confident of Elbrick's release.

"It would be madness not to release him immediately," he said.

"The process of armed revolution against the Brazilian government is now beginning to get under way," he added.

"Now I am going to stay here in Mexico and reconstruct my life," he said, adding that he did not know if his wife and three-year-old daughter would be joining him here.

Maria Augusta Carneiro, 22, a student, was one of the last prisoners off the plane. "I am going to sleep, then look for a job. I am going to stay in Mexico," she said.

The oldest of the prisoners, Gregorio Bezerra, 70, said to be dying of cancer, appeared spry but tired. An old-line Communist leader from Recife, he had been sentenced to 19 years imprisonment in 1964.

PROGRESS, PROMISE, AND PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to visit in recent weeks a number of countries, some of them well off the beaten track insofar as congressional interest generally is shown. I had noted many times that a large part of the world extending from Greece to Indonesia is not well known in congressional circles, yet it comprises an area where progress is being made, in most countries, and where conflicting ideologies are seeking to dominate. The course of history may well be affected by events which now are occurring in these emerging and developing nations of the world. I am glad to report high morale and dedication of U.S. personnel in these areas—a stimulating and encouraging thing in view of the comparative isolation which many of them must endure. The trip was a most interesting experience which I propose to touch upon briefly here and to discuss in detail later in reports to my committee and to Departments of Government.

I went at a time when U.S. prestige was at one of its highest points in years—largely as a result of the success of the man-on-the-moon program. There was no country that I visited whose people had not followed by some means the progress of the moonshot, and all of them were excited and thrilled at its outcome. Regretfully, we have not taken full advantage of the opportunities offered by the moon landing. In some areas, lack of planning or lack of publicity material has held back the showing of effective exhibits. In fact, only in Burma did U.S. representatives make what I considered full use of the opportunity. There, despite the fact that U.S. activities generally are curbed, an effective exhibit was prepared in an unoccupied building. Photographs were displayed showing various stages in the space program. There were models of a rocket and of the lunar landing craft,

and a large and impressive model of the surface of the moon complete with landing craft, astronauts, and footprints. In another room, a movie was run continuously during the hours the exhibit was open. This outstanding display was fully tailored to take advantage of the opportunity, and the U.S. team is to be highly commended for its work. It is disappointing that comparable efforts have not been made elsewhere.

I am very glad to state also that in South Vietnam the picture is much brighter for allied forces. The enemy has been hurt and hurt badly, and a continuation of military pressure will in time bring realistic negotiations in Paris. This I commented on in detail in Thursday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The allied military team has the combat situation well in hand, and our fighting forces are prepared to meet any new initiative the enemy may attempt. The Vietnamese have strengthened their Government and their economy and they are steadily assuming a more effective combat role. More and more hamlets are being brought under Government security. A total of 17 million people live in South Vietnam; 15 million of them live in areas of Government security. This security continues to gain ground and a strong pacification program is in progress despite a reversion by enemy forces to guerrilla-type assassination, coercion, extortion, and terrorism. The enemy has not won a single major engagement or captured an important city. Despite the cessation of the bombing, which greatly eased his supply problem, the allied forces by redoubled efforts have kept him off balance and seriously decimated his numbers. Nevertheless, the Communist is a stubborn enemy and he continues to fight. However objective our efforts may be at the Paris peace talks, we have no recourse but to maintain pressure on the enemy in Vietnam until those talks bear fruit. This also means troop withdrawals must be based on the progress of the war or the progress of the peace talks, not on wishful thinking. Thus far, realism at the peace talks has not been forthcoming because antiwar publicity in the United States and stress on troop withdrawals have convinced the enemy further concessions are forthcoming.

These generally favorable situations is offset at least in official circles in some areas by serious concern over future U.S. intentions regarding our commitments abroad. There is also the obvious fact that U.S. influence among most Mediterranean nations is largely gone and that Communists have made gains among some Southeast Asian nations. Russian missions are nearly everywhere offering credits and arms and taking in payment food or other products. One thing, however, is to be learned from the Russians. They offer hard rather than soft loans, and they give nothing free. They are better traders than we.

Talk of troop withdrawals and defense cutbacks in the United States plus uncertainty over U.S. policies thus have combined to stimulate Communist activity in other parts of the world and may result in adjustments in policy by nations directly under Communist pressure. It would not take much at this

stage to encourage defections of some of our friends to the other side.

For instance, Burma's socialistic government may not now have reason to steer a more independent course. India's march toward socialism is more likely to continue. Nationalism of the banks there is a straw in the wind, and Russian influence is being exerted to obtain a naval base with which to enhance Communist activities in the Indian Ocean area. This is not a happy situation when one considers that India is the second largest nation in the world. Cambodia's slight shift away from the Communist embrace is more likely to remain an accommodation only, in preparation for the eventuality of an allied victory in Vietnam when that comes. Sihanouk does not want an unfriendly Thailand and South Vietnam on either flank. The Communists maintain constant pressure on the Government of Laos, a country where they hold as much territory as they want for a buffer zone despite a valiant fight by Government forces.

I was disappointed to note what I must interpret as a wait-and-see attitude by our representatives in Indonesia. As a result of a shift in government which occurred only because the Communists were in too big a hurry to assume control, there is now a favorable picture for Western interests in Indonesia. Many of that country's present leaders are friendly toward the United States. We should be moving actively there to encourage stronger alliances with the West. Indonesia is one of the largest nations in the world, and it has definite ambitions for leadership in its area; leadership which can have Western rather than Communist orientation.

In the complex and sometimes confusing picture of developing nations, there are some bright spots. For instance, Singapore which, although rejected for membership in the Federation of Malaysia, is the brightest star in the area. Its progressive administration has made phenomenal progress in building good homes to replace slums, in providing clean government, and in exercising and encouraging leadership in trade and industry. The Government pays cash for its needs and has a favorable credit balance. United States, take heed.

I am impressed by the courageous leap from a feudal to a modern society now being made by Iran. The stable Government of the Shah has provided land reform and backed both industrial and agricultural progress. Promising young men who receive a basic education during their army service may be sent back as teachers in their home villages while still in uniform.

Now let me comment on what I regretfully must term a lack of imagination and initiative by U.S. representatives abroad. I am puzzled to find reasons for this. I hasten to state that the United States has many able and dedicated public servants in its foreign missions and many who perform their duties in an outstanding manner. Nevertheless, I cannot escape the apprehension that State Department policies generally are not as vigorous in support of U.S. interests as they should be. I find many in our Foreign Service who agree that we give up too easily in confrontation or discussion

with representatives of foreign governments. The hard-sell aggressiveness required to further U.S. policies too often seems to be lacking. The power and prestige of the United States do not suggest a hat-in-hand approach or obeisance in our dealings abroad; nor do we need bluff and bluster. We have shown our good intentions time and again to nearly every country in the world; we should combine this background with strong implementation of U.S. policy in support of democratic ideals, and we should be sufficiently practical to limit our help abroad to those who help us.

Perhaps the cutting edge of American diplomacy is dulled by 20 years of give-away programs and soft loans without the necessity for a quid pro quo. There is a need for a return of the present-day counterpart of the shrewd Yankee trader of other years. I must conclude that there should be more positive direction and stronger motivation from Washington.

An example of what I mean is shown in discussions now in progress on the return of Okinawa to Japanese rule. A number of years ago a commitment in principle was made to return Okinawa to Japanese jurisdiction, but no date was specified. Now, unaccountably, 1972 has become the year to accomplish this and the Japs are insisting that they spell out the terms under which the United States will continue to have base rights. Neither the date nor the conditions are justified by the facts. Nevertheless, I find some U.S. representatives in Tokyo who accept the Japanese case as irrefutable and even argue for it; this despite the fact that we have poured \$3.6 billion into the rebuilding of Japan, that we provide military defense for Japan at our own expense, and that the Japs enjoy a billion-dollar-a-year trade advantage here.

It is hard to imagine Russia yielding on a question of territorial jurisdiction in this manner. They would simply say that the matter is not open for discussion at this time and that would be the end of it. Nor would the world get excited about it. We tend to lead ourselves into traps when it is not necessary.

It would be interesting to speculate also on the effect of an all-out effort by U.S. diplomatic personnel to bring about a settlement of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. After conversations with nationals of both countries, I am convinced that however bold a front is presented on the question, both countries would like to find a solution, even by partition, and to end this primary cause of dissent between them.

Now a word about U.S. Embassies and other buildings abroad. Those we have purchased or built have gone up in value and most of them continue to be satisfactorily located. In areas where we lease, we are making a mistake by failing to buy or to build. Prices are going up by leaps and bounds. The importance of the U.S. presence is not going to diminish. Our status requires facilities which are both adequate in space and impressive in appearance. It will cost money to acquire what we need but it will cost more to wait. The U.S. Embassy and the Ambassador's residence in New Delhi offer an outstanding example of what can be accomplished.

A matter of paramount interest is that

of modernization of weapons for our own forces as well as for nearly all of our allies. The battle for modernization for our own forces is now being fought in the Senate. It is shocking to me that there should be any question about the requirement for modernization when it is obvious that many of our important weapons systems are now a generation behind their Russian counterparts. It has been well stated that if we are to draft men to fight we should at least give them adequate weapons with which to fight.

If the situation of weapons modernization is serious at home, it is much worse abroad. The weapons in the hands of our friends average two generations behind those in the hands of the Communists, whose countries they border. Take Turkey as an illustration. The Turks have rifles, tanks, and naval vessels, including submarines, which are World War II vintage. The Turks are well trained and effective fighting men. There is realism and confidence in their ranks. Yet it seems inexcusable to expect Turkish fighting men to effectively repel superior numbers plus superior weapons in the hands of equally well-trained and effective Russian forces at the Turkish borders or on the Bosphorus. Under these circumstances Turkey can scarcely be blamed for seeking better relations with Russia.

Taiwan is perhaps an even more impressive example, for this little country, by its location and the temper of its Government and its people, exercises restraint on Communist aggression just as South Vietnam and South Korea do. Taiwan's defense forces help to discourage direct aggression from colossal Red China. Yet the Taiwanese forces, which cannot begin to match those of Red China in numbers, are not even making comparable progress in modernization. Each day their weapons are falling further behind those of Red China in effectiveness. Taiwan needs F-4's to replace aging and obsolescent F-86's. Red China is building Mig-19's and has Mig-21's in inventory. Taiwan has no submarines, yet Red China has 33, including one guided-missile submarine, and is building more.

One of the gravest omissions to me is the lack of shelters for aircraft protection in Taiwan. A loss of control of the air over Taiwan could be a prelude to disaster in the event of conflict between Taiwan and Red China. The memory of the wholesale destruction of Arab aircraft caught on the ground by Israeli planes during the 6-day war brings a chill of apprehension when one considers the overwhelming superiority in numbers of the Communist Chinese air force. To me it appears essential that the aircraft of the Republic of China be protected from similar destruction by wave after wave of Red aircraft.

Nations which need modern weapons are willing to buy to the limit of their ability if we agree to sell to them. We can well afford to provide additional stocks to stanch friends if they are needed.

I return with the strong conviction that we are not giving sufficient stress to the various personnel exchange programs. Almost without exception, foreign nationals who train in our country return to their homelands to exercise

influence which is favorable to the United States. This, I believe, is true for all types of exchange programs. However, there is a particular need to encourage additional foreign military personnel to take advantage of training in military missions and in colleges in the United States. A good example is Indonesia, where the attitudes of U.S.-trained individuals who now have strong influence in government have substantially reversed the anti-U.S. policies of the previous administration.

In most of the areas I visited there is progress; much more measurable in some than in others. A few have governments which are unresponsive to Western ideas—at least at the moment. But the great majority are cooperative and some are enthusiastically so. I found no unfriendly people and this should tell us something. There is an awakening of opportunity in the world today and we can provide direction to it if we offer dramatic leadership.

MORTIMER CAPLIN DISCUSSES MINIMUM INCOME TAX AND RELATED TAX REFORMS

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mortimer M. Caplin has written an excellent article analyzing the principal minimum income tax proposals, as well as related proposals dealing with changes in the standard deduction. The article appears in volume 55, No. 5 of the Virginia Law Review. I commend the article to my colleagues and include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE MINIMUM INCOME TAX AND RELATED REFORMS

(By Mortimer M. Caplin)*

Today more than ever before, the American public is convinced of the need to reform our federal tax laws. Though Americans fulfill their tax obligations with integrity, a sense of duty and a better will than taxpayers anywhere else in the world, throughout the country there is increasing consciousness and resentment of high rates, unfairness and discrimination in the tax system. The middle-class salaried individual, whose income is fully subject to tax at ordinary rates and who has no loophole through which to crawl, is particularly concerned. The existence of the 10 percent surcharge—and the likelihood of its continuation¹—has deepened this feeling. The volume of mail which the Congress has received on the subject of tax reform in the past months is both impressive and disturbing.²

What has produced this surge of interest in tax reform? The key is to be found in some facts about the operation of our income tax system. In 1967, 155 citizens with incomes of over 200,000 dollars, and 21 individuals with incomes of over 1 million dollars paid no federal income tax.³ In 1966, four individuals, with total incomes ranging from 6 million dollars to more than 12 million dollars, were able to escape federal income tax altogether by carefully planned use of the unlimited charitable contribution deduction.⁴ For the same year, a fifth taxpayer had total income of more than 1.2 million dollars, offset by large deductions for capital gains and interest. He paid a total tax of 383 dollars—about 3/100ths of 1 percent of his income.⁵ His tax bill was approximately equal to that of a single taxpayer with ordinary income of

*Footnotes at end of article.

2,400 dollars. A sixth individual had total income of over 1.3 million dollars, but primarily because of very large percentage depletion deductions, paid no tax at all.⁶ Another investor in mineral properties had income of more than 924,000 dollars and paid tax of 397 dollars—about 4/100ths of 1 percent of his income.⁷ A real estate investor had over 860,000 dollars in real estate deductions and paid no tax on income of more than 1.4 million dollars.⁸

Data on the overall incidence of the income tax confirms the same fundamental lesson: Despite the essential objective of the income tax to match tax with the ability to pay, in significant areas of its operation the income tax system requires very little tax from those with substantial abilities to pay. In 1961, when tax rates nominally ranged up to a maximum of 91 percent, effective tax rates reached a high of 30 to 35 percent for people having annual incomes between 50,000 and 200,000 dollars and declined to about 27 percent for people whose incomes exceeded 1 million dollars a year.⁹ A recent Treasury Department study, based on 1966 data, shows the same pattern. Employing the so-called "amended adjusted gross income"¹⁰ as its measuring rod, the study indicates that average effective tax rates rose to a maximum of 32 percent, but receded to about 30 percent for those whose incomes were between 500,000 dollars and 1 million dollars, and further declined to about 28 percent for those whose incomes were over 1 million dollars.¹¹

A different symptom of the same basic defect in the income tax system is the markedly disparate tax treatment accorded taxpayers whose real economic income is the same. The artist pays tax at ordinary income rates when he sells his paintings;¹² the investor receives capital gains treatment when he sells the patent on his new potato-peeler.¹³ The self-employed individual or the man who earns a salary is subject to the ordinary rate schedule; his friend down the street, who has enough capital to support himself from investment income, puts his money in municipal bonds and is subject to no rate schedule at all—his interest income is entirely exempt from tax.¹⁴ The investor in stocks pays full tax on his dividend income;¹⁵ the investor in leased airplanes or railroad cars shelters his income from tax by means of large investment credits¹⁶ and depreciation deductions¹⁷ having little or no relation to the magnitude of his cash investment.¹⁸

THE SOURCE OF THE PROBLEM

These results flow from a variety of special provisions in our income tax system which grant favorable tax treatment to certain classes of income and allow generous deductions for certain kinds of expenditures. The complete tax freedom of municipal bond interest,¹⁹ the low tax rates imposed on long term capital gain income,²⁰ the grant of full depreciation deductions on highly leveraged investments,²¹ the special deductions accorded in the mineral field,²² and other tax preferences, particularly when combined, permit some taxpayers to realize a large real income without bearing a correlative share of the tax burden, and generate major disparities in the treatment of similarly situated taxpayers.

Of particular concern to the average taxpayer is the fact that these preferential provisions are uniquely available to individuals with large resources. The family with poverty-level income cannot afford to invest in municipal bonds; its income is realized in forms which are fully taxable at the ordinary tax rates. Former Treasury Secretary Fowler reported that "[u]nder present law, 2.2 million families with incomes below the poverty level are required to pay Federal income taxes. . . . For example, a married couple with an income of the poverty limit of \$2,200 would generally pay an income tax of \$84."²³ Similarly, the middle-income wage or salary earner, who shoulders a sizeable share of the nation's tax burden, is generally

unable to take advantage of tax-favored investments. Former Treasury Secretary Barr reported that "tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes of \$7,000 to \$20,000 . . . pay over half of our individual income taxes."²⁴ In contrast, as the examples mentioned earlier²⁵ indicate, individuals with large funds of capital are able to make full and effective use of special methods for securing favorable tax treatment, and are thereby able to pay much lower rates of tax—or no tax at all—under a system which, paradoxically, is designed to produce the most tax from those with the most income.

THE GOAL

If we were starting anew, the general objective of a sound income tax system would be to treat all forms of real economic income alike. The goal would be tax neutrality; the tax system would not favor the realization of income in one form rather than another.

One way of attaining that goal today would be to adopt a broadly based tax on all forms of real economic income,²⁶ reduced only by the expenses of producing that income, at much lower rates than those which obtain under the present system. There is widespread public sentiment in favor of such an approach. Interestingly, the desire for such reform exists even among some who derive considerable advantage from the tax preferences of the present structure. To achieve a fair tax system, bearing equally on different forms of income, and to free themselves of the record-keeping and other difficulties of complying with present law, these taxpayers would be willing to accept a major broadening of the tax base—even at some financial sacrifice to themselves.

With the accretions brought by over 50 years of history and with the genuine, pressing problems at which certain of the special provisions of our tax structure are directed, we can hardly expect to wipe the slate clean now. We can, though, work in the direction of increasing the neutrality of the tax system and diminishing the distortions. Senator Russell Long took an important step in that direction several years ago with his proposal of an "optional simplified tax method."²⁷ Under the Long proposal, taxpayers would be permitted the option of paying lower rates of tax by electing to forego the advantage of most of the exclusions and special deductions allowed by present law. Congressman Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin has introduced a bill for comprehensive and fundamental reform, dealing specifically with the major preferential provisions of the existing tax law.²⁸ The American Bar Association Special Committee on Substantive Tax Reform has done considerable work on proposals for broadening the tax base and eliminating tax preferences.²⁹ The Johnson Administration's Treasury Department conducted an extensive study of defects in our present tax laws, and its reform proposals, with supporting data, were made public at the beginning of this year.³⁰ Recently, the present Administration has submitted a more limited set of proposals to Congress.³¹

Proceeding on a broader front than either administration, the Ways and Means Committee is currently examining, specifically and in detail, a variety of tax devices used to shelter otherwise taxable income. That action is more than proper; it is urgent in order to strengthen public confidence in the evenhanded application of our tax laws. Thorough review of these rules—and re-examination of the underlying justification for any exceptional tax treatment—are plainly in order.

THE MINIMUM TAX

As an initial reform step, all individuals with the economic capacity to contribute should be required to bear at least some minimum share of the nation's tax load. The existence of tax patterns in which individuals with large real incomes pay no signifi-

cant tax is fundamentally incompatible with a balanced tax system. Without attempting to judge the merit of each of the individual provisions which permit such results, taxpayers ought not to be allowed to utilize such provisions to avoid all taxation.

The minimum tax concept found support in Treasury Department staff studies during the Johnson Administration,³² and has recently been embraced by President Nixon.³³ Under the earlier Treasury proposal, an individual's income tax would not be allowed to fall below a minimum tax which would be computed by applying special rates, graduated from 7 to 35 percent, to an adjusted and broadened tax base.³⁴ The tax base under this plan would be expanded by including the full amount of capital gains,³⁵ including tax exempt interest,³⁶ adding the value of appreciation in property donated to charity,³⁷ and excluding percentage depletion deductions to the extent that they exceed cost.³⁸

While the Treasury study offers substantial improvement, it omits two important adjustments which are necessary to effectuate the basic concept of the minimum income tax. First, the proposal fails to modify accelerated depreciation deductions and to relate these deductions to the taxpayer's equity investment in depreciable property.³⁹ Present tax provisions allow a real estate owner to use the double declining balance, the 150 percent declining balance or the sum-of-the-years digits methods⁴⁰ of computing depreciation. These methods result in a considerably more rapid write off of the original cost than would be possible by the straight-line depreciation method.⁴¹ After exhausting the tax benefits obtained through accelerated depreciation, the investor can—subject only to a mild and easily avoided recapture provision⁴²—sell the property at capital gain rates, even though the accelerated depreciation deductions have been used to offset income taxed at ordinary rates. Moreover, the taxpayer's basis on which depreciation is computed includes mortgages as well as equity.⁴³ Thus, by the use of highly leveraged investments in depreciable real property, the individual can obtain depreciation deductions many times his actual investment in the property,⁴⁴ and at the same time avail himself of mortgage interest deductions which can also be set off against ordinary income.⁴⁵

The abuse of accelerated depreciation deductions on depreciable property other than real estate has been largely eliminated by the recapture provisions of section 1245,⁴⁶ which, generally, tax as ordinary income gains from the sale or exchange of depreciable personal property to the extent that such gains are attributable to post-1962 depreciation. The recapture provisions for depreciable real estate,⁴⁷ however, are significantly less rigorous. Gains from the sale or exchange of such property held more than one year are recaptured as ordinary income only to the extent that actual depreciation deductions have exceeded the deductions which would have been permitted under the straight-line method,⁴⁸ and for each month that the property is held beyond twenty months the percentage of the excess depreciation recaptured decreases by one percent.⁴⁹ As a consequence, the taxpayer who disposes of improved real property held for more than ten years escapes ordinary income treatment on the transaction altogether.

The second shortcoming of the original Treasury plan is its failure to modify the allowance, under present law,⁵⁰ of full current deductions for the intangible drilling and development costs of oil and gas wells.⁵¹ By means of the special provisions for intangibles, the tax laws now permit a large part of the capital cost of a well to be written off as a deduction immediately, although a similar investment of capital in a different industry could only be recovered over the life of the property purchased.⁵² At the same time,

Footnotes at end of article.

the investor in oil and gas properties is able to spread the income derived from the well over the period of its recovery, enjoying the annual benefits of percentage depletion⁵³—theoretically a means of capital recovery—even though he has already recovered much or all of his investment in the form of intangible drilling and development costs deductions.

The inclusion of appropriate adjustments to limit the advantages of accelerated and highly leveraged depreciation and intangible drilling and development costs is fundamental to any sound minimum tax proposal. Indeed, if these items are omitted, we could well continue to have 155 non-taxable returns with over 200,000 dollars of income and 21 non-taxable returns with over 1 million dollars of income—even after the adoption of the Treasury proposal.

In his recent message to Congress on tax reform,⁵⁴ President Nixon recommended a minimum income tax which would deal with both of these problems.⁵⁵ The Nixon proposal would fix a ceiling of 50 percent on the amount of an individual's total income which could escape taxation through designated tax preferences. The preferential provisions included are: charitable contributions of appreciated property,⁵⁶ percentage depletion and intangible drilling and development costs,⁵⁷ accelerated depreciation on real estate,⁵⁸ and farm losses.

The Nixon proposal, however, omits two existing preferences which were specifically included in the minimum tax proposal of the Treasury staff studies. Tax-exempt interest is excluded because of "doubt whether such inclusion would be constitutional,"⁵⁹ and capital gain income is also excluded.⁶⁰ The omissions are of major significance. Together they convert the Nixon plan from a minimum tax to a minimal tax; they reduce the revenue yield of the tax from 420 million dollars—which the Treasury study proposal would have produced even without including depreciation or intangibles—to 80 million dollars. More fundamentally, neither omission has any convincing justification.⁶¹

The solution would seem obvious: The better features of the Nixon and Treasury proposals ought to be combined.⁶² The fundamental structure of the minimum tax is the same under both approaches. The Treasury study proposal would, in effect, tax total income at half the ordinary rates; the Nixon proposal would tax half of total income at the full ordinary rates. The Nixon plan, however, has the advantage of certain improvements in technical implementation. Utilizing that essential structure, a sound minimum tax system should incorporate in its base the items included in the Treasury proposal and, in addition, adjustments to deal with depreciation and intangibles.⁶³ So constructed, the system would provide an effective and fair solution for the problem which Congressman John Byrnes has summarized in these terms:

"When we find the extreme cases where some 155 tax returns with adjusted gross incomes above \$200,000 pay no income tax, including 21 with gross income over \$1 million, it cannot be said that the law imposes on all capable of doing so the responsibility of paying a reasonable proportion of the cost of government. No matter by what device, no matter how laudable the nature of the deduction or exclusion that produces this result, the fact remains that there is no justification for these individuals being non-taxpayers."⁶⁴

MAXIMUM INCOME TAX

A maximum limit on the individual income tax is a natural companion of the minimum tax. The recently released Treasury data reveals that among high income individuals there is, in addition to the group having strikingly low effective tax rates, a very highly taxed group.⁶⁵ The effective tax rates of taxpayers in the latter class rise well above 50 percent. For some, effective tax rates are from 60 to 65 percent.⁶⁶

Upon this category of taxpayers, the upper range of the income tax rate schedule operates too harshly. There is much to be said in favor of the proposition that no taxpayer should be compelled to pay more than half his total income in federal income tax. To that end, serious consideration should be given to the adoption of a 50 percent maximum limitation upon the effective tax rate applicable to any individual taxpayer.⁶⁷ In determining a taxpayer's total income for purposes of applying this 50 percent limitation, the broadened base outlined in connection with the minimum tax should be utilized.⁶⁸

LIBERALIZATION OF THE MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION

At the other end of the tax spectrum, a different problem exists. Among that segment of the population whose incomes are below the level which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has designated as the poverty line, about 4.3 million individuals and 2.2 million families are now required to pay federal income tax.⁶⁹

The imposition of tax upon those who have no real ability to pay is inconsistent with the fundamental principle of an income tax, and should be eliminated as quickly as possible. One method of accomplishing that result would be through liberalization of the minimum standard deduction. Present law allows individuals a minimum standard deduction of 200 dollars plus 100 dollars for each personal exemption.⁷⁰ The Treasury staff studies recommend raising the level of this deduction to 600 dollars, plus 100 dollars for each exemption, subject to an overall ceiling of 1,000 dollars.⁷¹ The degree of liberalization possible depends partly upon the amount of revenue which can be allocated to freeing property-level incomes from tax. The Treasury proposal would have an annual revenue cost of somewhat over 1.1 billion dollars.⁷² It would, however, still leave almost a million poverty-level families subject to tax.⁷³ Though the cost is substantial, the priority of the matter could hardly be higher. Hence, careful attention should be given to the possibility of raising the minimum standard deduction above the level proposed by the Treasury.⁷⁴

A different approach which has been suggested to alleviate this problem would raise the level of the personal exemption—currently 600 dollars per person.⁷⁵ Such a step, however, would represent a considerably less efficient technique than increasing the minimum standard deduction. The personal exemption is used by high income and low income taxpayers alike, and for both it saves tax at the top applicable rate. Hence, broadening the exemption would channel large portions of the resulting revenue loss to persons which the legislation is not intended to assist. On the other hand, because the minimum standard deduction is of utility largely to the very low income segment of the population, liberalization of that deduction would focus the revenue loss on the group which most requires assistance.

SIMPLIFICATION BY REVISION OF THE STANDARD DEDUCTION

Another aspect of the standard deduction also has important bearing upon the operation of our tax system. It is of vital importance, both to taxpayers and to the Internal Revenue Service, to simplify and ease the burdens of compliance with our tax laws.⁷⁶ Simplification of compliance and administration is significantly advanced by reducing the itemization of personal deductions. Indeed, the adoption of the standard deduction represents the single greatest tax simplification which Congress has yet achieved. Since the original enactment of the standard deduction, however, the growth in personal income levels has made that deduction—with limits of 10 percent of adjusted gross income or 1,000 dollars, whichever is lower⁷⁷—of rapidly decreasing usefulness to taxpayers.

Consequently, an increase in the upper

limits of the standard deduction would seem appropriate.⁷⁸ The Treasury staff studies proposed an increase of the percentage limit from 10 to 14 percent, and an increase of the dollar limit from 1,000 to 1,800 dollars.⁷⁹ Congressman Byrnes has suggested increasing the percentage limit to between 18 and 20 percent and doubling the dollar limit with, perhaps, graduated reductions in the upper ranges.⁸⁰ Here again, the extent of the revision will have to be balanced against its revenue cost. If the Congress enacts fundamental structural reforms which produce revenue, it will have greater freedom to liberalize the standard deduction. To the extent that the revenue reduction can be tolerated, some liberalization is in order.

CONCLUSION

The clamor for comprehensive reform of our tax system continues to mount. Some 10 years ago, Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, of the Ways and Means Committee, expressed a viewpoint that is of growing prominence throughout the land today:

"Tax preferences and differentials, which have the effect of departing from neutrality in the case of particular types of income and in the case of particular groups, have resulted in the narrowing of the dollar base of our revenue system to the point where it can be said with justification that the rate schedules supplied in the Internal Revenue Code are no longer meaningful. The benefits conferred by existing tax preferences and tax differentials breed demands for further erosion of the tax base."⁸¹

Adoption of the minimum tax and an enlarged minimum standard deduction will not solve all the problems of the present tax system. They offer no easy cure-all for the defects which have developed over many years. Nonetheless—short of direct comprehensive reform—their enactment would be an important first step forward; for they focus on the more flagrant distortions of the income tax system, which permit some persons with the largest capacity to bear taxes to pay none at all, and compel others with no tax-paying capacity whatever to bear a substantial tax burden.

Though deserving a lower level of priority, adoption of the maximum tax and elevation of the upper limits on the standard deduction would also contribute significantly to betterment of the income tax structure. The former would provide a larger measure of horizontal equity, while the latter would strengthen a mechanism which greatly simplifies tax compliance.

Together these four correctives offer an important and respectable, though only partial, answer to the increasingly insistent outcries of our citizens. If taken, however, this first step toward reform must not be permitted to become the last. It has been wisely said that the tax system "delves deeply with a sieve", and it is imperative for the Congress to look closely—with a hard and discerning eye—at each of the holes in that sieve. Indeed, an aroused Congress, prodded by an outraged constituency, may find that the time is at hand in 1969 for a sustained effort to achieve direct and broad-scale tax revision. Such a head-on approach may be the higher price demanded by the public if the Nixon Administration is to gain support for continuing the 10 percent income tax surcharge.⁸²

FOOTNOTES

*Member, District of Columbia, New York and Virginia Bars. Professor of Law, University of Virginia, 1950-61. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 1961-64. B.S., 1937, LL.B., 1940, University of Virginia. This article is based upon testimony which Mr. Caplin presented before the Committee on Ways and Means of the U.S. House of Representatives on February 28, 1969, in conjunction with that Committee's hearings on tax reform. For a general discussion of the problems and techniques of tax reform, see Caplin, *Federal Tax Policy—The Need for Reform*, 56 Geo. L.J. 880 (1968).

¹ In his message to Congress on federal income tax reform, President Nixon suggested a relaxation of the surcharge subject to repeal of the investment tax credit. The proposal includes extension of the full present 10 percent rate until January 1, 1970, a reduction to 5 percent on January 1, and, if economic conditions permit, total elimination on June 30, 1970. 115 CONG. REC. S3959-60 (daily ed. April 22, 1969).

² The current rash of protests has produced the warning of a possible "taxpayer's revolt." Despite the unlikelihood of such a catastrophic event, continued and widespread dissent gnaws at the roots of our enviable level of taxpayer compliance. See Caplin, *Threats to the Integrity of Our Tax System*, 44 VA. L. REV. 839 (1958).

³ Statement of Former Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr before the Joint Economic Comm., CONG. Q. WEEKLY REP. 147 (Jan. 24, 1969).

⁴ U.S. TREASURY DEPT., TAX REFORM STUDIES AND PROPOSALS, pt. 1, at 90-91 (reprinted by House Ways and Means Committee & Senate Finance Committee 1969) [hereinafter cited as TAX REFORM STUDIES].

⁵ *Id.* at 92.

⁶ *Id.* at 93.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.* at 94.

⁹ Williams, *The Changing Progressivity of the Federal Income Tax*, 17 NAT'L TAX J. 425, 426 (1964).

¹⁰ "Amended adjusted gross income" is defined as statutory adjusted gross income increased by the one-half of long term capital gains deductible under present law. TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 81.

¹¹ *Id.* at 81, table 5.

¹² INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 1221(3).

¹³ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 1235; see, e.g., *Hofferbert v. Briggs*, 178 F.2d 743 (4th Cir. 1949).

¹⁴ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 103(a)(1).

¹⁵ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 116 provides for \$100 of tax-free dividends from domestic corporations; dividends in excess of \$100 constitute ordinary income taxable under § 61(a)(7).

¹⁶ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 38; Treas. Reg. § 1.46-1 to 1.48-7 (1969).

¹⁷ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 167.

¹⁸ See note 43 *infra* and text at notes 43-45 *infra*.

¹⁹ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 103(a)(1).

²⁰ *Id.* §§ 1201(b), 1202.

²¹ This rule stems from dictum in *Crane v. Commissioner*, 331 U.S. 1 (1947). See note 43 *infra* and accompanying text.

²² INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, §§ 263(c), 611-16.

²³ Statement of former Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 3.

²⁴ Statement of Joseph W. Barr, *supra* note 3.

²⁵ See text at notes 3-8 *supra*.

²⁶ General definitions of such a base have been provided by Haig and Simons, among others. Haig equated personal income with "the money value of the net accretion to one's economic power between two points of time." Simons formulated the definition as follows: "Personal income may be defined as the algebraic sum of (1) the market value of rights exercised in consumption and (2) the change in the value of the store of property rights between the beginning and end of the period in question." Haig, *The Concept of Income—Economic and Legal Aspects*, in READINGS IN THE ECONOMICS OF TAXATION 59 (R. Musgrave & C. Shoup eds. 1959) (emphasis omitted); H. SIMONS, PERSONAL INCOME TAXATION 50, 206 (1938). For criticism of the goal stated in the text, see Bittker, "A Comprehensive Tax Base" as a Goal of Income Tax Reform, 80 HARV L. REV. 925, 935 (1967).

²⁷ S. 3250, 88th Cong., 2d Sess. (1964), reprinted in Bittker, *An Optional Simplified Income Tax*, 21 TAX L. REV. 1, 37-51 (1965).

²⁸ 115 CONG. REC. H588 (daily ed. Jan. 29, 1969).

²⁹ See Report of the Section of Taxation on Substantive Tax Reform, 90 A.B.A. REP. 289 (1965).

³⁰ TAX REFORM STUDIES.

³¹ 115 CONG. REC. S. 3959 (daily ed. April 22, 1969).

³² TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 13-14; pt. 2, at 132-42.

³³ 115 CONG. REC. S. 3959 (daily ed. April 22, 1969).

³⁴ TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 14; pt. 2, at 133.

³⁵ The proposal would, however, retain the present 25% alternative capital gain rate with respect to "capital gain income representing appreciation of property held by the taxpayer at his death or given away during his lifetime. This gain would be included in the regular tax base under another proposal in the program. The special rule for this income recognizes that capital gain income on death or at the time of a large gift may be abnormally large (and, thus, result in a minimum tax) in relation to what the taxpayer might have realized in any one year had he disposed of his investments over a period of years rather than in a single year." *Id.* at 134.

³⁶ Included in this proposal is "interest (including original issue discount) on State and municipal bonds." *Id.* at 137, and "any tax-exempt interest that is currently being paid on U.S. bonds or on obligations of certain corporations organized under act of Congress . . . to the extent that, to do so, would not interfere with a contractual obligation guaranteed by the Constitution." *Id.* at 137 n. 1.

³⁷ Under the present tax system, an individual is permitted to deduct the actual market value of appreciated property donated to charity subject to the normal limitations of INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 170. However, that part of the actual market value in excess of the taxpayer's basis in such property is considered unrealized, and is therefore not taxed even though the taxpayer obtains a tax benefit from the deduction. Given appropriate circumstances, it is possible for an individual to make a profit by such contributions to charity. See, e.g., Rudick & Gray, *Bounty Twice Blessed: Tax Consequences of Gifts of Property to or in Trust for Charity*, 16 TAX L. REV. 273, 308-09 (1961).

The proposed provision would add to gross income the appreciation in the value of property donated to charity to the extent that the appreciation was allowed as a deduction under the limitations of INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 170. TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 2, at 137-38.

³⁸ The INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 613(a) provides that "[i]n the case of mines, wells and other natural deposits," depletion shall be computed on the basis of a "percentage . . . of the gross income from the property . . . Such allowance shall not exceed 50 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income from the property (computed without allowance for depletion)." However, § 613 does not limit the allowable percentage depletion to the cost of the property.

Under the minimum tax proposal, "[n]o deduction would be allowed for . . . any percentage depletion once the cost of the applicable property has been recouped through prior depletion deductions." TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 2, at 139.

³⁹ For a detailed discussion of this problem. See generally TAX REFORMS STUDIES, pt. 3, at 438-58.

⁴⁰ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, §§ 167(b)(2), (3), (c) For a description of the operation of these methods of depreciation, see Treas. Reg. § 1.167(b)(2), (3) (1969).

⁴¹ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 167(b)(1). For a description of the straight line method of depreciation, see Treas. Reg. § 1.167(b)(1) (1968).

⁴² See text at notes 47-49 *infra*.

⁴³ This rule stems from the Supreme Court decision in *Crane v. Commissioner*, 331 U.S. 1 (1947), which held that Mrs. Crane's basis for computation of gain on property devised to her by her husband included the value of an unassumed mortgage encumbering the property. The Court went on to state that the basis for computation of depreciation also included the mortgage, though the latter issue was neither properly before the Court nor given separate consideration. See text at note 44 *infra*.

⁴⁴ See, e.g., *Mayerson v. Commissioner*, 47 T.C. 340 (1966), where the taxpayer was permitted to compute depreciations on a basis of \$200,000 although his actual investment was \$10,000. The property's basis for depreciation included a purchase money mortgage on which no payment was due until the end of 99 years.

⁴⁵ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 163(a).

⁴⁶ *Id.* § 1245.

⁴⁷ *Id.* § 1250.

⁴⁸ *Id.* § 1250(b)(1).

⁴⁹ *Id.* § 1250(a)(2).

⁵⁰ *Id.* § 263(c).

⁵¹ For examples of intangible drilling and development costs, see Treas. Reg. § 1.612-4 (1969).

⁵² TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 3, at 414.

⁵³ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 613(b)(1) allows a deduction of 27½ percent of gross income on oil and gas wells.

⁵⁴ 115 CONG. REC. S3959 (daily ed. April 22, 1969).

⁵⁵ U.S. TREASURY DEPT., TAX REFORM PROPOSALS 93, 95 (reprinted by House Ways and Means Committee 1969). This is the proposal of the Nixon Administration's Treasury Department before the House Ways and Means Committee concerning the "Limit on Tax Preferences" [hereinafter cited as LTP].

⁵⁶ The treatment of charitable contributions of appreciated property under the Nixon proposal, LTP at 94, is essentially the same as that of the Treasury study. See note 37 *supra*.

⁵⁷ The percentage depletion proposals of both the Nixon and Treasury studies' minimum tax plans employ somewhat different techniques. Under the Nixon plan, the excess of percentage depletion claimed during the taxable year over allowable cost depletion becomes a part of gross income for minimum tax purposes in the taxable year claimed. LTP at 95. The Treasury proposal would not include any part of claimed percentage depletion in gross income for minimum tax purposes until cost had been recouped through prior depletion deductions, and then would include all of it. See note 38 *supra*. The Nixon plan calls for including in total income for minimum tax purposes the excess of intangible drilling expenses claimed under INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 263(c), over the allowable amount of straight line depreciation that would have been claimed had the expenses been capitalized. LTP at 93.

⁵⁸ Although for minimum tax purposes, the Nixon proposal satisfactorily resolves the problem of accelerated depreciation on real estate, it, like the Treasury study proposal, does not limit depreciation to the equity in the property. See notes 43-45 *supra* and accompanying text.

⁵⁹ LTP at 22.

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ The deletion of municipal bond interest on constitutional grounds reflects a "doubt" which the Treasury Department, the Justice Department and most students of the field considered finally resolved more than 25 years ago. See opinions and discussion by Treasury and Justice Departments in 1942, in S. SURREY & W. WARREN, FEDERAL INCOME TAXATION CASES AND MATERIALS 185-98 (1960).

The Administration defends its exclusion of capital gains on the grounds that, (1) by the nature of the minimum tax structure, application of that tax to capital gains would affect only individuals who use the alternative tax, and (2) the economic consequences

of any variation of the alternative tax require further study. Neither argument seems persuasive. Those who use the alternative (25%) tax are precisely those who derive the most extreme advantage from the capital gains preference provided by existing law (one elects the alternative tax only when its tax benefit is greater than that of the 50 percent capital gains deduction), and application of the tax to them makes good sense—whether or not the tax also reaches those whose benefits from the preference are less substantial. Further, it seems exceedingly unlikely that full inclusion of capital gains in the minimum tax base would have significant consequences for the economy. One must remember that the proposal would affect only a small fraction of the total capital gains universe (only those capital gains realized by individuals whose total excluded income, for regular tax purposes, exceeds their total included income), and even within that area it would produce only a very modest tax increase. In view of these facts, it is hardly surprising that the Johnson Treasury Department was untroubled by this problem.

⁴² Senator Fred R. Harris recently introduced a minimum income tax reform bill, S. 1827, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969), reprinted in 115 CONG. REC. S3764 (daily ed. April 15, 1969). The Harris plan closely resembles President Nixon's proposed 50% ceiling on income enjoying tax-preferred status, but there are differences both in the tax preferences which would be subject to the 50% limit and the treatment of preferences which would be included in a minimum tax base. Senator Harris would include in the minimum tax base interest from state and municipal bonds and long-term capital gains, but would exclude farm losses. In addition, the Harris plan would include in the tax base the difference between the fair market value of stock received pursuant to a qualified stock option and the price paid for the stock. Another significant difference is that the full amount of deductions taken for intangible drilling and development costs are included in the Harris bill rather than the excess of the deductions taken over the deductions that would have been allowable as depreciation, if such costs have been capitalized rather than expensed.

⁴³ While the Nixon minimum tax plan also includes a limitation on farm losses, the set of abuses at which it is aimed can and should be eliminated specifically, directly and entirely, rather than obliquely and partially through the mechanism of the minimum tax.

⁴⁴ 115 CONG. REC. E659 (daily ed. Jan. 30, 1969).

⁴⁵ Statement of former Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, Tax Reform Studies, pt. 1, at 3.

⁴⁶ *Id.* pt. 1, at 80, table 4; pt. 2, at 172.

⁴⁷ See Caplin, *Federal Tax Policy—The Need for Reform*, 56 Geo. L.J. 880 (1968). The Johnson Treasury recommended such a limitation in conjunction with its proposal to tax appreciation at death or on gift: "The appropriateness of the maximum tax proposal is directly related to the proposal to include in the income tax base the appreciation in assets transferred at death or by gift. The adoption of a maximum tax provision without this other important reform would result in tax reductions for individuals who in reality have substantial exempt income represented by the untaxed appreciation in their investment and other assets." Tax Reform Studies, pt. 2, at 172.

⁴⁸ See text at note 63 *supra*.

⁴⁹ Tax Reform Studies, pt. 1, at 74, table 1; pt. 2, at 128.

⁵⁰ Int. Rev. Code of 1954, § 141(c).

⁵¹ TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 13, 74. "The effect of this proposal would be to make an additional 2.4 million returns nontaxable. . . . Of the 2.2 million poverty families paying tax under present law, 1.2 million would become nontaxable. An additional 1 million

families in poverty would have their tax reduced, although not completely eliminated." *Id.* at 75.

⁵² TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 35.

⁵³ See note 71 *supra*.

⁵⁴ The tax reform program of the present Administration suggests a new—and perhaps even more efficient—method of providing tax relief for poverty level taxpayers. LTP at 71, 101-04. Under the proposal, the optional tax tables would be adjusted to provide a "low income allowance," which would be based upon the income levels designated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as the poverty levels for families and individuals. When combined with the personal exemption and the present minimum standard deduction, the allowance would be sufficient to make all families and individuals below those levels non-taxable. For income above the poverty level, the allowance would be reduced by 50 cents for each dollar of adjusted gross income, so that individuals and families having adjusted gross incomes equal to the poverty level plus twice the maximum allowance would receive no allowance. The Treasury explanation states that this phase-out of the allowance permits relief for those in poverty at the lowest possible revenue cost.

⁵⁵ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 151.

⁵⁶ See TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 18.

⁵⁷ INT. REV. CODE OF 1954, § 141(a).

⁵⁸ At the suggestion of Chairman Mills, the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury Department are currently exploring a considerably more far-reaching approach to simplification. This approach would establish a 10% floor on all personal deductions other than the deduction for charitable contributions. A taxpayer's total of such personal deductions would be allowable only to the extent that they exceed 10% of his adjusted gross income. The revenue produced by disallowance of deductions below the floor would be used for substantial, across-the-board rate reduction. Chairman Mills has suggested, for example, that the measure might permit a rate structure ranging from a bottom bracket of 5% to a top bracket of 50%. The Treasury Department has been asked to use its computer models to determine the actual effect of the proposal on different classes of taxpayers under various alternative rate structures. If its technical details can be worked out, the proposal could produce major simplification of the tax system.

⁵⁹ TAX REFORM STUDIES, pt. 1, at 19.

⁶⁰ 115 CONG. REC. E659 (daily ed. Jan. 30, 1969). Representative Byrnes has also suggested: "In order to prevent the taxpayer from . . . taking the standard deduction one year and bunching certain deductions in alternate years, it can be required that the taxpayer, once he uses the standard deduction, be limited to its use, except in very unusual situations, to a definite period." *Id.*

⁶¹ Mills, *Preface to Symposium on Federal Taxation*, 44 VA. L. REV. 835, 836 (1958).

⁶² See note 1 *supra*.

CIVIL SERVICE WAGE BOARD REFORM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have in the past sponsored legislation dealing with the problems of Federal employees and designed to correct the inequities in their employment system. In this session I have introduced bills to make the pay of Federal employees comparable to that of employees in the private sector; to modernize our employees' health benefits programs; and to improve our Government retirement system. I was pleased when my colleagues in late July approved

the retirement legislation which is so vital to the security of our Nation's civil service retirees. The future also looks bright for the passage of the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act during this session.

With these recent successes fresh in our mind, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing additional legislation designed to benefit our civil servants. I urge the other Members to support this bill and by so doing continue their support of the men and women whose day-to-day efforts enable our Government to function.

This legislation, when adopted, will allow more employees to share the benefits extended to some in previous legislation. This bill, when it becomes law, will be the Prevailing Wage Rate Determination Act of 1969.

The hourly wage system originated 107 years ago when a statute in 1862 authorized the Secretary of the Navy to establish wage rates for blue-collar employees "of each naval activity—to conform, as nearly as is consistent with the public interest, with the rates of private establishments in the immediate vicinity."

Today the situation has changed considerably from anything ever envisioned in 1862. Civil Service Commission Chairman, John W. Macy, Jr., in early 1968 reported:

Today there are approximately 803,000 wage employees of more than 50 agencies in well over 300 separately identified localities. They have been paid under a veritable hodge-podge of widely differing agency policies which have resulted in baffling differences in pay for people doing identical work within the same wage area.

These varying policies result in situations where, for instance, a warehouse laborer working for one Government agency in a city was being paid \$3.60 an hour—and his counterpart, working for another agency in the same city, was getting \$2.81. What is most disconcerting is that these situations are not that uncommon.

Even the attempts made by the Civil Service Commission's introduction of the Coordinated Federal Wage System in 1967 did not do enough. Since, under the system, pay is generally fixed on the basis of area surveys, "thousands of wage board employees are invariably getting—for a variety of reasons—the lowest common denominator of pay, and their pay bears little relationship to a true prevailing rate concept," according to Nathan Wolkomir, the president of the National Federation of Federal Employees.

What is being urged in the legislation I am now introducing, Mr. Speaker, is briefly as follows: The act will establish by law an equitable and uniform pay system for Government employees in recognized trades and crafts, or other skilled mechanical crafts, or in skilled, semiskilled, or unskilled manual labor occupations.

We will accomplish the enviable aim of providing like pay for like work. We will establish relative differences in pay only where there are substantial or recognizable differences in duties, responsibilities, or qualifications among positions. Within a wage area comparable work will be rewarded by comparable levels of pay. There will be equality of pay for similar jobs performed in different agencies.

Very importantly, I feel, is that in the wage surveys which will be made—wherever possible at least 50 percent of private industry organizations surveyed shall be those where rates are fixed by collective-bargaining agreements.

The bill establishes within the Civil Service Commission a standing committee known as the National Wage Policy Committee. It will provide for a continuing program of review designed to keep the application of this act fully abreast of changing conditions, practices, and techniques—both in and out of Government.

The Policy Committee will be composed of 11 members. The chairman will be from outside the Federal service and is not to hold any office in the Federal service. He will be appointed by the President. Five members will be from Federal employee unions and five will be Government employer representatives.

There will be established wage committees within each Federal agency and there will also be local wage survey committees. These committees will maximize the involvement of Federal employees in the planning and scheduling of wage surveys and the establishment of wage rates schedules.

I wish to emphasize one of the key features of the bill. The chairman of the Wage Policy Committee will be from outside Government service. This will alleviate the situation which has, in the past, occasioned complaints about his lack of impartiality, because he previously was the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and consistently voted with management.

These and other more detailed changes should serve to at last advance the wage board portion of our employment system to a par with the modernized and presently more equitable system enjoyed by clerical and administrative workers. I hope that my colleagues will direct their own efforts to helping obtain for Federal employees the basic right of "like pay for like work."

IN DEFENSE OF THE PRESIDENT'S EAST ROOM SUNDAY SERVICES

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am apparently not the only person who has been offended by the recent statements of the so-called theologian, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, criticizing the President for holding religious services in the White House. Columnist Virginia Payette, writing in the Dallas Morning News on August 20, expressed my sentiments exactly and I would like to make her article available for everyone to read.

Niebuhr has descended from Mount Olympus and delivered himself of a titmouse when he accuses the President of displaying "a curious combination of innocence and guile" in holding these Sunday services. The truth is, rather, that Niebuhr displays a curious vacuousness of intellect and Christianity, particularly so for a theologian, when he directs such undeserved criticism at the President. A

true man of God would find some more deserving area for his concern. I hope the President continues, even expands, this practice.

The column in question follows:

THOSE SERVICES IN EAST ROOM

(By Virginia Payette)

Well, for God's sake (and ours), let's leave off jumping on President Nixon because he prays at home on Sunday!

Or maybe it's because the preachers he invites in to lead the prayers are theological conservatives. On the other hand, maybe it's just coincidental that the people who object to oldtime religion in the White House have more liberal (or do I mean high church vs. low church?) leanings.

When you get down to it, it's really kind of hard to figure out just WHY the clerical critics are rushing in where even Democrats fear to tread. The Lord knows the poor man has plenty to pray about. In that job he needs all the help he can get, and let's not quibble over how he goes about it.

But the zaps are coming in. From—of all people—a couple of certified, blue-ribbon theologians.

The first nip came a few months ago when the Rev. Harvey Cox of Harvard had a few unkind words to say about the President's plea that youngsters turn to religion for some of the answers they seem to be seeking.

MR. COX KICKS

The Reverend Mr. Cox said frankly that he and his fellow preachers were having enough trouble getting the kids interested in religion "without having Nixon support it." (And he wasn't struck down by lightning, or anything.)

Now, along comes Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, a 77-year-old theologian who's known most-whereas as our most respected Protestant thinker. Well, he's been thinking, and he protests that President Nixon is bending the First Amendment "by a curious combination of innocence and guile" when he holds those prayer meetings in the East Room of a Sunday morning.

Never mind how informal they are. Or that they're almost so nonsectarian they could pass for chapel in a prep school. Dr. Niebuhr thinks they are establishing a "conforming religion."

He's afraid President Nixon is latching on to Scripture to line up help for his own political ends—and this is just the kind of thing that put the fear of God into our Founding Fathers, he says, and made 'em stick that First Amendment in there in the first place.

Apparently Dr. Niebuhr feels the church's deep thinkers would do better to spend their time shooting moral criticism at the White House, instead of wasting their time praying there.

DISLIKES LIST

And he's not the least bit happy that the guest-preacher list has included not only evangelist Billy Graham and positive thinker Norman Vincent Peale, but also a Catholic, a Jew and a Quaker. (Would he prefer, maybe, Madalyn Murray O'Hair, who doesn't like prayer even a quarter of a million miles out in space?)

Dr. Niebuhr seems to be afraid that none of these men will ever come out against any Nixon program now, no matter what.

"It is wonderful," he says, "what a simple White House invitation will do to dull the critical faculties," and it just shows that those Founding Fathers were right all along.

He also wonders whether the late Dr. Martin Luther King, whose civil rights program sometimes differed from Mr. Nixon's, would have been invited to mount the temporary pulpit.

Well, that we'll never know. Dr. King died before Mr. Nixon's religious practices became such a public concern. But chances are he'd have accepted the President's invitation,

prayed over him on Sunday, hoped he'd saved a sinner, and said what he thought on Monday.

And so, no doubt, will all these other guest preachers.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION LAWYERS' REVOLT

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star hit the nail on the head in an editorial in their Wednesday, September 3 issue when, in reference to the so-called revolt of lawyers in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, the writer said:

We do not suppose that the Attorney General or the President will permit lawyers in the Department of Justice to dictate administration policy.

The fact that this malcontent group wants to charge ahead with forced integration of schools in spite of HEW Secretary Finch's plea that to do so would produce "chaos, confusion, and a catastrophic educational setback," shows their mentality, their morality, and their consciences or, rather, the lack of the three.

There is every evidence that the Department of Justice is headed for the first time in decades by a man of integrity, honor, and compassion, who does not believe in harassing the private sector with bureaucratic niggling for the sole sake of forcing on them an ideology, politically conceived, which will bring about a catastrophic educational setback.

Thank God for men of his caliber. They are a long time in coming.

If the malcontent group of lawyers cannot serve under a man like Attorney General Mitchell, they should submit their resignations and be on their way.

The Star editorial follows:

"REVOLT OF THE LAWYERS"

The reports that many, perhaps half, of the lawyers in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice are considering a mass resignation do not make a great deal of sense.

Their principal grievance, if the reports are accurate, flows from the administration's decision to obtain from the Fifth Circuit Court a three-month delay in enforcing a school integration order in 30 Mississippi school districts. The lawyers are supposed to believe this represents a retreat by the administration, and they are said to want a statement from Attorney General Mitchell affirming a department policy of strict civil rights law enforcement.

They are not likely to get it. For one thing, if such a demand were actually to be made, it would be presumptuous, to say the least. We do not suppose that the attorney general or the President will permit lawyers in the Department of Justice to dictate administration policy.

Furthermore, as we see it, the action in the Mississippi case does not amount to a retreat on civil rights. More probably, it reflects the use of at least a little common sense in trying to solve a most difficult problem.

The real request for the delay came, not from the attorney general, but from HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch. He told the appellate court that an attempt to implement the desegregation plan by the begin-

ning of this school year would produce "chaos, confusion and a catastrophic educational setback." The additional time is needed, he said, for further study and the preparation of additional plans to smooth the way.

If the critics do not believe Finch, they should at least take note of the language used by the court in granting the requested delay. "It is a condition of this extension of time," said the judges, "that the plan as submitted and the plan as finally approved shall require significant action toward disestablishment of the dual school system during the school year September 1969-June 1970." That is plain language. Clearly, the administration did not request and the court did not grant an indefinite delay in this matter. There must be "significant action" toward desegregation in this school year.

In our view, this is a judicial attitude that is both hard-nosed and unwise. It could very well still result in the "catastrophic educational setback" to which Finch alluded. For experience elsewhere, including the experience in this city, rather clearly indicates that parents cannot be forced in the name of integration to send their children to schools which they do not want them to attend. And in Mississippi the drift away from public schools to private schools is already under way. If it continues, the quality of public education will be the principal victim.

However this may be, it is clear that the administration has requested and the court has granted a delay of three months—nothing more. The discontented lawyers and the other critics should take time to examine the record before jumping to the conclusion that civil rights are going down the drain in this administration.

TINDERBOX IN LATIN AMERICA

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the August 16, 1969, issue of the Saturday Review features a most thought-provoking article, entitled "Tinderbox in Latin America."

Written by Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz, former Ambassador to the Organization of American States, the article calls attention to facts which cannot be ignored by anyone concerned with our hemisphere's future.

Ambassador Linowitz's many years of experience in the business and diplomatic worlds and his knowledge of Latin America have provided him with tremendous insight into the problems which beset our hemisphere and the directions we ought to pursue in seeking solutions to them.

Accordingly, I am sure my colleagues are interested in what Ambassador Linowitz has to say:

TINDERBOX IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

For some time now it has become a tired Washington cliché to issue periodic pronouncements to the effect that United States relations with Latin America are in a state of crisis and we must, finally, do something about it. It would be difficult to find anyone, no matter how sparse his knowledge of the hemisphere, who would argue about the crisis half of the cliché. It is the latter part—"do something about it"—that causes all the trouble.

James Reston once observed that the

American people will do anything for Latin America except read about it. The apathy is so widespread and endemic, however, that the usually reliable Mr. Reston may have overstated the case with regard to the American people's willingness to do anything for their hemispheric neighbors.

There is a paradox about the situation that contributes to making it one of the most perplexing among the many foreign policy problems that periodically plague Washington administrations, no matter what their political gender. Beginning with Franklin Roosevelt and his Good Neighbor Policy through John Kennedy and the Alliance for Progress, Lyndon Johnson and the summit meeting of American presidents, and now Richard Nixon and the Rockefeller Latin American study mission, no President, Democratic or Republican, in nearly two generations has denied the importance of Latin America, or has claimed it can be neglected or ignored.

Yet despite all the programs and official avowals of concern, who can find any sense of excitement about Latin America among the people of the United States? That does not mean we do not get worked up over a Castro, a Cuban missile crisis, a Dominican Republic crisis, an oil company expropriation, a fishing boat seizure. Or that we are not shocked when the visit of a Governor Rockefeller, who is rightly regarded as a friend of Latin America, touches off nasty demonstrations.

That is the heart of the paradox, for the emotions are genuine and the concern is real. Yet when the crisis of the moment is over, emotion subsides and concern is shrugged off, and once again we turn our attention to another part of the world—until some new Latin explosion, such as the El Salvador-Honduran clash, reluctantly drags it back again to our own hemisphere.

To suggest that this lack of public interest is directly responsible for the state of affairs in Latin America would be less than accurate. Surely it is not responsible for the nagging economic underdevelopment that grips the continent and its 240 million people—240 million who will be 600 million before the century is out, and, if circumstances continue as they are, many times poorer.

The other side of the coin, however, is that our public disinterest sharply points up the inescapable fact that there is no real Latin American constituency in the United States—a political nuance that the Congress has not failed to notice.

Last year, for example, we disappointed the people of Latin America with cuts in our appropriation for the Alliance for Progress—cuts that made it the lowest since that vital program was launched in 1961: \$336-million against some \$500-million in 1966 and \$460-million the following year. This year President Nixon has proposed an appropriation of \$603-million, and already we are beginning to hear the sound of chopping on Capitol Hill.

Obviously, it is far from the intent of Congress to do anything that would slow the rhythm of development in Latin America, for that could only weaken the constructive forces of peaceful change and give impetus to those who believe in violence as the way to alter the status quo. But cutting our share of the alliance appropriation has this precise effect, whether that is the intent or not, and the United States cannot evade responsibility.

What it all boils down to is that we cannot help Latin America solve its economic problems with bargain-basement tactics. We cannot do it on the cheap. Rhetoric is fine in its place, and the ringing words of our regard for Latin America make for fine speeches. But without the financial commitment to back up the words we are in trou-

ble in this hemisphere, and we had better make no mistake about it.

Too often in our relations with Latin America over the years we in the United States have not done as we said, nor have we always said clearly just what it is we would do. Our promises, moreover, have not always withstood the test of time or pressure. The people of Latin America have good reason to be confused about how seriously we regard them and their problems and, based on past experience, even better reason to have skepticism with regard to the credibility and continuity of the commitments we make to them.

There should be no doubt that this uncertainty in Latin America is a contributory factor in the repeated demonstrations of anti-U.S. sentiments that crop up with disturbing frequency, or that it is a potent weapon in the hands of those who relish the nation of a fragmented Western Hemisphere, with the South being played off against the North. Nor can there be any question that the time is long past for Washington to undertake a credible commitment to the republics of Latin America that will resolve the doubts that now give rise to such uncertainty and even to fear.

President Johnson, following the summit meeting of American presidents at Punta del Este in 1967, went a long way toward extending such a commitment when he said, "We will persevere. There is no time limit on our commitment." But realistically speaking, the words he spoke did not have the force of law or of a treaty—a fact Congress made all the more evident when it cut the alliance funds last year. And with a change of Administration, accompanied by all the uncertainty that such a change brings with it, the Latins are still wondering how far we will go, and to what extent we will persevere.

It was not, I am sure, President Nixon's intent to add to this uncertainty when, a few months after taking office, he addressed the Organization of American States and strongly criticized the alliance for all that it had left undone. Even the dispatch of Governor Rockefeller on his fact-finding mission, rather than help assuage fears that Washington was contemplating a major change in its Latin American policy, only intensified the uncomfortable feeling that, once again, things were up in the air.

Inevitably, there will be much of value in what Governor Rockefeller will be reporting to the President, but the point cannot be overstressed that we need, above all, patience, perspective, and the determination to see the job through. Latin America should not be an issue for domestic party politics. Quite the contrary, it offers what is perhaps the most inviting area for constructive and imaginative bipartisan foreign policy cooperation.

It is the kind of cooperation that must look beyond the immediate horizon and focus on another far off, one still shrouded in clouds of uncertainty. For no matter what we do, no matter how firm our commitment, no matter what funds we appropriate to help the people of Latin America to build and to develop their continent, no matter what our trade policies, we cannot guarantee the future; we cannot say that if we do this Latin America will be an unwavering ally and firm friend of the United States, that it will offer us a vast commercial market for our goods. No one—politician, economist, or seer—can offer any such guarantee. And even if he could, it would be a poor motivation for the kind of effort that must be undertaken for the remainder of this century.

Latin America is not for sale to the highest bidder, and if we gear our programs with the idea that it is, we are in for a sad awakening—an awakening that, as recent events demonstrate, has already begun. What we must understand is that change in Latin

America is inevitable. The only question remaining is whether it is to be a violent change or a relatively peaceful one, and obviously, therefore, our own best interests would dictate that we aid those forces seeking to build and to strengthen economic and political democracy in Latin America.

If they should fail, the change that is bound to follow can only be one of violence. All the explosive ingredients are present. For in Latin America, even as in the United States, we cannot expect people denied hope and dignity to sit patiently while life and the world pass them by.

The point has been made that if Latin American governments do not pass badly needed economic and social reforms they deserve to fall. And it has been argued too that perhaps some violence may be necessary to convince the oligarchies and military governments that desperate conditions beget desperate actions. To some extent it is difficult to answer these arguments. It is all too true that in too many cases Latin governments are not doing all they should and all they could to cope with the underlying causes of economic and social underdevelopment, nor are they doing enough of what must be done to promote the growth of representative government responsive to the will of the people. These facts are all too glaring to be swept under the rug, and we should recognize them for what they are—part of the reality of Latin America today.

What all this points up is the truism evident wherever people are struggling to be free—economically, socially, and politically: Time is not on the side of those who would shelter the status quo. Those who would see democracy and freedom fulfill their destiny have the responsibility of seeing to it that the vicious circle of poverty, sickness, and illiteracy is broken once and for all. People within its orbit live outside the mainstream of society and really play no part in shaping their nation's policies; because they are not part of the democratic process, they have little stake in it.

Clearly we must do all we can to encourage the growth of orderly, democratic procedures sensitive to the needs of the people they are designed to serve. But we can not and must not elbow our way into another country's system, telling it how it should manage its affairs, as if we had all the answers. We haven't, as the problems before us of putting our own house in order aptly testify.

What we can do, however—and what we have not done with any real consistency—is to make clear our firm commitment to representative government and to the growth of political democracy in this hemisphere. Such a policy will enable us to develop special friendships with Latin America's men of vision, with the men who know that peaceful social progress is endangered by any entrenchment of the privileged few.

Today the despair that exists in much of Latin America provides the climate in which a Batista or a Castro flourishes best, or in which a despotism of the right can provide the foundation for a dictatorship of the left. Or vice versa. It is a situation that only underscores the urgency of continuing the partnership launched eight years ago this month when President Kennedy, following a Latin-inspired initiative known as "Operation Pan-America," pledged the support of the United States to the Alliance for Progress.

The alliance was a magnificent concept, with goals and aspirations to match its grandeur. If it can be faulted in hindsight, it would be for assuming that the job could be done in ten years. That, and setting an annual growth-rate goal without recognizing that the birth rate was shooting up at a pace that far exceeded Latin America's growth-rate capabilities.

But who can argue that any program of the scope and reach of the alliance—a program

designed to bring about the upheaval of the Latin American continent and build a healthy, vibrant, economically secure, and politically sound inter-American community—must not set its sights high, and that it must not keep them there? Surely not the people who live without amenities of civilization, or without hope of a better tomorrow. For they can attain that tomorrow only if there is no compromise in the fight to attain the goals the alliance so eloquently set forth—goals for better housing, education, health, tax and land reforms, a revitalized and modernized industry and agriculture, and an integrated continent-wide economy.

Yet the yearly per capita growth rate still is well behind the Punta del Este goal of 2.5 per cent. The birth rate soars. Fifty per cent of the people are illiterate. The cities are clogged with workless *campesinos*. Tight protective tariffs protect inefficient monopolies. Feudalism persists in the countryside, and the people there go hungry or move away.

If it was a mistake then to hope that this could be changed in ten years, it would be catastrophic now to turn our backs on what has been done. True, economic sufficiency remains a distant goal, but for the first time a way has been charted out of the Latin American jungle of underdevelopment.

The statistics add up to an impressive total, particularly in an area of the world that has never experienced such concentrated doses of progress. But no statistic can possibly convey the meaning of a new road that slices through an Amazon jungle and links up a hitherto isolated village with the heartland of its country. Nor can it convey the significance of a new classroom opened for children in the plateaus of the Andes or in the *barrios* of the cities; of a *campesino* who now works his own farm; of water supplies made potable; of infant mortality rates reduced; of a family able to quit the sordid life of the slums for a new start in a new apartment.

And with all the statistics totaled up, it is clear that the alliance has devoted more of its resources to investments in the social areas, particularly education and health services, than in any other sector.

The actual rate of Latin American development, therefore, is higher than the economic growth charts indicate simply because social investment is not reflected in Latin America's gross product. But the direct effort to speed up the processes of education and social welfare is the surest guarantee that an obsolete social order will be peacefully transformed, as in Japan or Britain, rather than explosively altered via the violent, revolutionary routes of eighteenth-century France or twentieth-century Russia.

What must be understood above all about the alliance—and perhaps the most misunderstood feature, even among a number of our own key government officials—is that it is not a bilateral American aid program, but rather a cooperative self-help program, to be carried out primarily by the people of Latin America. The United States is one partner in this program, of which 90 per cent is financed by the countries of Latin America. The alliance is not ours to manipulate, and the amount we appropriate, therefore, is no handout, but a hand of help extended in friendship. Congress must not forget this when considering how much we can afford to appropriate for our share of the effort.

When all is said and done, and with all that remains undone, there is no escape from the conclusion that eight years ago the alliance launched a truly creative, regenerative development program. But it was, and is, only the first step in a long journey. In our inter-American relations, we need most of all a sense of propriety, a sense of time, a sense of scale, and a sense of destiny.

As for propriety, Americans may find wry amusement in cartoons that depict the

stereotyped Latin American—the sleepy, guitar-playing, sombrero-wearing, not too ambitious but pleasant fellow. But the stereotyped North American—the Yankee with the dollar sign for a heart—is hardly the object for smiles in Latin America. The truth, of course, is that neither stereotype is valid today, if it ever was.

The people of Latin America are a combination of some of the wealthiest cultures our civilization has known. Its young people, with their passion for country and their zeal for the future, are restless and prone to impatience. They are skeptical of our aims and so are more willing to blame us for their problems than to understand the difficulties in solving them. Yet these are the people with the mystique and the vision of grandeur who can spark the enthusiasm and loyalties of their countrymen. They are the people who are so anxiously searching for a revolution of social justice—the very people we must convince that we want to work with them because our continued partnership is essential to the future of freedom. In so doing, anti-Communism as such will not get us very far. It is not a powerful argument for the average citizen who is steeped in a personal struggle to keep his head above water.

A student at the University of Chile once summed it up when he told me: "The United States is constantly talking about the value of political democracy. We agree that it is essential, but we also feel you would accomplish far more if you said less about political democracy and put more of your weight behind the concept of economic democracy."

What he was saying is that city slum dwellers denied hope and illiterate rural Indians denied even a glimpse of the twentieth century neither comprehend the meaning of political democracy nor offer any foundation to sustain or to nurture it. They will either remain mute or give their sullen support to the demagogue or "leader" who elbows his way through the masses offering them protection and food. These are the staple commodities they want and need, and no promise of a better life made possible by democracy can vie with them. As former Senator Paul Douglas once said, "When you offer a starving man a choice between the Four Freedoms and four sandwiches, he always chooses the four sandwiches."

When, however, attention is given to questions of basic order, when roads and streets are made safe, when food, clothing, and shelter are made available, when attention is given to living conditions, when the masses discover they can rear, educate, and marry off their children and leave them an opportunity for a better life, political democracy becomes not only possible, but imperative. For as living standards rise, democracy becomes the only political system through which that better life can be sustained and advanced. And this is to the mutual benefit of all the Americas.

As for time, no nation has fully modernized itself in less than sixty years. The United States took much longer. In eight years Latin America, despite false starts and frustrated hopes, has made more progress than we had any right to expect. Realistically, however, it would be unwise to think in terms of less than thirty years for full-scale modernization of the continent. After eight years the alliance must, therefore, be regarded as in its infancy. Any other view does injustice to Latin America.

And this leads to the need for a sense of scale in our relations with Latin Americans, including a sense of proportion in both the United States and Latin America. We must look at our hemisphere with a new eye of understanding, one that recognizes its importance to the future peace of the world. We cannot take Latin America for granted, believing it will be there when we need it. We need it now no less—and perhaps more—

than it needs us, for what happens there in the closing years of this century may well shape the coming years of the next century.

As for Latin Americans, it is time for them to recognize that the United States is not the wielder of the big stick of the 1900s, that we mean what we say about wanting to work with them, that our commitment is to an inter-American community of equal states. In short, they must turn away from memories of the past and turn instead to our mutual hopes for the future.

We talk of destiny, of partnership, of shared hopes and efforts toward hemispheric unity. But what does that destiny look like if our hemisphere ends up half suburb and half slum? Is this the limit we set to the creative, working partnership the American presidents established at Punta del Este to meet the increasing needs of today's "revolution of rising expectations"?

Surely our destiny is more in keeping with the brave new world we have always sought to build. Surely it is more in keeping with our faith that the dream of Simón Bolívar will flourish at last, like the dreams of our own founding fathers—that this hemisphere will grow in prosperity and confidence into a model of new states, with all their diversity of cultures and differences of gifts, can work together to improve and enrich and ennoble their common life.

We shall not do this with cold, lifeless graphs and charts. We shall not do this with Congressional cuts. We shall not do this between today and tomorrow. But with time and with resources, and with the republics of the Americas all working together, it can be done.

CRISIS IN WORLD STRATEGY: THE SOUTH WEST AFRICA STORY

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in previous statements in Congress, I have described the vast area known as southern Africa as one of the key strategic spots of the world.

Its significance in the defense of Western civilization—as recognized by competent students of world strategy—was dramatized by the closure in 1967 of the Suez Canal, which forced shipping between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean to sail around the Cape of Good Hope.

One of the regions in southern Africa about which there has been much uninformed and pernicious discussion in the press of the world is South West Africa, which is an extensive territory under the jurisdiction of the Republic of South Africa.

Because it is important for the people of the United States, Members of Congress, and officials of the executive branch of their Government to have actual facts as well as harmful propaganda, the American Security Council, in a recent Washington Report, summarized the story of South West Africa in a brilliant article by John F. Lewis, coordinating editor of that publication.

For those who may wish additional authentic information about southern Africa, attention is invited to three notable books. Two are by Dr. Eschel Rhoadie: "South West—The Last Frontier," and "The Third Africa," both published in 1967 by Twin Circle Publishing Co., 86 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.

The third is by Dr. Robert Gayre, "Ethnological Elements of Africa," published in 1966 by the Armorial Ltd., Darnaway St., Edinburgh, Scotland.

As an example of hostile agitation in the United States against the proudly pro-Western civilized Government of the Republic of South Africa, I would again warn the Congress and responsible officials of the executive department of our Government concerning the book, "Apartheid and the Limited Nations Collective Measurer," edited by Amelia C. Leise, and published in 1965 under the auspices of the once great organization, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United Nations Plaza at 46th Street, New York, N.Y.

This volume by the Carnegie Endowment for Peace is a general staff type of war plan—prepared with the assistance of the West Point faculty—for an amphibious assault on South Africa. It estimates that the casualties would be between 19,000 and 38,000 killed and wounded, which no doubt are intended to be primarily from the youth of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the Republic of South Africa is by far the strongest and most stable on the entire Continent of Africa, which serves as a bastion of Western civilization.

An armed assault on South Africa would be far more disastrous than anything the world has witnessed since World War II.

I believe that I reflect the voices of our more thoughtful citizens when I say they do not wish any more Korean or Vietnam wars—on the deserts of the Sinai Peninsula, South West Africa, or anywhere else.

The previously mentioned article by John F. Lewis follows:

THE SOUTH WEST AFRICA STORY

(By John F. Lewis)

If a majority of the member nations in the UN had their way the world would be at war this year over one of the least known and most misunderstood areas of the globe—South West Africa.

Led by propaganda and political pressure from the communist bloc states and fed by a combination of misconceptions and demagoguery from the so-called Afro-Asian bloc of nations, the United Nations has very nearly committed itself to launch a military campaign to oust the white man—specifically the Republic of South Africa—from administration of the territory.

For 50 years, South Africa has run South West Africa under terms of a League of Nations mandate to administer the one-time German colony that was the Kaiser's pride before World War I.

What is more, even the most critical observers of South Africa's administration concede South West Africa has been run well and has prospered far beyond reasonable expectations.

Despite drought, limited communications through sparsely settled country, and the great diversity of its people, South West Africa's post-World War I bankruptcy has been converted under South African supervision to a point which allows the country today to export capital. During the days when the British ruled South Africa and, consequently, South West Africa, the level of real output (1920-1945) doubled. Since South Africa became a republic and cut loose their ties to the British crown the growth rate has been even more remarkable. For example,

during the period 1961-1965, when the population of South West Africa was rising at a rate of about 2.4 percent per annum, gross domestic output in the territory increased on an average of 12.6 percent per annum. This has been reflected in a per capita income growth rate to the non-white population of the area an estimated five to ten times that of most of the non-white administered states of the African continent.

Its tribal peoples have known a peace, stability and progress which they never enjoyed for periods of more than a decade prior to the end of World War I.

Only because the West, and particularly Britain, France and the United States, have no intention of waging war against the South Africans; only because the Soviet Union is unwilling to commit its own military might to such an adventure, and only because the Afro-Asian countries are unable to do so, has aggression against one of the most peaceful portions of this violence-plagued earth been averted in 1969.

Because it may not be averted in the future, it is important that the facts of South West Africa's story be known so the myths may be exposed before it is too late.

GEOGRAPHY AND PEOPLE

Facing on the Atlantic side of southern Africa, South West Africa shares a northern border with Portuguese Angola, an eastern border with Botswana and the Republic of South Africa and a southern border with South Africa. It has limited frontier contact with Zambia in its extreme northeast.

The territory is slightly larger than Texas and Louisiana combined, consisting of some 318,000 square miles. Fifteen percent of its total area is virtually useless except for one currently very important consideration—defense. This region is the Namib, a desert of dunes between the pounding waves of the Atlantic and the country's central plateau that varies in width from 50 to 80 miles along its entire west coast.

The Namib is formidably hot, utterly arid and a frightening obstacle for any would-be invaders from the sea. It is perhaps the earth's most desolate piece of real estate.

An inland escarpment which is known as the Central Plateau, covers more than half of the territory and also stretches from South West Africa's northern border to its southern border. It ranges in altitude from 3,200 to 6,500 feet above sea level.

The plateau offers a diversified landscape of rugged mountains, rocky outcrops, sand-filled valleys and gently rolling plains, has minimal amounts of rainfall and is sparsely inhabited.

The remainder of the area is known as the Kalahar, covering the eastern, northern and north-eastern parts of South West Africa. It includes what is called the Caprivi Strip—a thin corridor penetrating the southern heart of Africa between Botswana on the south and Angola/Zambia on the north (the Caprivi Strip was carved out of British Colonial holdings in 1908 to grant German South West Africa access to the Zambezi River. It was named in honor of the then German Chancellor, Count von Caprivi.)

Though most of the Kalahari is also deficient in rainfall, parts of it such as the Caprivi Strip are well watered and well developed agriculturally.

The entire country is inhabited by less than 630,000 people and about one-sixth of that number are white. Most of the whites are of German and South African (Afrikaner) or English origin.

The largest non-white group is the Ovambo tribe, living in a virtually autonomous region of the north, Ovamboland, adjacent to Angola. They number well over 270,000. Then come the Damara people (50,000), Herero (40,000), Nama (40,000), Okavango (32,000), East Caprivians (18,000), Basters (14,000), Bushmen (13,000), Tswana and much

smaller other tribes (20,000). The so-called "coloreds," Asians or products of white-non-white inter-marriage, are a group unto themselves and number some 15,000.

TRIBAL DISTINCTIONS

The biggest misconception much of the world has about all of Africa is that all non-white populations are as one in terms of ethnic origins, color of skin and level of social, political and intellectual advancement. On top of this, of course, comes the second biggest misconception—namely that since the white man runs the governments of southern Africa in Portuguese Angola and Mozambique, in Rhodesia and in South and South West Africa, the non-white populations are being oppressed.

That is a convenient theory to espouse wherever ignorance is deemed blissful but it is hopelessly out of line with the facts in southern Africa.

If one considers the white man as a tribal grouping in South Africa, for instance, the fact is the white tribe arrived in that area about the same time many of the Bantu (black) tribes arrived from east and central Africa following great migrations brought on by the pressures of war, famine and the Arab slave trade persecutions.

The settlement of southern Africa—in terms of today's major population groups—occurred in the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. The white man arrived in 1652 to form the first settlement at the Cape of Good Hope. However, European explorers and adventurers from Portugal, England and Spain had made landings and become familiar with some of the terrain of South and South West Africa since Portuguese Captain Diego Cao landed in 1485 just north of what is today, South West Africa's principal port, Walvis Bay. Two years later the only other modern South West African port—Luderitz—was a beachhead landing for explorer-geographer Bartholomew Diaz. Diaz then proceeded around the tip of the continent to discover the Cape, in 1488.

Only the Hottentots—now extinct as a race or tribe—and possibly the Bushmen, were indigenous to this part of Africa. Such a famous tribe as the Zulus migrated into the eastern portion of South Africa and became important only in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Though the United Nations and many of the most vocal of those countries now seeking the white man's scalp in southern Africa make the black man's experience in southern Africa sound like that of the Indian in America, there just are no parallels to be found.

Thanks to the white man's success (by the end of the nineteenth century) in putting an end to the non-white wars of tribal genocide, the non-white population of South and South West Africa today is four to six times greater than that of the white man.

In South West Africa, there are very wide differences to be noted among the tribal groupings. The Bushman is a Stone Age man—hopelessly outclassed physically and mentally by the sophisticated Ovambos, and Okavangos who similarly have little in common with the warlike Hereros and Namas.

In terms of language, customs, family and community relationships and tribal organization—each group in South West Africa, including the "coloreds," differs widely.

The United Nations has also insisted that South Africa's continued administration of the League mandate in South West Africa amounts to an "illegal occupation."

The World Court reviewed this entire issue as recently as 1965 and concluded—in effect—that the UN had no jurisdiction in the matter, that there was no evidence that South Africa had violated the League mandate and that the subject was not germane. The case was initiated at International Court of Justice by Ethiopia and Liberia yet the highest tribunal in international law found that neither country had been hurt by South Africa's administration of South West Africa

and neither country even shared a common boundary with the area in question.

Yet, the UN Security Council—earlier this year—was asked by the General Assembly of the United Nations to consider the use of armed intervention to make South Africa release its administrative hold on South West Africa. The fact that there was no demand from the people of South West Africa to do this and the fact that the UN was acting in direct conflict with the World Court opinion led South African Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Hilgard Muller, to comment: "We are occupying nobody and nothing. The people of South West Africa possess and occupy their own territories and they live in prosperity under our protection."

"We have been in South West Africa for fifty years already and I want to state clearly that we intend to remain in South West Africa legally because the inhabitants want us there and also because it is our intention to prevent any aggression from outside against the territory or any of its population groups . . ."

Most importantly, the major non-white tribal groups in South West Africa today live on the very homelands they originally occupied when they migrated south from other parts of the continent. They have not been dispossessed of their real estate holdings. They continue their tribal life in an unbroken pattern.

They choose their own chiefs in the way their people have chosen them for centuries. They run their own affairs. The white man interferes just enough to bring them schools, hospitals, agricultural know-how and, as indicated earlier, peace.

Yet the real irony of the South West Africa story is that an independent and objective survey made among the nonwhite groups of South West Africa suggests that any attempt by the outside world to enforce the United Nations or Communist and Afro-Asian claims against South Africa's administration of the country would be as stoutly resisted by the allegedly exploited natives as by their so-called white masters.

Despite the heavy dosages of Communist-directed and financed propaganda that seeks to infect black Africa with revolutionary fervor and despite the Afro-Asian bloc sensitivity to the real and imagined affronts to their brethren in South West Africa, any attempt to use force to impose the UN's will would be the height of folly.

Furthermore, it would be a reprehensible exhibition of double standards on the part of both the non-Communist world and the UN, so long as they seemingly tolerate the truly illegal occupation of Czechoslovakia, the real persecution of Hungarians and the demonstrated fifty-year oppression of millions throughout the Communist world.

VIETNAM—WHAT NEXT?

(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, we cannot allow the tragic nightmare that is Vietnam to linger. Beyond all else, the failure of our Government to end our costly adventurism in Southeast Asia still ranks as the most pressing problem facing this Nation.

Of course, I do not doubt that today we are nearer to some sort of settlement than we were a year ago. But, what good is it when the progress is measured only by inches when instead it should have been in miles. I become incensed whenever I hear the pap that any progress necessarily must be slow; that is nothing more than rhetorical nonsense, empty

phrases employed to cover up our real lack of true resolve.

Certainly, it is apparent that there now is more active strife off the battlefronts than on them, that the real struggle is going on between the Thieu-Ky government, combined with its friends in the American military hierarchy, and those policymakers who are pushing for acceleration of U.S. withdrawals and easing of our stands at the Paris peace talks.

Yet, because of this searing internal struggle, we face the terrible enigma of our current situation in Vietnam:

President Nixon encourages talk of phased troop withdrawals, but total troop strength has changed very little;

The emphasis is on increased "Vietnamization" of the war, but the period most generally mentioned for an effective transition to South Vietnamese control is 2 to 3 years;

Mr. Nixon goes on about the need for political settlement, but the government formed last week is even less broadly based and supported than before.

And some things never change.

The American military ethic continues to call for a victory in Vietnam, whatever that means and at whatever the cost. The Thieu-Ky government desperately hangs onto—and promotes—meager hopes of victory because it cannot tolerate settlement as long as the ruling junta represents nothing more than an extension of American policy in Asia.

After months of administration procrastination and hesitation—ostensibly because public and political pressures were lessened to avoid harming the chances for advance at the Paris peace talks—now we must realize that the situation is dismal, to say the least.

Indeed, what sort of progress should we expect when the South Vietnam Government rejects the proposed 3-day truce, and when the State Department then announces it will follow the lead of the Thieu-Ky regime. Must we interpret this ploy as meaning that we are turning over key political decisionmaking to the Vietnamese generals? I hope not.

Right now—today—we have reached a crucial point in the course of our Vietnam dilemma. Even before the death of Ho, there were encouraging signs from both Hanoi and Paris; most heartening of them was the report by Jonathan C. Randal of the Washington Post that Hanoi's chief negotiator had hinted that rapid and massive troop withdrawals could get the talks going again, and that North Vietnam would no longer insist—that the Saigon regime be replaced by a provisional coalition government.

The time is right for decisive American action primed to bring about peace in Vietnam. I suggest two immediate steps to President Nixon. The President should:

First, accept the 3-day cease-fire, and take initiative to make it into a permanent, lasting truce;

Second, speed up troop withdrawals at a pace six or seven times as fast as we now are going, and make sure that troop withdrawals are counted against total troop strength, instead of making it all a futile numbers game.

Over 2 years ago, in a speech given at the Los Angeles town hall, I outlined a four-point approach which I felt contained all the necessary elements to achieve an immediate end to the war, along with bringing a political settlement acceptable to both sides. I believe those four suggestions still are valid—still must be done—and I now reiterate them.

I call upon the President to take the following steps:

First, order our half million troops, our massive air and naval fleets, to cease fire and stand fast. Announce to the enemy and to the world that our soldiers will fire only if fired upon, but if fired upon will take all steps necessary for their own defense.

Second, asks the Geneva powers to reconvene, under call of the cochairman, to a neutral site in Asia, with the National Liberation Front participating as a belligerent.

Third, participate in good faith negotiations as long as necessary to reach a settlement, making clear that he will be guided by the basic principle that the future of South Vietnam shall be determined by the freely expressed decisions of its own people.

Fourth, insist that the final agreement be guaranteed by the great powers, and adequate enforcement machinery provided.

That town hall speech was entitled "Vietnam—What Next?" The title remains true. Yes, over the 25 months since that speech, there has been progress. But the killing, the destruction, the resource losses, the alienation which splits the entire world community, all those existed 2 years ago, and they all continue.

Surely we must agree that if the conventional wisdom cannot provide the solution, then we must be prepared to try new and different—even radical—methods of bringing about the objectives of peace and security for all peoples.

The traditionalists have blundered time after time by staying only within the bounds—and binds—of orthodox diplomacy and brinkmanship. And, in one way, we do owe them thanks, for, if anything, the traditionalists have succeeded in convincing the great majority of Americans that the war must be settled quickly—and, strangely enough, even if it means that we do not win the conventional military victory we have been promised so often—and so erroneously—in the past.

Thus we find a significant change in attitude by the American public, but that change is not reflected by either our position on a political settlement for South Vietnam or on the military strategy of the generals who run the war.

Earlier I recommended two immediate steps that must be taken now to insure a quick settlement; the town hall speech brought up even broader guidelines. Even so, those suggestions are just initial policies, but they are most important ones.

I urge my colleagues—as I urge all Americans—to stress the necessity for these proposals. As for myself, I see no greater task for any man than to give his entire energy to achieve peace in the

world at this time, and I am willing to do that. I will undertake any effort which might lead to peace, including travel to both North and South Vietnam to consult with their leaders if such action might lead to a new spirit of compromise and a realistic political settlement.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this Chamber is happy about the state of affairs in Vietnam. Congress has allowed this tragic war to escalate beyond all comprehension. Now let us act to bring a just and quick peace, for we all know that it can be done.

In the past two days, I have come across a number of important news stories relating to the situation in Southeast Asia, and I insert them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 7, 1969]
NIXON'S SECOND CHANCE: DEATH OF HO PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE FRESH BEGINNING ON PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By Joseph Kraft)

President Nixon missed the opportunity to make a fresh beginning on peace in Vietnam when he took office last January. But the death of Ho Chi Minh—with its incalculable impact on North Vietnam, the insurgency in the South and relations with Russia and China—gives him a second chance.

The serious question at this time, accordingly, is not what happens next in Hanoi. It is what happens next here in Washington. For to make the most of his second chance, the President will have to institute changes in his policy of troop withdrawal, in his attitude toward the Saigon regime and in his negotiating stance.

Troop withdrawal has been moving at a pace that would give snails itchy pants. The total American troop level in Vietnam is now only about 2,500 below what it was when Mr. Nixon took office. At that rate, a couple of hundred years would elapse before American soldiers finally got out of Vietnam.

The practical effect of that slow pace is to enshrine the principle of "see it through with Nguyen Van Thieu." Gen. Thieu is under no pressure to put together a broad-based regime capable of standing on its own feet and slugging it out with the other side. On the contrary, he has just put together a regime remarkable for its narrow base and lack of popular appeal.

Neither is Gen. Thieu under pressure to come forward with proposals that engage the other side. On the contrary, he is free to pursue a phony peace offensive—a series of spurious proposals that serve only to put the other side off.

Moreover, the American military is under little pressure to change its tactics. Episodes involving frontal assaults on strongly entrenched enemy positions for dubious gains—as in the cases of Hamburger Hill and Company A—keep cropping up. Casualties continue to run over 150 a week.

Heavy fighting combines with reliance on the Thieu regime to impair the Nixon negotiating stance at the Paris peace talks. That stance, according to the White House cliché artists, mixes the stick with the carrot. But the stick is an iron rod of planes, tanks and destroyers that falls away night and day. The carrot is a mangy root of uncertain dimensions.

The South Vietnamese insurgents, or Provisional Revolutionary Government, are offered the chance to participate in national elections for a new government of South Vietnam. These elections would be supervised by the present Saigon government, subject only to some vague international control.

But all experience teaches that those who organize elections in South Vietnam win

elections in South Vietnam. Thus the other side is never going to be tempted by elections organized by their foes in Saigon.

To break the stalemate requires a reversal on all fronts. As a first change, there is the need for a much more accelerated program of troop withdrawal. To avoid the entrenched opposition that caused the President to postpone the cuts due to have been announced last month, Mr. Nixon needs to set down in advance a firm schedule of future withdrawals that should lead to a complete pull-out of American troops within a stipulated length of time.

A first dividend would be new tactics by American commanders. With their forces ebbing away, the military would finally be constrained—in ways far more efficient than mere presidential orders—to develop a defensive strategy aimed at reducing casualties.

A second consequence would be the impact of troop withdrawal on Gen. Thieu. Maybe he would bustle about and start to build a broadly based government able to fight the enemy or beat them in a political contest. Far more likely, he would begin to search for ways to do a deal with the other side.

Either way, divorce from Thieu would make room for a change in the American stance at the Paris negotiations. There would be no obligation to sustain the principle of future elections managed by the Thieu regime. On the contrary, the administration could come up with explicit assurance that the elections would be managed by some intermediate or temporary government acceptable to both nationalists and Communists in Vietnam.

Neither would the United States be glued to the principle that all negotiations with the Provisional Government have to be done through the present Saigon regime. Washington could explore the repeated hints by officials of the Provisional Government that they were prepared to negotiate on the matter of a mutual winding down of military activity.

To be sure, changing positions is never easy in public life. But the basic fact is that Mr. Nixon has tried the easy way to get out of Vietnam and failed. His second chance is to take the hard way.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 1969]

EXTENDED VIET TRUCE SUGGESTED

(By Arthur Dommen)

SAIGON, Sept. 5—A former member of the State Department's Policy Planning Council said today that South Vietnam should take advantage of North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh's death to propose a long-term cease-fire at the Paris peace conference.

Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski, a leading authority on Communist affairs, indicated to reporters that there was a slight chance of a cease-fire being agreed upon in the near future.

But Brzezinski, who directs Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs, said the incipient power struggle in Hanoi would give the proposal a greater chance of consideration than it would have had.

"The death of a dominant political leader in a Communist country creates an external facade of unity behind which there is intense political conflict," Brzezinski said. "This creates the opportunity to focus the attention of Communist leaders on initiatives from abroad."

The Vietcong has set a three-day cease-fire to start Monday as part of the mourning for the North Vietnamese president.

Brzezinski, concluding a week's fact-finding mission in Saigon on behalf of the National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam, described the cease-fire proposal as a "wedge" to obtain negotiations. The New York-based committee includes the former deputy chief negotiator in Paris, Cyrus Vance.

The professor said he had received a wide

variety of reactions from the different people he had discussed the proposal with during his visit, including President Nguyen Van Thieu and American Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker.

He agreed that a cease-fire proposal might be officially rejected by Hanoi. "But in the context of a power struggle no 'no' is definitive," he added.

Concentrating on the negotiation of a cease-fire in Paris might lead to the negotiation of a settlement more easily than first trying to sort out the political future of South Vietnam, he suggested.

"A cease-fire proposal is not a simple device," he said. "It would have to be negotiated. It would make it possible for both sides to talk about some of the things neither is willing to talk about in the context of a settlement. It would make discussion more palatable."

The fact that the proposal was made would "create pressures for negotiations," he believes, and "focus on the real issues."

Brzezinski believes both the Soviets and the Chinese will be "heavily involved" in the struggle for power among the second-level Communist leaders in Hanoi following Ho Chi Minh's death this week.

Brzezinski, while agreeing with the administration in its decision to intervene with American troops in Vietnam in 1965, said "most of the conditions justifying our original intervention have now been changed."

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Sept. 3, 1969]

HANOI HINTS RAPID PULLOUT MAY AID TALKS
(By Jonathan C. Randal)

PARIS.—North Vietnam hinted Tuesday that rapid and massive withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam might get the stalled peace talks off dead center.

Xuan Thuy, Hanoi's chief negotiator, said: "If President Nixon continues to withdraw troops rapidly and in considerable numbers we will examine this factor and take it into account."

His remarks constituted the first indication that Hanoi would consider anything less than the total and unconditional withdrawal of the half-million U.S. troops in South Vietnam.

By the same token, he hinted that North Vietnam would no longer insist on its other previously intransigent demand that the present Saigon regime be replaced by a provisional coalition government.

Left unanswered was whether his remarks to reporters at a North Vietnamese reception represented the long-hoped-for breakthrough at the deadlocked peace talks or rather a propaganda ploy designed to increase pressure on Washington.

NIXON DECISION DEFERRED

Speaking at a reception commemorating the 24th anniversary of North Vietnamese independence, Thuy was asked whether the withdrawal of 100,000 American troops would constitute sufficient proof of Washington's intentions.

In a running exchange with reporters, he denounced the first American troop disengagement as "withdrawals by dribbles" and reiterated that an unconditional evacuation of U.S. forces was "the legitimate demand of the Vietnamese people."

As if to underline that Hanoi would only consider a massive withdrawal as meaningful, he said, "It is evident that if they (the United States) continue at the present pace we cannot judge the situation."

North Vietnamese departure from its previous demand, tantamount to overthrowing the Saigon government, was contained in his answer to another question.

Asked if both previous North Vietnam's demands for a coalition government and total, unconditional troop withdrawal were still linked, he said: "These two questions are

linked but if they (the United States) withdraw their troops rapidly, we will take this factor into account."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1969]

A WHIFF OF MUTINY IN VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

In every American war there have been isolated incidents of mutiny among the troops. It is the tragic human pattern. There is a breaking point where discipline, duty and even loyalty to the men at your side are overwhelmed by fear and death and a paralyzing feeling of the senselessness of the whole bloody operation. And we are now getting a glimpse of it in Vietnam.

Horst Faas and Peter Arnett of The Associated Press, two of the most courageous reporters of the Vietnam war, have now reported such an incident by men of Company A of the 196th Light Infantry Brigade's battle-weary Third Battalion in the Songchang Valley, and the surprising thing is that there has not been more of this sort of thing under the present circumstances of the war.

CONSIDER COMPANY A

Consider the position of the men of Company A. Most of them were nineteen- and twenty-year-olds, drafted into the Army. For five days they had obeyed orders to move down a jungled glen against an enemy concealed in underground bunkers. Most of their squad and platoon leaders had been killed or wounded. In the repeated attacks on the bunkers, Company A was down to sixty men, half its assigned combat strength, some of them in the last days of their year's tour of duty in Vietnam.

This is not, of course, a typical situation. Yet it must give President Nixon something to think about as he plans his Vietnam policy.

THE PRESIDENT'S WORRIES

He has been worried about the revolt of the voters against the war, and even about a revolt of the generals if he humiliates them by pulling out too fast, but now he also has to consider the possibility of a revolt of the men if he risks their lives in a war he has decided to bring to a close.

This is a devilish problem for everybody concerned, but particularly for men who find themselves in the position of Company A. The President is no longer saying that military victory in Vietnam is "vital" to the national interest. He is not claiming that a compromise or even a defeat in Vietnam would result in the "loss" of Southeast Asia. In fact, he is not only withdrawing troops from Saigon but opening talks for the withdrawal of American troops from Thailand.

Accordingly, battles for bunkers in the Songchang Valley are tactical moves in the President's strategy of retreat. He is asking Company A to fight for time to negotiate a settlement with Hanoi that will save his face but may very well lose their lives. He is also carrying on the battle in the belief, or pretense, that the South Vietnamese will really be able to defend their country and our democratic objectives when we withdraw, and even his own generals don't believe the South Vietnamese will do it. It is a typical political strategy and the really surprising thing is that there have been so few men, like the tattered remnants of Company A, who have refused to die for it.

At some point, the President is going to have to recognize that there is a fundamental difference between his policy of withdrawing gracefully from the war, and ending the war. The difference between what is graceful and what is decisive in ending the war is a great many lives of young men like the men in Company A, and while this may not produce a revolt among the young Americans in the Army in Vietnam, it will almost certainly produce a revolt among their contemporaries in the universities at home.

The President is now said to be delaying the withdrawal of another 25,000 or 50,000 men from Vietnam because the enemy is pressing the battle, and not negotiating seriously in Paris. The suggestion is that unless Hanoi cuts the fighting and starts making concessions at the peace table, he will keep all the Americans there and may even increase the level of the fighting.

But nobody should be fooled by this. He is delaying his announcement about withdrawing more troops from Vietnam, according to our information, not to influence the enemy, but to influence the American university students just before the start of the new school year. And the irony of this is that it won't work—or at least won't work for long.

PROPAGANDA AT HOME

For the more the President says he's for peace, the more troops he withdraws from Vietnam and Thailand, the more he concedes that Southeast Asia is not really vital to the security of the United States, the harder it is to ask for the lives of the men of Company A.

They may not be typical, but they are a symbol of his coming dilemma. He wants out on the installment plan, but the weekly installments are the lives of one or two hundred American soldiers, and he cannot get away from the insistent question: Why? To what purpose? The breaking point comes in politics as it came to Company A and it is not far off. What will now be gained by this incessant killing? And how will the President or anybody else explain or excuse it?

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun., Aug. 29, 1969]

HONEYMOON OVER, BUSINESSMEN SAY: NILES GROUP VISITS WHITE HOUSE, PRESSES VIET PEACE

(By John S. Carroll)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 28.—The Business Executives for Vietnam Peace stopped by the White House today to notify the Nixon administration that the honeymoon is over. Henry E. Niles, the Baltimore insurance executive who is head of the group, said he and two others spent an hour talking with John Holdridge, a senior staff member of the National Security Council.

"NOW IT'S NIXON'S"

"We came out feeling, 'Well, it used to be L.B.J.'s war, but now it's Nixon's' Mr. Niles explained, adding:

"We are unhappy that, seven months after the start of the new administration, there seems to be no real progress towards peace—plenty of words, but little action."

The anti-war group, which claims 2,500 business executives and owners as members in 49 states, left a memorandum at the White House addressed to Henry A. Kissinger, the President's assistant for national security affairs.

"The honeymoon period is ended," the letter said, "and the President must make good his promise to end the war or his ability to govern will be impaired."

Forecasting an end to the relative calm in the anti-war movement, the letter said students are planning protests in the fall, while there is growing unrest among soldiers.

"It is questionable whether the government can continue to have the loyalty to the people if it continues to go against what the majority wish and what was promised . . . namely, an end to the war."

In an interview after his White House visit Mr. Niles acknowledged that pulling out American troops "could very well mean supplanting the Thieu-Ky government by a coalition."

He was accompanied to the White House by J. Sinclair Armstrong, a banker who has served as assistant secretary of the Navy and as chairman of the Securities and Exchange

Commission, and Wallace T. Collett, a corporation vice president from Cincinnati.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1969]

HO'S DEATH: "SO IT GOES"

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

When during a war the leader of one side dies, it's customary for the other side to cheer. With the passing of Uncle Ho our cheering has been ragged and hesitating.

Here in the homeland of Uncle Ho's most powerful and dedicated enemies, even here his obituaries have been tintured with praise and admiration. You get the feeling that the people who hated him because he was a Communist would have traded Uncle Ho for Thieu, Ky, Diem and several boatloads of the more important corruptionists, dope smugglers, double agents, deserters and liberty lovers allied with us.

Uncle Ho alone appears to have come out of the war with his reputation. In death he seems the one outstanding man the war has produced. This curiously popular head of an enemy country has even had his communism explained away. "He turned to communism as a means—not an end—to achieve his life-long goal of freedom and unity for his homeland," said the lead editorial in *The New York Times*.

The pro Uncle Ho sentiment has been so strong that the other night on NBC Chet Huntley had to remind us not to be carried away. The old man had killed a lot of innocent people, he said, but the same has been said of the American Presidents involved in Vietnam.

Our reaction to these massacres is like Kurt Vonnegut's in his novel, *Slaughterhouse-Five*. "So it goes," he says, because if you meditate on all the death and dying you'll go crazy, the facts'll burn out the eyes of your mind. Uncle Ho killed a lot of people. So it goes. A boy driven mad by the war blows his brains out on the Capitol steps. So it goes.

It was said against Uncle Ho that he was a professional revolutionary. The United States has its professional revolutionaries too. Men like Allen Dulles and Richard Helms, the CIA bosses who differ from Uncle Ho in that he wanted to commit a revolution in his own country while they want to do it in other people's. Uncle Ho was involved in politics so he did what people in that line of work do; what made him different from our bunch were his reasons, or thus it seems, because really we don't know much about him.

We're not even sure what his real name was or if he ever got married. We have some black and white newsreel footage, some snapshots, a couple of old police dossiers; we know he was a good cook and a heavy cigarette smoker who made it to 79. Salems were his brand. . . Oh, you can get the Americans out of the war, but you can't get the war out of the Americans. But Ho was probably too busy to think up new words to old advertising jingles.

Maybe if we'd known Uncle Ho better we might not have regarded him with as much respect. The little glimpses made him so attractive. Imagine, a bandy-legged wog, renting a Sunday suit to go out to Versailles to present Wilson and Clemenceau with a petition asking that his distant, little colony be granted self-determination. . . and years later Uncle Ho still living like a poor man, wearing sandals cut from old automobile tires. There may have been a mean side to him but we never heard about that. We're left with these brief pictures to match up against our leading men.

Ellsworth Bunker, Ambassador to Vietnam and possessor of a good tailor, back in Washington for consultations as they say, his old eyelids sagging down to make drooping, mysterious triangles of his eyes, murmuring he didn't think he wanted to comment on the repercussions of Uncle Ho's death.

Presidents on airport runways in front of microphones, silvery Air Force One in the background so behind them you can read the United States of America, and you can hear the words, Presidential words, susceptible of many interpretations by American watchers and White House-ologists from the other side of the iron curtain, peace, commitments, honor, face, freedom, treaties, solemnly pledged, bombing, war.

Or the generals, Westmoreland, handsome nonwinner, all jaw and gold braid, Chapman ordering the black and white Marines to stop killing each other and get back to killing the Vietnamese (so it goes), and Hershey, doughty 75-year-old conqueror of ten thousand squeamish liberals, givin' it to the kids and telling them what an honor it is.

The kids went for Uncle Ho. "Ho! Ho! Ho Chi Minh!" they'd chant at the big rallies to end the war against him. Recently they haven't been chanting so much. General Hershey's been coming down on them heavy and they've had to spend their energy escaping. All over the country, a million bull sessions about that. Don't get busted for pot in Illinois because they've changed the law so it's only a misdemeanor now and a misdemeanor won't keep you out.

It's gotta be a felony. Steal a car, that's good if it's grand theft auto, but joy riding won't keep you out of anything. Be a teacher or a cop or a fag. Get a sympathetic draft board. Cut off a toe. There's lots of nine-toed guys who don't have any trouble hitting on chicks. You can wear shoes. What chick's going to count your toes? I know but I can't do it. Once I put my foot on the kitchen table and I had the cleaver in my hand, but, man, it was my toe, my toe, man. So get married. Have a dependent. Adopt a baby or a sick, old mother.

The kids never blamed Uncle Ho for causing General Hershey to draft so many of them. That was strange but people never were able to work up a good hate against him. Wall Street didn't blame him for the market's not cracking 1,000 on the Dow-Jones. Remember this was the year it was going to happen? The old people didn't blame him for the inflation. Strange. Strange too, thinking about a truce in a war to mourn the other side's leader. The Americans didn't do that for Hitler. The Germans didn't do that for Roosevelt.

Uncle Ho did that to this war, drained our side of righteousness, left us nothing but the fine print and the technicalities. He had a monopoly on the big phrases, the words you put on banners, so we fought for some sentences written by lawyers and printed in agate type and cheered ourselves on with the thought we have a fine professional army doing the job it was sent out there to do.

Now maybe we'll get a few of the slogans back and a little of the old enthusiasm. Ho had it, but they can't keep it in Hanoi because he's gone, dead, dead like so many others over there are dead. So it goes.

CONGRESSMAN HANSEN OF IDAHO INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO GIVE NATIONAL GUARDSMEN AND RESERVISTS EQUAL GI BILL EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

(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, today I am introducing H.R. 13650, H.R. 13651, and H.R. 13652, identical bills with a total of 55 sponsors. This legislation will correct an inequity in the so-called GI bill. Under the present law, members of the National Guard and Reserve units called into active Federal service during

the war in Vietnam do not qualify for the same educational benefits as do members of the regular Armed Forces with the same total active service.

During the past 2 years 98 Reserve and Guard units from 37 States, as well as many individual reservists, have been called to active duty. From my own State of Idaho, the 116th Engineer Battalion of the Idaho National Guard was activated on May 13, 1968. It was my privilege to be present in Idaho a few days ago to join in a welcome home observance on the occasion of the return of the guardsmen following a year's service in Vietnam.

The guardsmen and reservists responded to the call of duty and served in many cases at great personal sacrifice. In many instances they interrupted their education and left their jobs and families on short notice. Many have served under the most difficult combat conditions suffering wounds and the loss of life.

Members of these National Guard and Reserve units are now returning home following many months of active duty. Many plan to continue their education. Others that were not financially able to pursue their education will take advantage of educational benefits available under the GI bill.

It appears, however, that members of the National Guard and Reserve units do not qualify under the GI bill for the same educational benefits as members of the Regular Armed Forces. For Regulars, all time including the time spent in basic training is counted for purposes of determining the length of time for which they qualify for educational benefits. For reservists and guardsmen, however, the period of active duty for training prior to the activation of a unit does not count.

Fairness requires that all who serve our country in the Armed Forces be treated equally under the applicable laws. The purpose of the legislation we have introduced today is to correct the inequity of the present law and to achieve equal treatment for all.

The legislation provides that reservists and guardsmen who are called to active duty and who serve at least 6 months during the period of the war in Vietnam may include their prior active duty for training up to a maximum of 6 months in determining eligibility for educational benefits under the GI bill.

In addition to the 55 sponsors of these three bills, other Members have indicated their intention to introduce separate bills. Others have indicated their intention to join as cosponsors of identical bills to be introduced in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the full text of H.R. 13650, together with the names of the sponsors of this and identical bills and a list of all National Guard and Reserve units that have been activated during the war in Vietnam.

H.R. 13650

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) (3) of section 1652 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and section 1661(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of this subsection and subsection (a) of section 1661 (except as provided in the last sentence thereof)".

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 1661 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this chapter and subject to the limitation in subsection (c), if a veteran serves for a period of active duty pursuant to a call or order thereto issued to him after August 4, 1964, as a Reserve or a member of the National Guard or Air National Guard of any State, and is an eligible veteran as a result of such duty, any period of not more than 6 consecutive months of full-time duty performed by him after January 31, 1955, for the purpose of obtaining initial military training pursuant to His Reserve, National Guard, or Air National Guard obligation shall be deemed to be active duty."

A LIST OF SPONSORS OF H.R. 13650, H.R. 13651, AND H.R. 13652

Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Zwach, Mr. Denney, Mr. McClure, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Biester, Mr. Boland, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Dellenback, Mr. Devine.

Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Esch, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Hosmer, Mr. Ichord, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Keith, Mr. King, Mr. Kluczynski, Mr. Kyl, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McKneally.

Mr. Mikva, Mr. Minish, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Mize, Mr. Morse, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Rees, Mrs. Reid of Illinois, Mr. Robison, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Vank, Mr. Waggoner.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE UNITS ACTIVATED DURING THE VIETNAM WAR
(Unit and home station)

Alabama: 650th Medical Detachment, Birmingham.

Arizona: 277th Military Intelligence Detachment, Phoenix.

Arkansas: 978th Army Postal Unit, Fort Smith; 336th Ordnance Battalion, Little Rock; 189th Tactical Recon Group, Little Rock.

California: 1st Squadron, 18th Armored Cavalry, Burbank; 40th Aviation Company, Long Beach; 82d Aerial Port Squadron, Travis Air Force Base, 776th Attack Squadron, Los Alamitos; 873d Attack Squadron, Alameda.

Colorado: 140th Tactical Fighter Wing, Burkley ANG Base.

Florida: 35th Surgical Hospital, North Miami; 231st Transportation Company, St. Petersburg.

Georgia: 319th Transportation Company, Augusta; 413th Finance Disbursing Section, Atlanta; 445th Military Airlift Wing, Dobbins AFB.

Hawaii: 29th Infantry Brigade, Honolulu; 2d Battalion, 299th Infantry, Hilo; 100th Battalion, 442d Infantry, Fort DeRusse.

Idaho: 116th Engineer Battalion, Idaho Falls.

Illinois: 126th Supply and Service Company, Quincy; 482d Medical Detachment, Aurora; 724th Transportation Company, Forrest Park; 52d Medical Services Squadron, Scott AFB.

Indiana: Company D, 151st Infantry, Greenfield; 890th Transportation Company, Fort Wayne; 930th Tactical Airlift Group, Bakalar AFB.

Iowa: 2d Battalion, 133d Infantry, Sioux

City; 185th Tactical Fighter Group, Sioux City.

Kansas: 69th Infantry Brigade, Topeka; 169th Aviation Company, Kansas City; Troop E, 114th Cavalry, McPherson; 169th Engineer Company, Emporia; 169th Support Battalion, Kansas City; 2d Battalion, 130th Artillery, Hiawatha; 1st Battalion, 137th Infantry, Wichita; 2d Battalion, 137th Infantry, Kansas City; 995th Maintenance Company, Hays; 1011th Supply and Service Company, Independence; 842d Quartermaster Company, Kansas City; 184th Tactical Fighter Group, McConnell AFB.

Kentucky: 2d Battalion, 138th Artillery, Louisville; 950th Army Postal Unit, Lexington; 123d Tactical Recon Wing, Staudiford.

Maryland: 472d Medical Detachment, Rockville; 113th Tactical Fighter Wing, Andrews AFB; 175th Tactical Fighter Group, Martin Airport; 661st Fighter Squadron, Andrews AFB.

Massachusetts: 1st Battalion, 211th Artillery, New Bedford; 513th Maintenance Battalion, Boston; 241st Military Intelligence Detachment, Boston; 12th Reserve Mobile Construction Battalion, Boston.

Michigan: 424th Personnel Service Company, Livonia; 305th Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron, Selfridge AFB.

Minnesota: 452d General Supply Company, Worthington.

Mississippi: 173d Quartermaster Company, Greenwood.

Missouri: 208th Engineer Company, Festus.

Nebraska: 172d Transportation Company, Omaha; 295th Ordnance Company, Hastings.

Nevada: 152d Tactical Recon Group, Reno Municipal Airport.

New Hampshire: 3d Battalion, 197th Artillery, Portsmouth.

New Jersey: 141st Transportation Company, Orange; 177th Tactical Fighter Group, Atlantic City Airport.

New Mexico: 150th Tactical Fighter Group, Kirtland AFB.

New York: 1018th Supply and Service Company, Schenectady; 448th Army Postal Unit, Garden City; 237th Maintenance Company, Fort Hamilton; 316th Medical Detachment, New York City; 74th Field Hospital, New York City; 203d Transportation Company, Garden City; 174th Tactical Fighter Group, Hancock Field; 107th Tactical Fighter Group, Niagara Falls Municipal Airport; 904th Military Airlift Group, Stewart AFB; 831st Attack Squadron.

North Carolina: 312th Evacuation Hospital, Winston Salem.

Ohio: 1002d Supply and Service Company, Cleveland; 311th Field Hospital, Sharonville; 121st Tactical Fighter Group, Lockbourne AFB.

Pennsylvania: 630th Transportation Company, Washington; 357th Transportation Company, Greencastle; 305th Medical Detachment, Philadelphia; 931st Fighter Squadron, Willow Grove.

Rhode Island: 107th Signal Company, East Greenwich; 115th Military Police Company, Pawtucket.

Tennessee: 378th Medical Detachment, Memphis.

Texas: 113th Light Maintenance Company, Gatesville; 238th Maintenance Company, San Antonio; 921st Military Airlift Group, Kelly AFB; 34th Aeromedical Evacuation Squadron, Kelly AFB; 703d Fighter Squadron, Dallas; 22d Reserve Mobile Construction Battalion.

Utah: 259th Quartermaster Battalion, Pleasant Grove.

Vermont: 131st Engineer Company, Burlington.

Virginia: 304th Medical Detachment, Richmond; 313th Medical Detachment, Richmond; 889th Medical Detachment, Richmond.

Washington: 737th Transportation Company, Yakima; 941st Military Airlift Group, McChord AFB.

Wisconsin: 377th Maintenance Company, Manitowoc; 826th Ordnance Company, Madison.

THE RECREATION EXPLOSION AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it shall be my purpose in this dissertation to bring to the attention of all Americans the excellent efforts of the National Park Service in meeting the multiplying desires of the American public for outdoor recreation during the 14 years it has been my honor to be a Member of the Congress.

It is with great pleasure to note that I am a Member of this august body that almost 100 years ago gave life to the national park concept with the authorization of Yellowstone National Park. Every one of my colleagues should share in this pride.

The national park concept is an American contribution to the world culture that is widely accepted and acclaimed around the globe. More than 90 other nations have adopted the idea. In this they received the sincerest accolade of appreciation.

It also is a pleasure to note, especially since American history is my hobby, that the area of responsibility of the National Park Service includes historical preservation and historical interpretation.

One of the choice examples of that historical preservation is located within the long morning shadow of the Capitol dome, the magnificent authentically restored Ford's Theater, the living memorial to President Lincoln. It exemplifies the dedication of the National Park Service to its assignment to restore, preserve, and interpret historical areas which are closely associated with our national heritage.

The Park Service counted 434,000 visitors to the Ford's Theatre last year—all of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia in 1920 numbered only 3,000 more. And servicewise, the Park Service counted almost 151 million visits to our national shrines, parks, and recreation areas last year. In 1950 that would have meant that a park visit could have been made by every man, woman, and child counted in the U.S. census.

The reasons for this recreation explosion are plain. Improved technology has brought more and more leisure time and quicker and more convenient travel. Our population grows and becomes more and more urban. The combination of more leisure, better travel, and more city dwellers means travel America. And the visitor load in the national park-managed areas exceeds all forecasts.

It was the National Park Service forecast of increased visitor loads which helped to bring about the Park Service's Mission 66. The objective of that mission was to refurbish the park system after it had languished during World War II.

I remember that it was my freshman year in the House when the Mission 66 program was presented. President Eisen-

hower gave the program a green light and Congress speeded it along.

Now President Nixon, who then was the President of the Senate, has increased the budget estimate for the National Park Service for the 1970 fiscal year by \$11,700,000, the largest annual increase in operating funds in the history of the Park Service, so that it can meet the demands of the burgeoning visitor load.

And the Director of the National Park Service, George B. Hartzog, Jr., has emphasized to his fellow workers:

Such dramatic and constructive support of our (National Park Service) program by the Administration challenges us to respond with ingenuity and redoubled efforts in providing quality work experiences for our increasing visitation and improved management of the resources of the System.

We hear much about the population explosion—and a serious problem it is. The recreation explosion, however, is twice the scale of the population boom. The population in the year 2000 is forecast to be double the 179 million counted in the 1960 census. But the recreation explosion is forecast to increase not twofold but fourfold.

Right now the better known, more popular recreation areas on occasion are jammed to overflow. The avalanche of visitors now bearing down on parks, seashores, recreation areas, and historic sites merits our concern even though the National Park Service has met similar crises in the past and is in control of the situation today.

The biggest of those crises of the past resulted in Mission 66. Personnel, equipment, roads, and other manmade structures had deteriorated during World War II. And then postwar recreation seekers surged into a park system held together principally by the dedication and determination of a sadly understaffed and underfunded organization. The harder the Park Service worked the further behind it fell.

Both visitor accommodations and roads were poor to nonexistent. Uncomfortable people queued up to use lavatories. Some historic and scenic sites were damaged by vandalism and the constant pounding of human feet.

The plan to counter the bad conditions and to meet future needs was the program named Mission 66 because it was to end in the 50th anniversary year of the national park system—1966.

As I noted, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to support this comprehensive program, designed to provide national park areas capable of accommodating a predicted 89 million visitor load by 1966.

The Mission 66 expenditure of \$725,478,740 has proved to be one of the soundest and most rewarding investments ever approved by Congress. This is impressively evident by the 150 million visitors which the national park system attracted in 1968. Meanwhile the value of the national park system properties increases every year. Dr. Ernst Swanson, the widely known economist from North Carolina State University, recently estimated the capitalized value of the national park system at \$142.7 billion.

Mission 66 gave new life, vigor, and structure to the national park system.

The impressive construction list which I shall read shortly, however, is not the only, or even the principal criterion for evaluating the achievements of Mission 66. Under Director Conrad Wirth and his successor in 1964, George B. Hartzog, Jr., Mission 66 concentrated on preserving the essential values of the national park system. The Park Service selected building sites that would not demean or diminish the area's scenic natural or historic values. The master plan for each park sought to preserve key areas "unimpaired," in accordance with the National Park Service Act of 1916.

Mission 66 took into consideration the special recreation and intellectual interests of both youth and senior citizens so far as could be done without lessening park values. Facilities for the handicapped and older citizens required attention as to accessibility and convenience. Back-country hiking trails and campsites appeal to many of the younger visitors.

Most of the roads installed by Mission 66 were those essential to newly established areas or campgrounds and picnic grounds. Some 80 or 90 percent of the road funds went for reconstruction and realignment of existing routes, none of them designed to encourage speed, but with increased safety and pleasure objectives. Mission 66 also supplemented the road network with hiking and horseback riding trails.

It was Mission 66 also that modernized the radio communication network of the National Capital Park Police here in Washington, providing tie-ins with the Washington Metropolitan Police and law enforcement agencies in Maryland and Virginia. In the parks, communication systems for fire detection, park administration and protection of visitors and park resources were extended and improved.

By the 50th anniversary year of the National Park Service in 1966, the mission called 66 had brought improvement to the park system—indelibly in many areas. It brought 2,767 miles of new roads, 1,570 miles of reconstructed roads; 936 miles of trails and 359 miles of reconstructed trails. It brought also: 1,502 new parking areas capable of accommodating 47,071 additional cars; 330 reconstructed parking areas adding space for 5,682 more vehicles; 45 miles of new road, and 19 miles of reconstructed road to serve concession facilities; 575 campgrounds, with 17,782 campsites; 472 picnic areas; 29,432 new campfire circle and amphitheater seats, plus 2,300 reconstructed seats.

It brought 426 water projects and 301 additions, 432 sewer projects, and 223 additions; and for concession facilities—10 water projects; 89 sewer projects, 57 power projects; 214 power projects and 126 additions; 218 utility buildings; 221 administrative and service buildings, plus 36 reconstructed; 100 visitor centers, a new type of open design structure providing exhibits, information and interpretive facilities; and often rest areas, souvenir sales, food services, audiovisual equipment and auditoriums; 458 historic buildings reconstructed or rehabilitated at a cost of \$15 million; 1,239 housing units for employees; 584 comfort sta-

tions; 17 reconstructed; 1,116 roadside exhibits installed or rehabilitated; 50 boating marinas; 93 boat docks; nine fire lookout towers; 39 entrance stations; 37 trailer disposal systems; and nearly \$1 million for two park ranger training centers.

During Mission 66, park concessionaires invested more than \$33 million in new and improved cabins, lodges, motels, stores, service stations, marinas, and other installations. The Park Service provided more than \$14 million worth of roads, powerlines, water mains, sewers, and other utilities to complement the concession improvements.

Mission 66 increased the number of full-time permanent employees from 3,364 to 5,498, and seasonal employees from 4,700 to 7,800. This increased strength allowed the Park Service to devote attention to planned management of its resources and the correction of ecological imbalances.

The net effect of Mission 66 was expansion and improved performance in park system services and activities across the board. The National Park Service produced exhibits for all of the 100 new visitor centers, 40 rehabilitated museums, 26 shelters, and 13 wayside projects, until it was operating 215 museums with nearly 3 million specimens. Mission 66 provided at least 115 parks with audiovisual installations, and modern projection and sound equipment for 45 park campfire circles and amphitheaters.

A Division of International Affairs, established during Mission 66, assisted more than 90 nations which contain national parks or equivalent reserves. The National Park Service participated in trainee exchange programs with foreign countries and cooperated with the University of Michigan in conducting short courses on national park administrations. Fifty park leaders from 32 countries took part in this program in 1965-66.

Mission 66 added 142 miles to the Blue Ridge Parkway and 262 miles to the Natchez Trace Parkway. This year the Travel Writers of America voted the Blue Ridge Parkway—with Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park—the No. 1 scenic automobile trip in the United States. The Blue Ridge Parkway attracted 11 million visitors in 1968, easily the highest attendance of any area in the national park system. The Natchez Trace Parkway was close behind with 8.9 million.

Now the National Park Service is trying to cope with one of the great socioeconomic phenomena of the century—this astounding large movement of our people to outdoor recreation areas.

As the units of the National Park Service have grown to the number of 270, the Service has learned that each unit must be judged and operated for its own unique features and the master plan for each unit must be constantly kept up to date to meet ever-increasing pressures upon it. Such problems can be exemplified in the supply and drainage waters of the Everglades; the provision of accommodations in the Yosemite Valley and the Chisos Basin of Big Bend; and the pressures brought on by those smooth

tongues of penetration—improved roads. Combined with the roads is the ever-present knowledge that provision of access to an area can result in destruction of the attraction that brought need of the access.

Recently, the National Park Service articulated its people-serving mission with a pledge of public service that has been distributed in wallet-card form to each employee. The pledge follows:

To protect man's right to exult in the presence of superlative wilderness and scenic grandeur;

To communicate to all an understanding of the people and events that shaped these United States;

To provide in the recreational areas, opportunities for varied outdoor recreation of a quality in keeping with exceptional natural and historical values;

To make the beauty and the history of our Nation's urban parklands a richer and more meaningful part of the life of all Americans;

To manage the National Park System so that all Americans, now and in the future, may be assured of the privilege—

Of experiencing the serenity of quiet forests and the renewing strength of nature unimpaired,

Of letting their spirits return—through the touch of hammered iron, roughhewn wall, and treasured relic—to the presence of the men and women who built America,

Of knowing the exhilaration of a rushing river, the feel of sun-warmed beaches and pounding surf, and the high adventure of the great outdoors;

To seek out and foster the protection of the finest of what now remains unprotected of the Nation's natural and cultural inheritance and its outdoor recreational opportunities;

To join with all people of this and other nations in conserving and renewing the total environment to keep this world a delight to live in.

In line with this pledge, the National Park Service, although already the operator of more significant parklands in urban areas than any other governmental agency on any level, established an Office of Urban Affairs in 1967.

Last year, "Summer in the Parks," conducted by the National Park Service, was a major factor in providing residents and visitors to Washington, D.C. with a more rewarding and enjoyable summer than the city had experienced for many years.

The Park Service also is conducting, nationwide, an environmental awareness program designed to acquaint young people with knowledge of their environment and the dangers threatening it through pollution, pesticides and despoilation of the countryside and natural resources. The Park Service has designated 100 environmental study areas on park system lands and conducts a National Environmental Education Development—NEED—program in conjunction with local schools. In 44 of the environmental study areas, children are already being enlightened on the environmental crisis. The Park Service believes this program could be one of the most important it has ever adopted, since it involves the very survival of the human species.

From 1960 to 1968 the Nation's population increased 9.4 percent. But the number of visits to the national park

system increased 90 percent. The most conservative estimates predict a continuation of this trend. In the past 10 years the visitation figure increased 82 million, as compared to an increase of 125 million expected in the next 10 years. An attendance of 162 million is expected this year. Some time in 1973 this figure will pass the 200 million mark, and in 1980 the 300 million mark. The most conservative estimates foresee Americans making several hundred millions visits to the national park system annually, well before the year 2000. The National Park Service must plan for this onrush if it is to keep faith with future generations.

Other Members of this House have cited the economic study of national park system travel by Dr. Swanson, to whom I have referred. His study is a matter of record but I wish to mention it briefly. He found that travel to the park system in 1967 resulted in an expenditure of \$6.35 billion, resulting in \$4.76 billion in personal income to our people, \$5.71 million added to the gross national product and \$952 million in Federal taxes. Asked if we can "afford mass attendance threatening the very existence of our parks," Dr. Swanson said:

The National Park System is such a powerful generator of a sizeable amount of the national income, that there is no convincing reason why Congress should not provide whatever funds are necessary to guard against such a threat and to maintain, operate and perpetuate these valuable lands and waters.

Dr. Swanson is well aware, of course, that the real value of the National Park System's irreplaceable resources cannot be expressed in monetary terms. He said:

Dollar signs cannot be attached to them, but the economic value alone justifies our continued care of these assets.

I have observed the National Park Service closely during the administrations of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and now President Nixon—ever since the Congress approved Mission 66 funds during my first year in this House.

The vision and enterprise of this splendid organization in meeting its increasingly heavy load of responsibilities are commendable indeed. It is completely devoted to the national interest and public service on a nonpartisan basis.

This House has given the National Park Service generous support in the past. But to meet the tremendous recreation demands of the present and future, this agency will need help on an increased scale. I urge the House to consider these facts and to provide the National Park Service with the funds and assistance it deserves if it is to cope with the recreation explosion.

TRIBUTE TO AND SPEECH BY GEORGE HARTZOG

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we

are fortunate to have had the long record of effective, intelligent, and dedicated leadership in the National Park Service. George Hartzog, the present Director, is continuing and adding to that tradition. Mr. Hartzog has a distinguished record of service in the National Park Service. Since joining the Park Service in 1946 he has served in several important positions, becoming the Director on January 6, 1964.

He is the recipient of several awards: the Meritorious Award certificate from William A. Jump Memorial Foundation, Washington, D.C., June 1956, "for exemplary achievement in public administration"; Special Service Award of Greater St. Louis Federal Business Association, July 1962; Distinguished Service Award of the Department of the Interior, December 1962; Alumni Recognition Award, the American University, Washington, D.C., May 1966; and Cornelius Amory Pugsley Gold Medal Award for 1967, January 1968.

Recently, Mr. Hartzog addressed an alumni gathering of the graduates of the Federal Executive Institute. In this splendid address he eloquently expressed his concept of the role and responsibility of the National Park Service and its employees. His speech should be well read.

One statement in particular caught my attention. He said, "Uniformity is not what I seek in management, rather I seek creativity and personal growth." This is a superb ideal.

Mr. Hartzog's address follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. HARTZOG

It is a great privilege and pleasure to participate in this reunion of the graduates of the first and second sessions of the Federal Executive Institute. For the high honor you have bestowed on me to present this first Distinguished Alumni address, I am deeply grateful.

I remember my attendance here as one of the highlights of my career. I shared many hours of good fellowship; made new friends among my colleagues in the Federal service; and gained new insights into our mutual problems and aspirations.

It is my firm belief that this Institute has the highest potential existing today for significant improvement in the quality of management within the Federal career service. I congratulate the Civil Service Commission, Dr. Sherwood, the faculty and the staff of the Institute for creative leadership in Executive Education. This pioneering effort has been difficult. You have accepted the challenge with vigor and imagination. You have achieved results and I predict even greater success in the years ahead.

Dr. Sherwood, in extending the invitation on behalf of the Alumni, suggested that I discuss with you the management of the National Park Service, with particular emphasis on policy leadership, the relationship of management to the political processes, and the special management needs of the National Park Service. Since you are all "old pros" of management in the Federal Government, I shall not presume on your time and your patience to treat literally all of the ramifications of the broad subject he has suggested.

By numerous legislative enactments, the Congress has granted the National Park Service a broad charter:

a. To manage and develop the National Park System for public use and benefit by such means and in such manner as to leave

its resources and values unimpaired for future generations.

b. To cooperate with Federal, State, and local Governments and the private sector in programs to preserve the natural and cultural inheritance of our Nation.

To establish a frame of reference for this discussion of the management of the National Park Service, I wish to mention, briefly, three basic factors, as follows:

First, the National Park Service is not an independent agency of the Executive Department. The National Park Service was established as—and remains—a Bureau of the Department of the Interior. The positions of Director and Deputy Director are in excepted Schedule C. My Deputy Director and I serve, therefore, during the pleasure of the Secretary, in supportive policy making roles with him in the management of the National Park Service. Within the Department of the Interior, the Director of the National Park Service reports to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources.

There have been seven Directors of the Service since it was established in 1916. Five of the seven Directors have been appointed to this position from the ranks of the National Park Service after many years of service in the Federal career system. Moreover, no Director has ever been changed with a change in Administration. This record is one in which all employees of the National Park Service take justifiable pride for it bespeaks of the high professional integrity of our work. It bespeaks, likewise, I suggest, of the responsiveness of each Director to the principal policy making officers in the Department and to the goals of the Administration.

Second, the areas of the National Park System are public lands of the United States. Under our constitution, the Congress is charged with the responsibility of establishing the public land policies of the United States. These policies, for the most part, are broad guidelines leaving large areas of discretionary authority in the President and in the Secretary. For example, the Antiquities Act of 1906 authorizes the President of the United States by Proclamation to set aside, from lands owned or controlled by the United States, national monuments having scientific significance or containing artifacts of antiquity.

Moreover, the Historic Sites Act of 1935 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine the national significance of historic sites and in his discretion to designate them as National Historic Sites either in private ownership or as a part of the National Park System, with fee simple title vested in the United States. In connection with the exercise of this latter authority, President Franklin D. Roosevelt directed that the authority should be exercised with respect to placing areas in the National Park System only after clearance by the Bureau of the Budget.

In the decade of the 1960's, through negotiations with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, an agreement was reached by President Kennedy and Secretary Udall—and adhered to by succeeding Administrations—that the authorities of the 1906 and the 1935 Acts would be exercised only after consultation with the legislative committees of the Congress.

Third, the resources of the National Park System represent values far beyond their significance as public lands of the United States. They are, in fact, the strands of the natural and cultural inheritance of a great Nation and a proud people. This Nation perhaps more than any other, was richly endowed with a superlative natural environment. Its creative, ingenious, hard-working people have laid on this land the foundations of our American way of life.

Thus, the natural, historical, and recreational resources of your National Park System have a tremendous tug at the heart-strings of America. The manifestation of this reality is that thousands of citizens through numerous organizations—with funds to employ full-time professional staff—intimately involve themselves not only in day-to-day management decisions but also in policy decisions of both the Administration and the Congress.

The National Park Service—like all of your organizations—is a public agency. Policy making—and even more significantly the implementation of policy—in public agencies is, in actuality, a function of all its members. Policy, to be creative in its making and constructive in its implementation, must be validated by the members of the organization. Thus, while the employees of the National Park Service are, on the one hand, members of the management body they are also, on the other hand, a very special and important public.

In light of these "facts of life" I have, quite naturally, formed certain fundamental beliefs that undergird my approach to management of the National Park Service. In stating these beliefs and reporting our management program as it has been shaped by these beliefs, I do not presume to suggest that the way we have approached our responsibilities is either the only way or, indeed, even the best way to manage—although, certainly, the latter is the ideal and the objective we seek.

My first belief is this:

A public agency, such as the National Park Service, cannot operate successfully in a vacuum;

Its programs are executed in a political environment—not a partisan environment; that is to say, its programs are scrutinized, evaluated, validated or rejected in the arena of public discussion among the Congress, the administration and the taxpayers and within the context of national priorities.

It is, therefore, the function of management to open lines of communication—and keep them open constantly—with our Departmental policy making leadership, the Congress, and the public to facilitate this evaluation process.

An essential keystone for building channels of communication, in my judgment, is a concise—easily understood—statement of management philosophy. As a public agency responsive to the policy making authority of the Congress and the Administration, our statement of management philosophy must necessarily embody the mandates of these policies. Thus, our statement of management philosophy—summarized in the National Park Service Pledge of Public Service—is a synthesis of the numerous public land policies enunciated in a series of legislative enactments concerning the National Park System.

Stripped of all technicalities generally associated with legislative enactments, it distills the essence of the philosophies expressed in these statutes. To make it even more useful for communication—especially with our employees—we have duplicated the statement of management philosophy on wallet-sized cards for each employee—whether permanent or seasonal—of the National Park Service.

Of equal importance to a statement of management philosophy in communication, is the development of long-range objectives. Our long-range objectives—confirmed by the Honorable Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior on June 18, 1969, are as follows:

1. To provide for the highest quality of use and enjoyment of the National Park System by increased millions of visitors in years to come.
2. To conserve and manage for their highest purpose the natural, historical and rec-

reational resources of the National Park System.

3. To develop the National Park System through inclusion of additional areas of scenic, scientific, historical, and recreational value to the Nation.

4. To participate actively with organizations of this and other nations in conserving, improving, and renewing the total environment.

5. To communicate the cultural, inspirational, and recreational significance of the American heritage as represented in the National Park System.

6. To increase the effectiveness of the National Park Service as a "people-serving" organization dedicated to park conservation, historical preservation, and outdoor recreation.

In his management directive of June 18, Secretary Hickel also established policy guidelines for the management of the National Park System. Briefly summarized, they are as follows: The National Park Service shall:

1. Operate campgrounds rather than lease them to concessionaires;

2. Initiate study of opportunities which may exist, as well as financing proposals, for an expanded program of Federal acquisition and federally-assisted acquisition of park and recreation lands in large urban centers in order to bring parks to people;

3. Innovate programs, especially in the Nation's urban parklands, to make parks more meaningful to people;

4. Make parks and park facilities more available for neighboring school districts;

5. Initiate mass transportation services, such as shuttle buses, tramways, etc., to lessen the impact of private automobile congestion now threatening the quality of several of our most popular National Parks;

6. Explore possibilities for increasing the participation of private citizens, the business community, and organizations in nature and historic preservation;

7. Speed up wilderness studies to get this program on schedule;

8. Identify gaps in the National Park System that should be filled by establishing new parks to preserve the heritage of our history and our natural environment;

9. Work with colleges and universities to develop joint training opportunities for young people seeking careers in park and recreation programs;

10. Plan appropriate activities to commemorate the Centennial of National Parks in 1972;

11. Work in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to plan programs for developing the recreational and cultural resources of the Indian people, thus enhancing the economy of our Indian Reservations.

Long range objectives and policy guidelines serve several useful purposes in the communications process:

First, they establish a clear understanding between the Secretary—the policy making official appointed by the President to oversee the management of the National Park System—and the Director of the National Park Service appointed by the Secretary to manage the National Park System.

Second, through objectives and policy guidelines we communicate to the Congress—which has constitutional responsibility for public land policy—the direction we are heading in implementing their policies and the programs to be emphasized in the execution of our missions.

Third, they are useful in communicating with the several publics interested in the management and the policies of the National Park Service.

And, lastly, they set the broad parameters for our work program and serve as guidelines for day-to-day management.

Of course, our agency, like yours, appears annually before the Subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to support the President's budget for its programs. During these hearings we have an opportunity to communicate to the members of our Subcommittees significant accomplishments of the Service and also trends which we see developing that may affect future management and funding needs of the agency. A copy of my statement to the House and Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Interior Department and Related Agencies is available as reference material.

Additionally, with the cooperation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have been provided the opportunity each year that I have served as Director of the National Park Service to report to the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation on my stewardship. Occasionally, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has also scheduled such oversight briefings.

These have been extremely useful sessions since they afford the members of the legislative committees a formal opportunity to address themselves to programs initiated in implementation of their broad policy mandates. Occasionally, the committee members have challenged the merit of our management decisions. For instance, in 1968, as a result of personnel ceilings and budgetary restrictions, we adopted an administrative policy to lease campgrounds to concessioners for operation. Historically, campgrounds had been operated by National Park Service personnel. A great many complaints were received from the public concerning this decision to switch to concessioner-operated campgrounds. In the meantime, Secretary Hickel advised the House Committee that he had this particular administrative policy under review. At the briefing session, the House Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation expressed itself very strongly in opposition to the administrative policy.

After reviewing the basis for our initial decision, the public complaints, and evaluating the views of the Subcommittee, the Secretary reversed this administrative policy and directed that in the future the National Park Service operate its campgrounds and not lease them to concessioners.

In another instance, the House Subcommittee took an unusual and tremendously supportive action. It passed a resolution requesting the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation and of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to direct a letter to the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department and Related Agencies urging approval of the entire budget for the National Park Service as recommended by the President.

These briefing reports, of course, are only a part of the communication process with the Congress.

Throughout the course of a year there are dozens of individual meetings with members of the Congress to discuss matters of concern to them—to us—and to their constituents. There are, moreover, thousands of letters from the Congress referring for attention subjects of concern to their constituents with respect to the management of the National Park System. These Congressional referrals are an extremely important part of the communication process with the Congress.

As a result, one of the first actions I took upon becoming Director of the National Park Service was to consolidate all congressional mail in one office. This has enabled us to acknowledge every congressional inquiry within 48 hours. We cannot provide the answer in the great majority of instances within this

time frame, but, importantly, we have said to the member of the Congress, and he, in turn, can say to his constituent, "the matter is receiving attention." A follow-up system has been established for these communications to insure that the final answer is supplied as quickly as possible.

Of course, there are many other forms of communication with the Congress associated with legislative hearings, special inquiries, etc.

With respect to communications with our several publics, I shall touch briefly on only two matters. First, the citizen conservation organizations. To maintain channels of communication with them, I have tried to meet their professional staff representatives each three to four months during the period of my Directorship. This is an unstructured meeting, usually, two to three hours, at which they can present any subject of interest to them and at which I report to them on significant management and policy matters in which I believe they may have a particular interest.

Second, the National Park Service employees are our unique and all-important public. To meet a part of the communication need with them, we initiated a Newsletter—published biweekly—which contains important matters of Service-wide interest to all employees. The Newsletter also includes a special column for the ladies of the National Park Service.

The cardinal principle in communications in a public agency, I believe, is complete candor. If you don't know the answer to a question—say so. It is much better for people to conclude you are ignorant than for them to find out later that you are a liar! Your personal integrity in fulfilling your commitments is an absolute irreducible minimum in maintaining communications with your policy making officers of the Department, the Congress, and the public concerned with your management.

My second belief about management of a public agency is this:

People do not work for money alone:

Efficiency is a byproduct of personal interest and achievement; and

People do wish to achieve and to grow.

It is, therefore, a function of management to create an environment in which people may grow and achieve to the limit of their potential.

One of the long-range objectives established by the Secretary to guide our management is "to increase the effectiveness of the National Park Service as a 'people-serving' organization dedicated to park conservation, historical preservation, and outdoor recreation." This objective recognizes that our management in its essence is of human beings and not of theories and charts. We shall achieve this objective only as the employees of the National Park Service grow in their capabilities and in their commitment to the agency and its programs.

To assist us in meeting this challenge, we have established objectives for personnel management, as follows:

1. Encourage highly motivated people of talent and high potential to seek employment with the National Park Service.

2. Provide equal opportunities to all employees for individual growth.

3. Encourage an attitude of constructive inquiry, a receptivity to change, and a determination to find better ways of doing our job.

4. Encourage, recognize, and reward individual initiative.

5. Require consistent and demonstrated productivity and achievement as the essential requirement for advancement.

6. Provide opportunities for transfers, details, and other assignments of employees that contribute to the good of the Service and the career development of the employee.

Foster the development of a climate that recognizes and accepts the benefits of such interchanges.

7. Make fullest utilization of modern management methods and technology.

The National Park Service had 56 volumes of administrative manuals and handbooks. Some of these were absolutely essential. They contained the accounting, procurement, and personnel requirements and procedures established pursuant to law. But, the vast majority of these handbooks and administrative manuals dealt with the subject of "how to do the job."

Some time ago, I appointed a committee to evaluate our handbooks and manuals and make recommendations on the subject. The committee concluded, in part, that these volumes—many of which they acknowledged were out of date and not current—should be maintained in order "to insure uniformity in management." My experience in Government leads me to believe that, generally, "uniformity" is a synonym for "mediocrity." *Uniformity is not what I seek in management! Rather, I seek creativity and personal growth.*

Accordingly, I issued a memorandum abolishing all handbooks and administrative manuals as of July 1, 1969, except those essential to guide our field personnel in adhering to legal requirements of personnel, property, and money.

In lieu of administrative manuals, we have provided different management tools.

First, we have promulgated administrative policies to guide day-to-day management in the field. Each of these policies is accompanied by an explanation of "why this is the policy." These policies do not provide answers to specific problems. They do, however, establish boundary lines within which a decision can be made consistent with the policy of the organization and in light of the circumstances that exist in the particular case at hand.

These administrative policies recognize the three different categories of areas making up the National Park System, i.e., the natural, historical, and recreational. Each category of area was established by the Congress to serve a different purpose and these different purposes are reflected in the administrative policies.

Secondly, we have established program standards for the execution of each major field function—administrative management, maintenance, protection and visitor services, resources management, and interpretation. These program standards define three appropriate levels for the operation of these programs depending upon season of the year, public use and similar demands on the local operations. For example, the maintenance program standards recognize that all facilities do not require the same degree of maintenance care. Thus, a back-country administrative road does not have to be maintained at the same level as does a major park road having high density visitor use. Importantly, therefore, the standard of maintenance established for each facility is designed to achieve the best balance between meeting the public needs and preserving the public investment at reasonable cost.

Third, we have initiated personal performance standards for each employee of the National Park Service. These standards describe the conditions which will obtain when the job has been done satisfactorily. We initiated this as a four-year project. In the first year, we have developed personal performance standards for Regional Directors, Superintendents, and District Rangers. In the second year, it is our goal to develop performance standards for Assistant Directors and for each member of the Regional offices. Our third year program will involve the development of personal performance standards for each member of the park organization; and

our final year's program will involve the development of personal performance standards for each member of the Washington Office and the Service Centers.

These performance standards establish a channel of communication between the employee and his supervisor for objective dialogue concerning job performance. They represent an agreement in advance between the employee and his supervisor as to the job to be done and the results that will be obtained when the job is done adequately. In my mind, at least, their greatest value is to enable the employee to know in his own mind that he is, indeed, doing an adequate job, or he is not doing an adequate job, even before his supervisor knows it.

My third belief about management in a public agency is this:

The support of one's partner—either husband or wife—is essential to top performance in the job;

Retirement—like recruitment—is simply a change in occupational status.

It is, therefore, the function of management to provide the avenues by which an employee's family (as well as former employees and their families) may relate to the organization and its programs in meaningful ways.

The "team" is generally the basic work unit in day-to-day park management, such as, mountain climbing, rescue, fire fighting, underwater swimming, wildlife management, and a wide variety of other responsibilities.

One of the most effective applications of the "team" principle in the National Park Service is the family. We have conscientiously and systematically tried to encourage this family team effort. For example, as I mentioned earlier, one section of our employees' Newsletter is devoted to the activities of our park wives. We have encouraged them in maintaining a national park wives organization. They do much significant work without which our programs would simply founder. They are the hostesses in the parks, many of which are isolated; they are a vital link between the official organization and the community; in an emergency they serve as the unpaid—yet indispensable—communication link between a rescue team and home base; they advise constructively and creatively on many of our management programs such as employee housing, park communications, etc. The stories that I could share with you—based on my personal experience in the field—as to the invaluable contributions of our park wives would require a second alumni presentation. As a matter of fact I am so thoroughly convinced of the value of the wife's commitment and contribution to her husband's career and the agency's mission that I suggest it would be well worth the money for the Institute to provide a training opportunity for Government wives. I suggest that the taxpayers would get the biggest dividend for their money ever offered by a sovereign!

In many ways the National Park Service is a young agency; and, yet, we are older than we sometimes realize. For example, we now have third generation employees in the Service. The result is that we have a growing body of alumni. These are talented men and women who have devoted decades of their lives to the management of this Nation's natural and cultural inheritance, and to providing opportunities of inspiration, relaxation, and recreation for millions of citizens in God's great out-of-doors.

To encourage their continued interest in the programs of the Service and to provide meaningful ways in which they can continue to relate to the agency, we initiated several years ago a "reemployed annuitant program." In this program, we employ those retirees who are interested in pursuing part-time active work. The pay for this part-time work is the difference between the annuitant's retirement and the salary of the position

he occupies. It is a small amount, indeed. Generally, we can reemploy a GS-15 annuitant for an amount roughly equivalent to the salary of a GS-5 and where can you improve on that bargain today? We have also adopted a "trial retirement" program.

Several years ago our employees and our alumni organized an Employee and Alumni Association which publishes a monthly paper, "The National Park Courier." Through this paper we are able to communicate with our retirees on important aspects of park programs and thereby continue their link with the Service.

There are many other things that we have done to improve the management of the National Park Service. For example, we have consolidated our professional disciplines, i.e., planners, architects, engineers, landscape architects, etc., in Service Centers; grouped parks in the immediate vicinity of each other under centralized management, providing common administrative services, such as, accounting, purchasing, etc.; expanded our training and manpower development programs; restructured our Washington Office to recognize the growing dimension of our urban parklands; initiated ecological master planning and joint regional planning; improved resource management based on scientific data; designed an environmental education program integrated with the secondary school curriculum; started studies to determine the "carrying capacity" of parks—to mention just a few things.

So much for management of the National Park Service—more importantly, what are we managing for?

I believe a National Park is more than a physical resource. I believe a National Park is an idea which in the fullness of its meaning is a link between the generations of men in their continuing search to be "at home" in their world.

National Parks and historic landmarks help give us all a "sense of place" in a mobile America. They contribute to our sense of both the beautiful and the familiar. Love of locality is one of the roots of social cohesion, according to Charles E. Merriam, who was one of our greatest political scientists. But in a new country like the United States, and in a society where one family in five moves each year, and where we have over 80 million automobiles, we have a hard time developing local roots of the kind familiar to Englishmen in Sussex, Frenchmen in Brittany, or Irishmen in County Cork. Our National Parks like Yosemite and Grand Canyon, and our historic places like Independence Hall and the Washington Monument take the place of local roots for tens of millions of mobile Americans. They give us the assurance of a "sense of place" expressive of our country that we can tie to permanently, wherever we move or live.

I believe many people go to the National Parks and historic landmarks not simply to satisfy a need to get back to nature from crowded cities or for outdoor recreation. Many people go to the National Parks and landmarks to strengthen their identity with their country. "Seeing is believing," and touching the Liberty Bell or setting foot in Yosemite Valley is worth a long trip to experience a sense of identity with America where it is unchanging. It isn't subtle. It's the deep human need to know "I was there" at Independence Hall or Yosemite Valley; and, as a result am a little more an American. This experience is especially needed in these times of war, turmoil, and technological change.

When the bill to create a National Park Service was under consideration in Congress in 1916, J. Horace McFarland testified before the House Committee on Public Lands. His words echo today's needs of our urban society:

"... the word 'park' in the minds of most

of us suggests a place in which there are a number of flower beds, and probably stone dogs, and iron fountains, and things of that kind, and a road over which an automobile may travel. We forget that the park has passed out of that category in the United States. *The park now serves the people; the park decreases the demand on the forces for keeping order; the park is the direct competitor, in the United States, of the courts, of the jail, of the cemetery, and a very efficient competitor with all of them.*" (Italic supplied).

The beauty of the parks in the National Capital was just coming to fruition in 1916 when Congress was talking about a National Park Service. The McMillan Commission had made its great report on the plan for Washington in 1902, the Mall was rescued shortly afterward, the Lincoln Memorial was authorized in 1911, and the Arlington Memorial Bridge followed along. In his testimony, McFarland linked this to the idea of establishing a National Park Service:

"I had the great pleasure one day to bring here a sort of wild man from Iowa, who had never seen the East at all; who had never seen any great buildings, and, while a man of tremendous business ability, he had no conception of the value of beauty. We reached Washington about nine o'clock one night and he was so eager to see what this town looked like that we went on top of one of the buildings just back of the Capitol, and he had his first glimpse of the whole scene by moonlight. He was fairly crazy about it. *He said he had never been a good American citizen before. There was made that very instant a good, strong, fighting unit out of a man who was merely a business man before—in it for what he could get out of it. There was born in his bosom at that instant a devotion to the country because of the beauty of the city which has been created by the hand of man.*"

"Now, gentleman, if that can happen in Washington—and it happens constantly... it will happen to a much greater extent in connection with these great national wonders that are comprised in the national parks."

The National Park System has a deep stake in the urban park idea, and it goes back to the founding of the Service in 1916; and, to a realization that the National Capital and the National Parks are both symbols of the Nation.

Beyond our need to identify with the nation is the urgent need to understand our place in the world environment and to join hands in doing our part to rescue it from impending ecological disaster. As Freeman Tilden put it, we need "to understand our place in nature and among men." We will reach this objective more quickly and we will heal our environment more rapidly if we develop social cohesion "at home" by learning we are one people with a common heritage well expressed in your National Park System. As we achieve social harmony we will do better in joining together to recover our natural heritage and that of the world around us.

With innovative programs, such as Living History demonstrations and Summer-in-the-Parks we are striving to make parks more meaningful to people in their search to be "at home" in their world. In assessing the impact of Summer-in-the-Parks on his work, one park policeman, recently observed, "we now play with the youngsters in the parks, rather than chase them on the streets."

"Through program innovation in response to the changing needs of our society and by sensitive management," Secretary Hickel has said, "the National Park System can contribute enormously to our national goals of enhancing the life of every American and supporting the effort to articulate an envi-

ronmental ethic as a rule of human conduct." He has challenged us to make this larger objective our "constant guide as we approach the decade of the seventies."
Thank you very much.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the period September 1 to September 12, 1969, on account of official business attending the NATO Military Installation Tour.

Mr. MANN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, September 8, on account of official business.

Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for Monday, September 8, 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. SIKES, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROTZMAN), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DICKINSON, for 1 hour, on September 17.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 1 hour, on September 17.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter, to:)

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. TUNNEY, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McMILLAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROTZMAN), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. DENNEY.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. WIGGINS.

Mr. MAILLIARD in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. REID of New York.
Mr. HORTON.

Mr. SNYDER.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN in four instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in four instances.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. HEBERT.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. ICHORD.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. TUNNEY.

Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN in six instances.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 719. An act to establish a national mining and minerals policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1499. An act to name the authorized lock and dam numbered 17 on the Verdigris River in Oklahoma for the Chouteau family; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7206. An act to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of Congress.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 5, 1969, this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11235. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 532

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of thirty-two Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. BOGGS;
Mr. GERALD R. FORD;
Mr. ARENDS;
Mr. DAWSON;
Mr. PRICE of Illinois;
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI;
Mr. SPRINGER;
Mr. RHODES;
Mr. POFF;
Mr. BOB WILSON;
Mr. CRAMER;
Mr. GRAY;
Mr. COLLIER;
Mr. MICHEL;
Mr. SMITH of California;
Mr. DERWINSKI;
Mr. MURPHY of Illinois;
Mr. PUCINSKI;
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI;
Mr. SHIPLEY;
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois;
Mr. FINDLEY;
Mr. McCLORY;
Mr. MORTON;
Mrs. REID of Illinois;
Mr. YATES;
Mr. ANNUNZIO;
Mr. BROWN of Ohio;
Mr. ERLBORN;
Mr. TAFT;
Mr. RALLSBACK; and
Mr. MIKVA.

The Clerk will report the remaining resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, September 9, 1969, at 11:45 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1120. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Gary, Ind., Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1121. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program under title IB of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Kansas City, Mo., Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1122. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the financial statements of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the year ended December 31, 1968; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1123. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act of September 11, 1957, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1686. An act relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; without amendment (Rept. No. 91-477). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7066. A bill to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to provide for the development of the Eisenhower National Historic Site at Gettysburg, Pa., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-479). 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. ADAMS:

H.R. 13639. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 13640. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 13641. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13642. A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for

the transportation of salacious advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13643. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 13644. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13645. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13646. A bill to amend the act of April 14, 1910, relating to railway safety appliances, to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe reflecting devices or materials as a safety measure on all railroad cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 13647. A bill to authorize voluntary withholding of Maryland, Virginia, and District income taxes in the case of certain legislative officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13648. A bill to authorize voluntary withholding of Maryland, Virginia, and District income taxes in the cases of officers and employees of the Architect of the Capitol or of the Botanic Garden; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 13649. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself,

Mr. DULSKI, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. McCURE, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COWGER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ERENBORN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. FRIEDEL):

H.R. 13650. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself,

Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KING, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. KYL, Mr. McCLODY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MIEVA, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MIZE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REES, Mrs. REID of Illinois, and Mr. ROBISON):

H.R. 13651. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself,

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 13652. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educa-

tional benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 13653. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13654. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 13655. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas of the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 13656. A bill to amend the act of September 21, 1965, relating to the Assateague Island National Seashore to permit Federal participation in the cost of maintaining certain bridge approaches; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13657. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing certain portions of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and Great Lakes of the United States as marine sanctuaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PURCELL (for himself, Mr. REUSS, Mr. WYATT, Mr. MacGREGOR, and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 13658. A bill to encourage the development of novel varieties of sexually reproduced plants and making them available to the public, by making protection available to those who breed, develop, or discover them, thereby promoting progress in the useful art of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 13659. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to extend, in certain pending cases, the period prior to approval of a neighborhood development program within a public improvement or facility must have been commenced in order to qualify as a local noncash grant-in-aid; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 13660. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13661. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Act for the blind so as to make certain improvements therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 13662. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 13663. A bill to strengthen State and local tax systems by providing for a credit against individual income taxes for 40 percent of State and local taxes, and by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into agreements providing for Federal collection of State income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 13664. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educa-

tional benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 13665. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,680 to \$2,400 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 13666. A bill to amend title XII of the National Housing Act to provide, under the urban property protection and reinsurance program, for direct Federal insurance against losses to habitational property for which insurance is not otherwise available or is available only at excessively surcharged rates, to make crime insurance mandatory under such program, to provide assistance to homeowners to aid in reducing the causes of excessive surcharges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13667. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 13688. A bill to amend the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1968 to provide additional funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 13669. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require the public disclosure of all direct payments made to physicians and other medical practitioners under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 13670. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to opportunities industrialization centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13671. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual a deduction from gross income for certain expenses of employing housemaids, yardmen, and other household help; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 13672. A bill to provide additional assistance for the reconstruction of areas in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, and West Virginia

which were damaged by Hurricane Camille of 1969; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13673. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 887. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.J. Res. 888. Resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning February 13, 1970, and ending February 19, 1970, as "Mineral Industry Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 889. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution protesting the treatment of American servicemen held prisoner by the Government of North Vietnam and backing the administration in its efforts on behalf of these servicemen held captive by the North Vietnamese Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 326. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 13674. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Garrido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 13675. A bill for the relief of Tara Chand Sharma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 13676. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13677. A bill for the relief of Michael Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13678. A bill for the relief of Therese Liautaud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13679. A bill for the relief of Samuel Woletsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 13680. A bill for the relief of Chyn Hwang Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13681. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lovece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Res. 533. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 3722) entitled "A bill for the relief of John S. Attinello" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

259. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Federal food stamp and commodity distribution programs in California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

260. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

261. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to continuation of fund to federally impacted school areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

262. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to offshore oil development operations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

228. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State Council of West Virginia, Junior Order, United American Mechanics, relative to display of the American flag in public school classrooms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

229. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to amending the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE—Monday, September 8, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. 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 who are from everlasting to everlasting, come upon us this day with a vivid and intimate awareness of Thy presence, that we may know that neither life nor death, nor things present nor things to come shall ever separate us from Thy love, and that in Thee the temporal and the eternal have no distinction. Surround us with Thy love, impart to us Thy healing grace, and bring

to us the ministry of hallowed memory and sacred recollection.

We thank Thee for Thy servant and our comrade, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, who has fought a good fight, kept the faith, finished his course, and is at rest with Thee. For the nobility of his manhood, the magnanimity of his spirit, the hospitality of his mind, and the inclusiveness of his friendship we give Thee thanks. For his massive mind, his matchless speech, his powers of persuasion, and his parliamentary skills we give thanks to Thee. For his elevated patriotism and his manly piety, for his grace and dignity in public service we give Thee thanks. For his prodigious energy spent in self-

sacrificing public service, for his fortitude in suffering, and his witness to values which are everlasting we give Thee thanks. May the integrity of his manhood, the radiance of his character, his gentle but subtle humor, and his sense of the divine in all things human remain as an abiding legacy for all generations. May his golden voice now silenced on this side be lifted with the everlasting choirs invisible on the other side of the great divide. May the land he loved, the Nation he served, and the principles to which he was dedicated make this land more and more a foretaste of the kingdom whose builder and maker is God. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.